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# Appendix A: Annual Institutional Profile

## Middle States Commission on Higher Education

### Institutional Profile 2012-13

**[0360] New York University**

## A. General Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Data on File</strong> (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th><strong>IP Data</strong> (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution Name</strong></td>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>70 Washington Square South, New York, NY 10012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Telephone</strong></td>
<td>212 998 1212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax</strong></td>
<td>212 995 4159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.nyu.edu">www.nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Private (Non-Profit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carnegie Classification</strong></td>
<td>Research - Very High Research Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calendar</strong></td>
<td>Semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree Granting Authority</strong></td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licensed to Operate in</strong></td>
<td>Argentina, China, Czech Republic, England, France, Germany, Ghana, Israel, Italy, Spain, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees/Certificates Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Data on File Offered</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programs</strong></th>
<th><strong>IP Data Offered</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programs</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate's</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor's</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postbaccalaureate Certificate</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Master's Certificate</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor's - Professional Practice</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor's - Research/Scholarship</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctor's - Other</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Related Entities

- **Name, State, Country**: none
- **Initial Accreditation**: 1921
- **Last Reaffirmed**: 2009
Next Self-Study Visit: 2013-14
Next Periodic Review Report (PRR): June 2019
CHE Staff Liaison: Dr. Ellie A. Fogarty

Notes

Instructions

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Institution Name

This field must be updated by MSCHE staff. If your institution name has changed, please send a letter (on institution letterhead) to MSCHE providing the new name and the date (mm/dd/yyyy) of the name change. Address the letter to your CHE staff liaison. You may email the letter (scanned copy) or place it in regular mail. Upon written request in the text of your letter, MSCHE will provide a letter acknowledging the name change.

Address

This field must be updated by MSCHE staff. Please contact Tze Joe (tjoe@msche.org) if you need to correct the institution’s address due to a spelling, typographical, or other error. Please note: an official change of address (moving locations) is covered under MSCHE’s substantive change policy.

Telephone and Fax
List the numbers to which you prefer to have general inquiries directed. These numbers will be published in our on-line directory.

Website
Provide the web address for your institution’s home page.

Control

This field must be updated by MSCHE staff. Please contact Tze Joe (tjoe@msche.org) if you want to update the control category.

Carnegie Classification
This field must be updated by MSCHE staff. The Commission uses the categories in the 2010 Carnegie Classification - Basic Classification. The classification categories are determined by the Carnegie Foundation as shown in the chart below. The data in the MSCHE system should match exactly what is provided by Carnegie for your institution.

For a complete description of the Carnegie Classification system, go to http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org.descriptions/. More information is provided about how and when Carnegie Foundation updates the classification in their FAQs at http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/resources/faqs.php.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-R-S</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Rural-serving Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-R-M</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Rural-serving Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-R-L</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Rural-serving Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-S-SC</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Suburban-serving Single Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-S-MC</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Suburban-serving Multicampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-U-SC</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Urban-serving Single Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-U-MC</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Urban-serving Multicampus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub-Spec</td>
<td>Associate's--Public Special Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Assoc/PrivNFP</td>
<td>Associate's--Private Not-for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Assoc/PrivFP4</td>
<td>Associate's--Private For-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub2in4</td>
<td>Associate's--Public 2-year colleges under 4-year universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Assoc/Pub4</td>
<td>Associate's--Public 4-year Primarily Associate's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Assoc/PrivNFP4</td>
<td>Associate's--Private Not-for-profit 4-year Primarily Associate's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Assoc/PrivFP4</td>
<td>Associate's--Private For-profit 4-year Primarily Associate's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Master's L</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Master's M</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Master's S</td>
<td>Master's Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges--Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bac/Diverse</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges--Diverse Fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bac/Assoc</td>
<td>Baccalaureate/Associate's Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Spec/Faith</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Theological seminaries, Bible colleges, and other faith-related institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Spec/Med</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Medical schools and medical centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Spec/Health</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Other health professions schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Spec/Engg</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Schools of engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Spec/Tech</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Other technology-related schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Spec/Bus</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Schools of business and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Spec/Arts</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Schools of art, music, and design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Spec/Law</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Schools of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Spec/Other</td>
<td>Special Focus Institutions--Other special-focus institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td>Tribal Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calendar**

Indicate the predominant calendar system used at your institution, including:

* Semester
* Quarter
* Trimester
* 4-1-4 Plan
* Continuous Term
* Differs by Program
* Other

**Degree Granting Authority**

Select the state or other jurisdiction that authorizes your institution to offer postsecondary degrees. Federally chartered institutions (i.e., military) should select "United States of America."

**Licensed to Operate In**

Select the state(s)/province(s) or other local jurisdictions in which your institution was required to get national or local government permits or other forms of approval in order to conduct business there. At least one of these must be the same state or country that provided your degree granting
authority. Federally chartered institutions (i.e., military) do not need to answer this question.

**Degrees and Certificates Offered**

Update the number of programs for each of the following certificates and degrees that your institution offers.

- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 1 (< 1 year - less than one academic year)
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 2 (>=1 year, < 2 years - at least one but less than two academic years)
- Associate's Degree
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 3 (>= 2 years, < 4 years - at least two but less than four academic years)
- Bachelor's Degree
- Postbaccalaureate certificate
- Master's Degree (Including M.Div. and M.H.L./Rav)
- Post-master's certificate
- Doctor's degree - research/scholarship
- Doctor's degree - professional practice
- Doctor's degree - Other

Note: The number of programs refers to the number of programs of study/majors available for a given degree/certificate level. Please see "Definitions of Types of Awards" at the bottom of the screen for definitions of each degree level. More information is also available on the most recent post baccalaureate degree classifications at the **Association for Institutional Research** web site at [http://www3.aiweb.org/images/new%20post-baccalaureate%20degree%20classifications.pdf](http://www3.aiweb.org/images/new%20post-baccalaureate%20degree%20classifications.pdf).

- The degree levels you report must correspond with the degree levels your institution is **currently approved to offer and must be degree levels** which are **included within the existing scope of accreditation for the institution**. The data recorded in the MSCHE database reflects the degree level indicated in the institution’s initial application for accreditation or the substantive change request. See your institution’s Statement of Accreditation Status (SAS) available within the institution’s record in the Institution Directory at [www.msche.org/institutions_directory.asp](http://www.msche.org/institutions_directory.asp). If you believe the current degree level is incorrect, please contact Amy Shew Moseder at amoseder@msche.org for guidance about how to proceed.

- If your institution is offering a new degree or certificate level which has not previously been approved, an application for substantive change must be submitted to MSCHE. According to Department of Education regulations, a **New Degree Level** may not be added or removed except through the Substantive Change process. See the relevant **Substantive Change policy statement** with instructions for submitting a Substantive Change request and the separate **Frequently Asked Questions** on the MSCHE web site.

**DEFINITIONS OF TYPES OF AWARDS (Adapted from the IPEDS Glossary)**

**Certificate**: A formal award certifying the satisfactory completion of a postsecondary education program. MSCHE collects data on certificates of varying levels including postsecondary (less than 1 year, at least one but less than two academic years, at least two but less than four academic years), postbaccalaureate certificate, and Post-masters certificate.

**Associate's**: An award that normally requires at least 2 but less than 4 years of full-time equivalent college work

**Bachelor's**: An award that normally requires at least 4 but not more than 5 years of full-time equivalent college-level work. It also includes bachelor's degrees in which the normal 4 years of work are completed in 3 years

**Master's**: An award that requires the successful completion of a program of study of at last the full-
time equivalent of 1 but not more than 2 academic years of work beyond the bachelor's degree

**Doctor's - research/scholarship:** A Ph.D. or other doctor's degree that requires advanced work beyond the master's level, including the preparation and defense of a dissertation based on original research, or the planning and execution of an original project demonstrating substantial artistic or scholarly achievement. Some examples of this type of degree may include Ed.D., D.M.A., D.B.A., D.Sc., D.A., or D.M., and others, as designated by the awarding institution.

**Doctor's - professional practice:** A doctor's degree that is conferred upon completion of a program providing the knowledge and skills for the recognition, credential, or license required for professional practice. The degree is awarded after a period of study such that the total time to the degree, including both pre-professional and professional preparation, equals at least six full-time equivalent academic years. Some of these degrees were formerly classified as "First Professional" and may include Chiropractic (D.C. or D.C.M.); Dentistry (D.D.S. or D.M.D.); Law (L.L.B. or J.D.); Medicine (M.D.); Optometry (O.D.); Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.); Pharmacy (Pharm.D.); Podiatry (D.P.M., Pod.D., D.P.); or Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.), and others, as designated by the awarding institution.

**Doctor's - other:** A doctor's degree that does not meet the definition of a "doctor's degree - research/scholarship" or a "doctor's degree - professional practice."

### Related Entities

Indicate if the institution completing this form is related to another entity, within this region or elsewhere, that is not accredited by Middle States. Provide the name, state and country of the related entity.

Excerpt from the "Related Entities" policy statement:

A related entity may be a corporate parent, system administration or board, religious sponsor, funding sponsor (which, in some cases, may include an equity or investment fund), or other entity that can affect decisions related to accreditation (herein "Related Entities"). Related entities may include institutional or corporate layers or groups. Ordinarily, local, county, and state legislatures, other accreditors, local advisory boards, and government agencies are not related entities. The scope of this policy does not include "contractual relationships" in which the accredited entity contracts for services; these are governed by a separate Commission policy.

**Exclusions:**

Do not report relationships that you are listing elsewhere in the IP as Branch Campuses, Additional Locations, or Other Instructional Sites.

---

**Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

**Institutional Profile 2012-13**

[0360] **New York University**

---

**B. Key Contacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Contact</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>Dr. John Sexton President</td>
<td>Dr. John Sexton President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 Washington Square South New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>70 Washington Square South New York, NY 10012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://www.msche.org/ip/report.asp?flgOutput=0&btSection=allWithInsructions](https://www.msche.org/ip/report.asp?flgOutput=0&btSection=allWithInsructions)
Chief Academic Officer

Dr. David McLaughlin
Provost
70 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 2415
Fax: none
Email: david.mclaughlin@nyu.edu

Chief Financial Officer

Dr. Michael Alfano
Executive Vice President
70 Washington Square South
1219
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 4090
Fax: 212 995 4789
Email: michael.alfano@nyu.edu

Chief Information Technology Officer

Ms. Marilyn A. McMillan
Associate Provost and Chief Information Technology Officer
10 Astor Place, Room 502B
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 2001
Fax: none
Email: marilyn.mcmillan@nyu.edu

Accreditation Liaison Officer

Mr. Barnett W. Hamberger
Associate Provost of Academic Program Review
194 Mercer Street, Room 406
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 2310
Fax: 212 995 4251
Email: bwh1@nyu.edu

Coordinator of Distance Education

Dr. Kristen Sosulsiki
Academic Director
70 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 992 9133
Fax: none
Email: kristen.sosulsiki@nyu.edu

Coordinator of Outcomes Assessment

Mr. Barnett W. Hamberger
Associate Provost of Academic Program Review
194 Mercer Street, Room 406
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 2310
Fax: 212 995 4251
Email: bwh1@nyu.edu

Coordinator of Institutional Research Functions

Dr. Randall Deike
Vice President of Enrollment Management
70 Washington Square South
New York, NY 10012

Phone: 212 998 4553
Fax: none
**Chair: Self-Study Steering Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Norman Dorsen</td>
<td>Counselor to the President/Stokes Professor of Law</td>
<td>40 Washington Square South, New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>212 998 6233</td>
<td>212 995 4030</td>
<td><a href="mailto:norman.dorsen@nyu.edu">norman.dorsen@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Co-Chair: Self-Study Steering Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Barnett W. Hamberger</td>
<td>Associate Provost of Academic Program Review</td>
<td>194 Mercer Street, Room 406, New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>212 998 2310</td>
<td>212 995 4251</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwh1@nyu.edu">bwh1@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person in the President's Office To Whom MSCHE Invoices Should Be Sent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Barnett W. Hamberger</td>
<td>Associate Provost of Academic Program Review</td>
<td>194 Mercer Street, Room 406, New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>212 998 2310</td>
<td>212 995 4251</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bwh1@nyu.edu">bwh1@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person Who Should Receive a Copy of MSCHE Invoices (Optional)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. John Sexton</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>70 Washington Square South, New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>212 998 2345</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><a href="mailto:john.sexton@nyu.edu">john.sexton@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person Completing IP Financials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Cara Squicciarini</td>
<td>Director of Financial Reporting</td>
<td>838 Broadway #521, New York, NY 10003</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carasquicciarini@nyu.edu">carasquicciarini@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person Completing IP (Key User)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Rachel Maxwell</td>
<td>Associate Director, Institutional Research</td>
<td>196 Mercer Street 7th Fl., New York, NY 10012</td>
<td>212 998 2311</td>
<td>212 995 4400</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmaxwell@nyu.edu">rmaxwell@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions**

**B. KEY CONTACTS**

Verify existing or provide additional information in ALL of the requested fields.
If a person has more than one function, please add his or her name to each category. Otherwise, the correct person may not receive postal mail or e-mails that the Commission directs to specific key contacts. **Do not leave any contacts blank. Do not enter “vacant.” Provide the most appropriate contact name for the position.**

**Telephone/E-mail.** Please note that the telephone number and e-mail address in each instance should be the individual’s direct number or address, not the institution’s main number or address. This information is exclusively for the internal use of Middle States staff, and it is not made available to the public.

*Exception:* Chief executive officers, chief academic officers, or provosts may provide either their own direct telephone number and e-mail address or those of their personal assistant authorized to receive private messages on their behalf.

**Personnel Changes.** If you are aware that a Key Contact will be leaving your institution after you lock down the IP, leave that person’s name in his or her current role. The IP should be accurate as of the time of lock down. Subsequently, please notify Mr. Joe ([tjoe@msche.org](mailto:tjoe@msche.org)) by e-mail of the actual termination and/or any replacement, and he will make the change(s) on your behalf. If someone on the list is deceased or has left your institution, please also notify Mr. Joe.

**Replace/Modify.** For each key contact category, you may replace one person with another or modify (update) the information about an incumbent.

To replace a person with someone already affiliated with your institution in the Middle States database, select from the list provided. If the replacement is at your institution but has had no prior activity with Middle States or is someone who came to your institution from elsewhere, please send an e-mail to Mr. Tze Joe ([tjoe@msche.org](mailto:tjoe@msche.org)), asking him to add that person to your list. When you are notified that the person has been added to the list, you may modify the information if necessary.

**International Addresses.** For addresses outside the United States, the screen provides three address lines. Starting with Address Line 1, enter the entire mailing address in the postal format commonly used in that country.

**System/District Chief Executive Officer**
If Middle States has designated your institution as part of a system or district, please complete this section.

**Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO)** Enter the name, title, and phone number of the individual currently appointed by the chief executive officer of your institution to work directly with the Commission on matters of accreditation. This person may be the same as, or different from the Key Holder, or may hold any other job title at the institution, at the discretion of the CEO. Please see the Commissions Guidelines on the Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO): Role and Responsibilities [http://www.msche.org/documents/6B---5-ALO-guidelines-122109.pdf](http://www.msche.org/documents/6B---5-ALO-guidelines-122109.pdf) for more information.

**Coordinator of Outcomes Assessment Functions**
Enter the name of the administrator or faculty member who is responsible for coordinating the institution’s outcomes assessment activities, regardless of that person’s actual job title. For instance, this person may be a faculty member who is the chair of the outcomes assessment committee or other organized group that is driving the outcomes assessment efforts on campus.

**Coordinator of Institutional Research Functions**
Enter the name of the person responsible for the institution’s institutional research functions, regardless of that person’s actual job title. For instance, the primary contact for institutional research may have the title Director of Institutional Research or the Institutional Research Coordinator.
Coordinator of Distance Education
Enter the name of the person responsible for coordinating the institution's distance education courses. (Required for institutions that offer distance education courses)

Chief Information Technology Officer
Enter the name of the person responsible for managing the institution's information technology department or functions, regardless of that person's actual job title.

Chair/Co-Chairs of Self-Study Steering Committee
Complete this item ONLY if your institution is scheduled for a team visit in 2011-12 or 2012-13. (See the dates pre-formatted in General Information.) Provide the name and title of the Chair (or co-Chairs) of your institution's Self-Study Steering Committee. If your institution has more than two co-Chairs, select only two for the IP as contacts for MSCHE staff. Please update these Chairs if those who are currently in the database were from a previous self-study or PRR and new Chairs have been appointed.

Person in the President's Office to Whom Invoices Should be Sent
Enter the person who is responsible for coordinating the approval and payment of invoices from MSCHE for dues and fees. MSCHE will send its invoices by e-mail to this individual.

Person Who Should Receive a Copy of the Invoice (optional)
Enter the person who should simultaneously receive a copy of the invoice sent to the president's office.

Person Completing IP Financials
Enter the person who is responsible for providing the financial data and who can answer questions about the meaning of the data.

Person Completing the IP
Enter the Key User who is responsible for the content of the IP (not necessarily the data entry person).

Verify Key Contacts

☐ Click here to indicate that you have reviewed and accepted the list of Key Contacts above. (Required to "Lock Down" the IP data)

You must click the checkbox at the bottom of the screen to verify that you have reviewed and updated the entire key contact list. This is a required field. If you do not click the checkbox, you will receive an error message and you will not be permitted to lock down the IP.
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C. Graduation Data

Awards Granted
Report all degrees or other formal awards conferred by your institution between July 1, 2011, and June 30, 2012. If an individual received two degrees at different levels during the specified time period, report each degree in the appropriate category.

Please see the instructions for specific inclusions and exclusions.
Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (less than 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>6431</td>
<td>5854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>6783</td>
<td>6876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's Certificate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Other</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screening Questions

Does your institution have undergraduate programs? yes
Does your institution serve only transfer students? See instructions if the answer is yes. no

Completers

This section requests completion data on two separate cohorts (150% and 200%) of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students enrolled in your institution during the specified fall term or academic year. Students must be enrolled full-time in courses that lead to a credit-bearing degree, diploma, certificate or other formal award. Count completers only once and indicate the highest degree level earned. Report the status of these students as of August 31 of the reporting year. Please see the instructions to identify students for inclusion in the specific cohorts.

Completers of Programs of <= 2 Years

Data on File (as of 4/24/2013) IP Data (2012-13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data on File</th>
<th>IP Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150% of expected time to completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students in the Fall 2009 cohort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number completed within 150%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transfers out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Fall 2009 cohort still enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of expected time to completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students in the Fall 2008 cohort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number completed within 200%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transfers out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Fall 2008 cohort still enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completers of Programs of > 2 and <= 4 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data on File</th>
<th>IP Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150% of expected time to completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students in the Fall 2006 cohort</td>
<td>3689</td>
<td>3653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number completed within 150%</td>
<td>3184</td>
<td>3116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total transfers out</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of Fall 2006 cohort still enrolled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200% of expected time to completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students in the Fall 2004 cohort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students in the Fall 2004 cohort</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number completed within 200% 0 0
Total transfers out 0 0
Total number of Fall 2004 cohort still enrolled 0 0

Notes

Instructions

C. GRADUATION DATA

PART 1: Awards Granted
Report the total number of degrees, certificates, or other formal awards conferred by your institution between July 1, 2011 and June 30, 2012 (or other official year, if your institution uses an enhanced semester calendar).

Include:

- Formal awards conferred as a result of an academic or occupational/vocational program of study. The instructional activity completed as part of the program of study must be credit-bearing, but can be measured in credit hours, contact hours, or some other unit of measurement.
- Earned degrees and awards conferred by branches of your institution located within or outside the Middle States region, including foreign countries.

Note: Although IPEDS was updated for the 2011-2012 reporting period to exclude "awards conferred by branches of your institution located in foreign countries," MSCH will continue to collect degrees conferred by branches of your institution located in foreign countries. Continue to include them in the count for the IP.

- Multiple awards earned by a single student. If an individual received two or more awards during the specified time period, report each award in the appropriate category.

Do Not Include:

- Awards earned but not yet conferred.
- Honorary degrees and awards.
- Awards conferred by an entity other than the postsecondary institution (such as the state, or an industry certificate).
- Informal awards (such as certificates of merit, completion, attendance, or transfer).
- Noncredit awards.

Note: Institutions that offer transfer programs only and have no first time students should check the appropriate box in the screening questions that appear at the beginning of the IP. Institutions that indicate "Yes" their undergraduate programs serve only transfer students will not be provided with a Completers section. Institutions that started first-year baccalaureate programs in 2007-08 or later should answer "no." These institutions are not required to report in the Completers section below in order to lock down.

PART 2: Completers
This section requests completion data on two separate cohorts (150% and 200%) of full-time, first-time, degree/certificate-seeking undergraduate students enrolled in your institution during the specified fall term or academic year. Students must be enrolled full-time in courses that lead to a credit-bearing degree, diploma, certificate or other formal award. Count completers only once and
indicate only the highest degree level earned. Report the status of these students as of **August 31** of the reporting year as indicated by institution type below.

**Include:**

- Full-time students enrolled in the fall term who attended college for the first time in the prior summer term.
- Full-time students enrolled in remedial courses if the student is considered degree-seeking for the purpose of student financial aid determination.
- Full-time students enrolled in courses that are part of a vocational or occupational program, including those enrolled in off-campus centers and those enrolled in distance learning/home study programs.
- Full-time students taking remedial courses if the student is considered degree-seeking.
- Full-time students who subsequently became part-time, transferred OUT to another institution, dropped out, stopped out, or have not fulfilled the requirements for a degree or certificate.

**Do Not Include:**

- Students who are enrolled exclusively in non-credit courses or are not seeking a degree/certificate.
- Students exclusively auditing classes.
- Students studying abroad at a foreign university if their enrollment at the reporting institution is only an administrative record and the fee is only nominal.
- Students studying in a branch campus located in a foreign country.
- Students who transferred IN to your institution. Institutions that have only transfer programs should check the applicable box in the screening questions at the beginning of the IP.
- Students who fall into the following exclusion categories according to IPEDS:
  1. Students who died or became permanently disabled.
  2. Students who left school to serve in the armed forces (or have been called up to active duty). Do not include students already in the military who transfer to another duty station.
  4. Students who left school to serve on an official church mission.

**Completers of Programs < or = 2 years:**

The **150% cohort** includes full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking students entering your institution in fall 2009 (i.e., first enrolled in academic year 2009-10). Report the status of the 2009 cohort as of August 31, 2012 in terms of the number of completers graduated in 150% of normal time to completion. For most two year degree programs, this is three years (2009-2012).

The **200% cohort** includes full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking students entering your institution in fall 2008 (i.e., first enrolled in academic year 2008-09). Report the status of the 2008 cohort as of August 31, 2012 in terms of the number of completers graduated within 200% of normal time to award. While the data for 150% of normal time are cumulative (in that it also includes those students who complete in 100% of normal time - 2 years for Associate's degree), the data reported for the 200% of normal time should just include those additional students who completed 151% and 200%. For most two year degree programs, this is four years (fall 2008 - 2012).

If your institution is an Associate's college and began offering such programs in or prior to 2009-10, include in the cohort the students who enrolled in fall 2009 and received full credit through 2011-12.

**Completers of Programs of > 2 or > = 4 years:**

https://www.msche.org/ip/report.asp?flgOutput=0&btSection=allWithInstructions
The **150% cohort** includes full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking students who entered in Fall 2006 (i.e., first enrolled in academic year 2006-07). Report the status of the 2006 cohort as of August 31, 2012 in terms of the number of completers graduated in 150% of normal time to completion. For most 4-year degree programs, this is six years (2006-2012).

The **200% cohort** includes full-time, first-time degree/certificate-seeking students who entered in Fall 2004. Report the status of the 2004 cohort as of August 31, 2012 in terms of the number of completers graduated within 200% of normal time to award. While the data for 150% of normal time are cumulative (in that it also includes those students who complete in 100% of normal time - 4 years for Bachelor's degree), the data reported for the 200% of normal time should just include those additional students who completed 151% and 200%.

Do not include students who initially entered in an Associate's programs (they should be included in the “Completers of Programs < or = 2 years” or students who transferred into your institution. Institutions that have only transfer programs should check the applicable box in the screening questions at the beginning of the IP.

Four-year institutions that offer 5-year or longer programs should include in the 2006 cohort the students for these programs who received full credit through 2011-12 (i.e., include all the students who entered the 5-year program in Fall 2006 and reflect their status as of the end of the 2011-12 academic year).

**Institutions with a continuous-term calendar** for the majority of their programs should use the full-year cohort.

**Transfers Out:**

If you collect transfer information, report the number of students whom you know to have transferred to another institution, without a degree/award from your institution, for both 150% and 200% normal time to completion. If you cannot confirm that the student transferred and was enrolled at another institution, the student should not be counted in transfers. Include students who transferred out of your institution and returned. Track the entire cohort for 3 years (2-year institutions) or for 6 years (4-year institutions), as applicable. Reporting transfer information is optional.

**Still Enrolled:**

Provide the number of students from the relevant cohort who were still enrolled at your institution at the 150% or 200% normal time to completion point through **August 31, 2012**.

**DEFINITIONS OF TYPES OF AWARDS**

**(Adapted from the IPEDS Glossary)**

**Associate's:** An award that normally requires at least 2 but less than 4 years of full-time equivalent college work

**Bachelor's:** An award that normally requires at least 4 but not more than 5 years of full-time equivalent college-level work. It also includes bachelor's degrees in which the normal 4 years of work are completed in 3 years

**Master's:** An award that requires the successful completion of a program of study of at least the full-time equivalent of 1 but not more than 2 academic years of work beyond the bachelor's degree

**Doctor's - research/scholarship:** A Ph.D. or other doctor's degree that requires advanced work beyond the master's level, including the preparation and defense of a dissertation based on original
research, or the planning and execution of an original project demonstrating substantial artistic or scholarly achievement. Some examples of this type of degree may include Ed.D., D.M.A., D.B.A., D.Sc., D.A., or D.M., and others, as designated by the awarding institution.

**Doctor's - professional practice:** A doctor's degree that is conferred upon completion of a program providing the knowledge and skills for the recognition, credential, or license required for professional practice. The degree is awarded after a period of study such that the total time to the degree, including both pre-professional and professional preparation, equals at least six full-time equivalent academic years. Some of these degrees were formerly classified as "First Professional" and may include Chiropractic (D.C. or D.C.M.); Dentistry (D.D.S. or D.M.D.); Law (L.L.B. or J.D.); Medicine (M.D.); Optometry (O.D.); Osteopathic Medicine (D.O.); Pharmacy (Pharm.D.); Podiatry (D.P.M., Pod.D., D.P.); or Veterinary Medicine (D.V.M.), and others, as designated by the awarding institution.

**Doctor's - other:** A doctor's degree that does not meet the definition of a "doctor's degree - research/scholarship" or a "doctor's degree - professional practice."

---
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### D. Enrollment (Unduplicated)

#### Total Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total credit hours of all part-time students</td>
<td>9143</td>
<td>51049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum credit load to be considered a full time student</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Head Count</td>
<td>21025</td>
<td>13173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Head Count</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>8458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Credit Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students matriculated, enrolled in degree programs (Undergraduate + Graduate)</td>
<td>42995</td>
<td>43689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students not matriculated, enrolled in credit-bearing courses</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-Credit Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students enrolled in non-credit, graduate level courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students enrolled in non-credit, undergraduate level and other continuing education (excluding avocational) courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

NYU does not have a way to differentiate between undergraduate and graduate non credit courses. The information above reflects all non-credit enrollment; not only avocational.

Instructions

D. ENROLLMENT

Total Enrollment (as of Fall 2012)

Total credit hours of all part-time students. Compute the total as of Fall 2012, using the institution's official fall reporting date (or as of October 15, 2012, whichever is sooner). Report separately for both undergraduate and graduate students. If your off-campus sites have different census reporting dates from the main campus cutoff date, please report the total number of credit hours, regardless of the census date.

Minimum credit load for a student to be considered full-time (per semester or equivalent unit). The general rule is that a full-time student is one who is enrolled for 12 or more semester credits, 12 or more quarter credits, or 24 or more contact hours a week each term. A full-time graduate student is enrolled for 9 or more semester credits, 9 or more quarter credits, or who is involved in thesis or dissertation preparation that the institution considers full-time.

If your definition of a full-time load varies by program or course of study, use the load representing the majority of your students. Explain the difference briefly in the Notes; if Commission staff or evaluators need further details, you can provide a full explanation at that time.

Headcount. Provide an unduplicated headcount of all full-time and part-time students, reporting undergraduate and graduate levels separately. The Commission will print the Total FT and PT headcount in its directory and will rely on it when selecting visiting teams of evaluators and for other purposes.

Institutions operating under a calendar that differs by program or enrolling on a continuous basis should include students who were enrolled in your institution at any time between August 1 and October 31 of 2012.

Include:

- Students enrolled in courses for credit at the main campus, at all branch campuses (except those that are separately accredited), and at all off-campus sites as defined in these Instructions (i.e., domestic or overseas branch campuses, additional locations, other instructional sites, and students in the institution's study-abroad program who are enrolled for credit at the reporting institution).

- Students enrolled in courses for credit who are not recognized by the institution as seeking a degree (i.e., students receiving certificates or diplomas for academic, occupational, or post-baccalaureate continuing professional studies).

Note: IPEDS defines an "Occupational program" as "A program of study consisting of one or more courses, designed to provide the student with sufficient knowledge and skills to perform in a specific occupation." It is usually below the baccalaureate level. Examples include bookkeeping, office management, massage therapy, etc.

Do Not Include:
• Students exclusively auditing classes.
• Students who receive the reporting institution’s distance education programs but who receive credit from another institution through consortia or other agreements.
• Students exclusively enrolled in courses that cannot be credited toward a degree or other formal award (i.e., non-academic, recreational, avocational [leisure], continuing education, workforce development, high school equivalency, or other similar certificates).
• Students at a reporting institution located abroad, who are study-abroad students from another U.S. institution, when those students will not receive their degrees from the reporting institution.

**Summer Programs.** Students attending the Summer 2012 session to complete requirements for graduation in 2011-12 are considered to be part of the 2011-12 cohort. However, students who start in Summer 2012 courses and continue into Fall 2012, are to be counted in the 2012-13 cohort. Alternatively, use your institution’s normal procedures for computing an academic year (e.g., Summer 2, Fall, Spring, and Summer 1), if applicable.

**Credit Enrollment (Unduplicated)**

**Matriculated (Degree-Seeking) Students**
Report the unduplicated headcount of all enrolled students as of Fall 2012 who are recognized by the institution as working toward a specific degree or certificate (i.e., matriculated, degree-seeking). Report also an unduplicated number of students who are not matriculated but who are enrolled in courses for which credit is awarded.

**Do Not Include:**

• Students exclusively auditing classes
• Students who receive the reporting institution’s distance education programs but who receive credit from another institution through consortia or other agreements
• Students exclusively enrolled in courses that cannot be credited toward a degree or other formal award (i.e., non-academic, recreational, avocational [leisure], continuing education, workforce development, high school equivalency, or other similar certificates).
• Students at a reporting institution located abroad, who are study-abroad students from another U.S. institution, when those students will not receive their degrees from the reporting institution.
• Students who are matriculated but who are on leave and not actively pursuing a degree/diploma (i.e., not utilizing the institution’s faculty, staff, or facilities).

**Non-Credit Enrollment**
The purpose of reviewing non-credit enrollment is to consider the likely impact of this enrollment on the institution’s faculty, facilities, revenue, and other overall operations and integrity.

○ Report the number of students enrolled in non-credit courses (i.e., courses that cannot be counted toward a degree). The reporting period is the entire prior academic year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012). If you use a different calendar, use your institution’s normal procedures for computing an academic year.

Count students without regard to whether they also enrolled in for-credit courses, and count them once if they enroll in more than one non-credit course. If a non-credit student takes a vocational course and an avocational course, count that student once under vocational.

**Note:** The column marked "IP Data (2012-13)" refers to the year in which your institution is submitting the IP. This is the column where you should enter data for "the entire previous academic year" (i.e., 2011-12) referred to above.
Report headcounts separately for: (1) graduate level non-credit courses; (2) undergraduate level noncredit and other continuing education courses for which certificates of completion may or may not be provided (including ESL, remedial, or career-related skills and knowledge for vocations); and (3) avocational (self-improvement/leisure) courses.

If your institution has no system for separating enrollment in continuing education versus avocational courses, report all such enrollment as continuing education, and explain in the Notes section.

Include any pre-college students, because they also have an impact on the institution’s physical, fiscal, and human resources.

For situations when the student is taking both noncredit and credit courses at the same time: Count the number of students enrolled in noncredit courses, that are not part of any formal curricula or degree program. You should NOT include audited courses that are part of a degree program. Realizing that not all student information systems track or code data the same way, rely on the course and whether it is a noncredit offering or a credit offering as defined by the institution.

**Do Not Include:**

- Students exclusively auditing classes that are part of a degree program.
- Students enrolled and seeking a formal award who also choose to take a course without credit, who complete all assignments, and who do so for personal enrichment.
- Students who receive the reporting institution’s distance learning programs but who receive credit from another institution through consortia or other agreements.
- Students who are completing requirements for a class taken in a prior semester, who pay a basic registration fee for tracking purposes but who are not independently taking a scheduled non-credit course.
- Matriculated students who are required to take a particular non-credit course in order to graduate but who are not independently taking that scheduled non-credit course.

**Avocational** programs are defined in the IPEDS Glossary as Instructional programs in personal interest and leisure categories whose expressed intent is not to produce postsecondary credits, nor to lead to a formal award or an academic degree, nor result in occupationally specific skills.

---
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**E. Distance and Correspondence Education**

Distance education means education that uses one or more technologies to deliver instructions to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor. See the Instructions for a full explanation.

**Part 1. Distance Education**

Did your institution, in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012), offer distance education courses, as defined in the Instructions?

Provide: (a) the unduplicated headcount of all students in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012)

Data on File (as of 4/24/2013) | IP Data (2012-13)
---|---
Yes | Yes

https://www.msche.org/ip/report.asp?flgOutput=0&btSection=allWithInstructions
who took distance education courses for credit by your institution; and (b) the total number of registrations of all students. The registrations may be duplicated if a student enrolls in more than one course.

Provide an explanation in the Notes context box if this reporting year's total is greater than the prior year and you have significant growth in distance learning enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Registrations</td>
<td>2826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programs**

Programs. Report the number of degree or certificate programs offered during the previous year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) for which students could meet at least 50% of their requirements for any of the programs by taking distance education courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2. Correspondence Education**

See the Instructions for a definition of Correspondence Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did your institution, in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012), offer Correspondence education courses?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

**Instructions**

**E. DISTANCE EDUCATION AND CORRESPONDENCE EDUCATION**

**Part 1. Distance Education**

Distance education means education that uses one or more of the technologies listed below to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor, either synchronously or asynchronously. The technologies may include: (1) The Internet; (2) One-way and two-way transmissions through open broadcast, closed circuit, cable, microwave, broadband lines, fiber optics, satellite, or wireless communications devices; (3) Audioconferencing; or (4) Video cassettes, DVDs, and CD-ROMs, if the cassettes, DVDs, or CD-ROMs are used in a course in conjunction with any of the technologies listed above.

Requirements for coming to campus for orientation, testing, or academic support services do not exclude a course from being classified as distance education.

The predominant mode of delivery is the deciding factor whether a hybrid/blended program or course is considered to be distance education versus on-site/residential education. Include "hybrid" or "mixed delivery" courses if the predominant mode of delivery is through the use of information technologies.

Indicate whether your institution, in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012), offered courses for credit using distance education. If a course was offered but no students enrolled, select...
"No" and continue to Part 2: Correspondence Education.

Courses
If you selected 'yes' in the previous question, then provide, in the appropriate field:

(a) the **unduplicated headcount** of all students in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) who took distance education courses for credit by your institution. Alternatively, use your institution's normal procedures for computing an academic year.

(b) the **total number of registrations** in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) who took distance education courses for credit by your institution. "Registrations" refers to the sum of "seats" filled. Therefore, registrations may be duplicated if a student enrolls in more than one course.

Exclude: Students who drop out during the drop/add period.

Programs
Report the number of degree or certificate programs offered during the prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) for which students could meet 50% or more of the requirements for any of the programs by taking distance education courses.

**Definition:** Program means a postsecondary educational program offered by an institution of higher education that leads to an academic or professional degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential.

**Summer Programs.** Students attending summer sessions to complete requirements for graduation are considered to be part of the previous year cohort. Students starting early, who take summer courses and continue in the fall are to be counted in the current cohort.

**Part 2. Correspondence Education**

**Correspondence education** means: (1) Education provided through one or more courses by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor; (2) Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student; (3) Correspondence courses are typically self-paced; and (4) Correspondence education is not distance education.

Indicate whether your institution, in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012), offered courses for credit using correspondence courses. If a course was offered but no students enrolled, select "No."

Courses
If you selected 'yes' in the previous question, then provide, in the appropriate field:

(a) the **unduplicated headcount** of all students in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) who took correspondence courses for credit by your institution. Alternatively, use your institution's normal procedures for computing an academic year.

(b) the **total number of registrations** in the most recent prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) who took correspondence courses for credit by your institution. "Registrations" refers to the sum of "seats" filled. Therefore, registrations may be duplicated if a student enrolls in more than one course.

Exclude: Students who drop out during the drop/add period.

Programs
Report the number of degree or certificate programs offered during the prior year (July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2012) for which students could meet 50% or more of their requirements for any of the programs by taking distance education or correspondence courses.

**Definition:** Program means a postsecondary educational program offered by an institution of higher education that leads to an academic or professional degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential.

**Summer Programs.** Students attending summer sessions to complete requirements for graduation are considered to be part of the previous year cohort. Students starting early, who take summer courses and continue in the Fall are to be counted in the current year cohort.
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### F. Regional, National, and Specialized Accreditation

Please list the name of the regional, national, and specialized accrediting organizations that accredit your institution or its programs.

*It is not necessary to report the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and it is excluded from this list.*

#### Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)

**Accreditors Recognized by U.S. Secretary of Education**

- Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education
- American Bar Association, Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
- American Dental Association, Commission on Dental Accreditation
- American Dietetic Association, American Commission on Education in Nutrition and Dietetics
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
- American Physical Therapy Association, Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education
- American Psychological Association, Commission on Accreditation
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
- Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education
- Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
- Council on Education for Public Health
- Liaison Committee on Medical Education
- Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Accreditation Committee

#### IP Data (2012-13)

**Accreditors Recognized by U.S. Secretary of Education**

- Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, Accreditation Council for Education in Nutrition and Dietetics
- Accreditation Commission for Midwifery Education
- American Bar Association, Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
- American Dental Association, Commission on Dental Accreditation
- American Occupational Therapy Association, Accreditation Council for Occupational Therapy Education
- American Physical Therapy Association, Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education
- American Psychological Association, Commission on Accreditation
- American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology
- Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education
- Council on Education for Public Health
- Liaison Committee on Medical Education
- Teacher Education Accreditation Council, Accreditation Committee

### Other Accreditors

Please list any other accrediting organizations that accredit your institution or its programs.

*Please separate each accreditor by semi-colon (;).*

---

https://www.msche.org/ip/report.asp?flgOutput=0&sectId=01&printInstr=1
Instructions

F. OTHER REGIONAL, NATIONAL, AND SPECIALIZED ACCREDITATION

Please verify and update the list of other regional, national and specialized agencies that accredit your institution.

The regional, national, and/or specialized accrediting organizations your institution reported last year are shown in the left column.

- In the column on the right, check the box next to the name of the accreditors that currently accredit your institution or its programs. The applicable boxes must be checked each year. The items you selected last year will not carry over automatically to the Current IP Data column.

NOTE: To view the complete federal list, go to: http://www2.ed.gov/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation_pg6.html#NationallyRecognized. This list contains those accrediting agencies that are recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. If you do not see an accreditor, please double check the federal list and make sure the agency has not changed its name.

If other accrediting organizations are applicable for your institution, please insert them in the "Other Accreditors" section.

If your institution offers programs in collaboration with another institution, and the other institution is accredited for that program but your institution is not, do not list the accreditor.

*NOTE: You must enter all accreditations each year. Items selected last year (and found in the left hand column) are not automatically pre-populated for the current reporting year. You must make checkbox selections.

Please use the space in the Notes section to inform MSCHE of any change in (probationary status) or removal of accreditation by any other external accrediting body. MSCHE may contact you for more information.
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G. Instructional Personnel (as of Fall 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Headcount</td>
<td>4114</td>
<td>4373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Headcount</td>
<td>4082</td>
<td>4473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Instructions

G. INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL (As of fall 2012)
Report an unduplicated headcount of full-time and part-time instructional personnel employed by your institution as of fall 2012.

Definitions:

**Full-time vs. Part-time.** Full-time personnel are either available for full-time assignment during the period being reviewed or are designated as “full time” in an official contract or appointment. Normally, employees who work approximately 40 hours per week for a full academic year are considered full-time. Individuals on sabbatical should be counted as full-time if their status was full-time prior to their leave. Faculty who teach only one semester or term are part-time, because the basis of measurement is a full academic year.

**Adjunct professors.** Count adjunct professors and visiting professors as part-time, unless you have a specific category for full-time adjunct or visiting professors. Adjunct faculty are defined by IPEDS as non-tenure-track positions where one has a temporary or auxiliary capacity to teach specific courses on a course-by-course basis. An adjunct who serves only one semester should be counted as a whole (not one-half) part-time assignment.

**Medical School Faculty.** Include those faculty members who may be exclusively involved in clinical and pre-clinical instruction at the primary reporting location and at satellite or other locations where students rotate. Indicate in the Notes section the number of faculty with this role. Again, the purpose is to consider the likely instructional impact on the enrolled students.

**Instructors.** Include those personnel who may have the title of instructor but who are not student assistants, adjunct professors, and lecturers.

**Compensated vs. Uncompensated.** For the purpose of this survey, it is of no consequence whether instructional personnel are financially compensated or not. The purpose is to consider the likely instructional impact on the enrolled students.

Exclude:

- Professional staff, such as librarians, administrators, researchers, and others if they do not have faculty status at your institution, or if they have faculty status but do not teach as their primary activity (Note: Instructional librarians with faculty status who teach credit-bearing courses would be included.)
- Faculty who teach only non-credit courses
- Students (typically graduate students) having such titles as teaching assistant, teaching fellow, or research assistant.

---
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---

**H. Related Educational Activities**

**H-1. Study Abroad**

This section is only required if your institution’s Self-Study Visit is scheduled for 2013-14 or 2014-15.

Note:
Your institution's next Self-Study Visit is scheduled for 2013-14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Number of Sites</td>
<td>Total Students at All Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Instructions

H1. STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS OFFERED FOR CREDIT

This section is required ONLY if your self-study visit is scheduled for 2013-14 or 2014-15.
Note:
Your next Self-Study Visit is scheduled for (THE ON- LINE PROGRAM WILL INSERT THE DATE FOR YOUR INSTITUTION.)

Definitions:

Study Abroad programs may be sponsored or co-sponsored by your institution. Report only sites where your institution has "ownership" over the curriculum (i.e. determines what will or will not be taught) and where your institution specifically approves which faculty members will or will not teach.

Contracts for programs where the reporting institution has an arm's length contractual relationship with the study abroad operators (i.e. without veto power over curriculum components and individual faculty) will be treated as if they are equivalent to articulation agreements for the purposes of the IP. They should be reported as such, when appropriate, in your institution's self-study report.

A Study Abroad site, for purposes of the IP, is for U.S. students traveling to that country. An Other Instructional Site located in a different country is primarily for the benefit of local students (regardless of nationality, including U.S. nationals) living in that country.

Reporting:

For each country, enter the total number of sites at which your institution offers credit bearing study abroad programs, and enter the total number of students (undergraduate + graduate) who enrolled for the required reporting timeframe, which is defined as the current year (July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013). If your semesters abroad run into the next reporting year (i.e. summer programs that start in June but run through August for example), include them in the current reporting year. Use the start of the semester as the date for inclusion in the current reporting timeframe.

Include only those students who are enrolled in study abroad programs for which academic credit will be awarded by your institution.

Exclusions:

- Do not count students from other institutions enrolled at your site if your institution does not award the credit, regardless of whether or not your institution provides the faculty and other services. These types of situations are more appropriately discussed in your institution's next self-study report.
- Do not count individualized or group programs for students who may visit one or more sites in a given season (i.e., not resident at the site for an entire semester or equivalent period).
- Do not count exchange programs.
- Do not count international branch campuses, additional locations, or other instructional sites.
- If a country has no students enrolled, or if none are expected to enroll in the program(s) during this reporting period, delete it, even though there were students in a prior year and the institution still has contractual obligations with an affiliated provider or maintains its own physical plant in that location. Do not report sites that are permanently closed.
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H-2. Branch Campuses
**Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU Abu Dhabi Branch Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>Abu Dhabi United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degree programs that may be completed at this branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this branch</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Dr. Al Bloom Vice Chancellor for NYU Abu Dhabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>971 240 697 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:al.bloom@nyu.edu">al.bloom@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IP Data (2012-13)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU Abu Dhabi Branch Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of degree programs that may be completed at this branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this branch</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this branch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Dr. Al Bloom Vice Chancellor for NYU Abu Dhabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>971 240 697 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:al.bloom@nyu.edu">al.bloom@nyu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions**

**H2. BRANCH CAMPUSES**

Please verify existing and provide new or additional information for the 2012-13 reporting period.

**Definitions:**

The Commission defines a branch campus as a location of an institution that is geographically apart, independent of the main campus of the institution. The branch campus is considered independent of the main campus if the location offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential; has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; and has its own budgetary and hiring authority.

Branch campuses are not considered to be temporary, but they may be rented or made available to
the institution at no cost by another institution, organization, agency, or firm. The branch may be organized and managed by the institution itself or by contractual agreement with a third party.

- a student may be able to complete 100% of a degree or certificate program at the branch over the course of time
- offers courses in educational programs leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized educational credential
- has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; AND
- has its own budgetary and hiring authority
- A facility listed as a “branch campus” may not be listed as an “additional location” or an “other instructional site.”

The Commission’s definition of a branch campus may not be the same definition the institution uses for state reporting purposes.

Reporting:

*NOTE: Provide a complete address for each branch that is reported, including street address and zip code. Your institution’s Title IV funding could be in jeopardy if the address provided to MSCHE is not identical to the one provided to the federal government.

Number of Degree Programs. Verify the number of degree programs or specialties that may be completed entirely (100%) at this branch over time. Include all certificate/diploma programs but exclude avocational/leisure and noncredit courses. IPEDS defines a program as “A combination of courses and related activities organized for the attainment of broad educational objectives as described by the institution.” This question does not refer to the number of degrees awarded at each branch by the institution. Instead, it applies to the programs offered at this particular site. The degree levels offered at various sites must be included within the existing scope of the institution’s accreditation.

For each Branch Campus, click "Modify" and indicate the number of programs your institution offers for each of the following certificates and degree levels:

- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 1 (less than one academic year)
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 2 (at least one but less than two academic years)
- Associate’s Degree
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 3 (at least two but less than four academic years)
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Postbaccalaureate certificate
- Master’s Degree (Including M.Div.)
- Post-master’s certificate
- Doctor’s degree - research/scholarship
- Doctor’s degree - professional practice
- Doctor’s degree - Other

Headcount. Provide the unduplicated full-time and part-time headcount at each branch for the current year which is defined as July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013 (estimated if your counts are not yet final), whether or not those students are matriculated in a specific degree or certificate program. If a student changes status from full-time to part-time or vice versa, count the student as only one of the two, making your best guess as to which status the student should be placed based on the number of credits the student has completed during the reporting year. Indicate any such situations in the Notes section at the bottom.

Report graduate and undergraduate students separately. The headcounts at various branches may be duplicated if students attend multiple branches. The objective here is to identify the totals served at each branch. If duplicated, indicate that in the Notes section.
Exclude:

- Distance education programs;
- Any site used only in the Summer;
- Sites used only for internships or practica (However, if entire courses are available there for other disciplines, those sites should be counted.)

Substantive Change:

Inactive Branches. If an institution has no students at a branch during the reporting period for this Institutional Profile, but the institution maintains contractual obligations to maintain the branch, mark the Status as inactive, and the headcount for the current year will be displayed as zero. The purpose of designating a branch as inactive is to avoid the necessity of deleting a branch that has been approved within the scope of your accreditation and then reinstating it on this report in a subsequent year when there are students. However, a branch campus should not remain inactive for an excessive amount of time. After four years of inactivity, please review the institutional plans for the site and if applicable, proceed with a substantive change request to close the site permanently.

Add or Close a Branch Branches may not be added or closed except through the Substantive Change process six months in advance of the addition or closing. See the relevant policy statement with instructions for submitting a Substantive Change request and the separate Frequently Asked Questions.

Indicating that a branch is permanently closed under "Modify" will NOT reflect that it is actually closed in the MSCHE database and it will continue to appear until you have successfully completed the Substantive Change process.
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H-3. Additional Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>2800 Victory Blvd. Bldg. #4S-229 Staten Island, NY 10314</td>
<td>2800 Victory Blvd. Bldg. #4S-229 Staten Island, NY 10314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location

| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 0 | 0 |
| Postbaccalaureate | 0 | 0 |
| Master's | 2 | 2 |
| Post-Master's | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's - Professional Practice | 0 |
| Doctor's: Research/Scholarship | 0 |
| Doctor's: Other | 0 |

Full-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 8 |
| Undergraduate | 0 |

Part-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 47 |
| Undergraduate | 0 |

| Name | Englewood Cliffs Location |
| Street Address, City, State, Postal | 300 Sylvan Avenue Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632 |
| Status | Inactive |

Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location

| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 0 |
| Postbaccalaureate | 0 |
| Master's | 0 |
| Post-Master's | 0 |
| Doctor's - Professional Practice | 0 |
| Doctor's: Research/Scholarship | 0 |
| Doctor's: Other | 0 |

Full-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 0 |

Part-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 0 |

| Name | London |
| Street Address, City, State, Postal | 6 Bedford Square WC1B 2RA London England |
| Status | Active |

Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location

| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 |
### Bachelor's
- 1

### Postbaccalaureate
- 0

### Master's
- 0

### Post-Master's
- 0

### Doctor's - Professional Practice
- 0

### Doctor's: Research/Scholarship
- 0

### Doctor's: Other
- 0

**Full-time Headcount at this location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part-time Headcount at this location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>National University of Singapore</th>
<th>National University of Singapore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>Singapore City, Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore City, Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location**

### Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year)
- 0

### Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years)
- 0

### Associate's
- 0

### Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years)
- 0

### Bachelor's
- 0

### Postbaccalaureate
- 0

### Master's
- 1

### Post-Master's
- 0

### Doctor's - Professional Practice
- 0

### Doctor's: Research/Scholarship
- 0

### Doctor's: Other
- 0

**Full-time Headcount at this location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part-time Headcount at this location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU at St. Thomas Aquinas College</th>
<th>NYU at St. Thomas Aquinas College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>Room 208, the Village, 125 Route 340, Sparkill, NY 10976</td>
<td>Room 208, the Village, 125 Route 340, Sparkill, NY 10976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location**

### Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year)
- 0

### Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years)
- 0

### Associate's
- 0

### Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years)
- 0

### Bachelor's
- 0

### Postbaccalaureate
- 0

### Master's
- 1

### Post-Master's
- 0

### Doctor's - Professional Practice
- 0

### Doctor's: Research/Scholarship
- 0

### Doctor's: Other
- 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate</td>
<td>&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU in Berlin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>Schonhauer Allee 36, Gebaude 2.2, 10435 Berlin, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NYU in Berlin

| Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location | |
| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 1 |
| Postbaccalaureate | 0 |
| Master's | 0 |
| Post-Master's | 0 |
| Doctor's - Professional Practice | 0 |
| Doctor's: Research/Scholarship | 0 |
| Doctor's: Other | 0 |
| Full-time Headcount at this location | |
| Graduate | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 129 |
| Part-time Headcount at this location | |
| Graduate | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 2 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU in Florence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>27 via de Bruni, 50319 Florence, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>27 via de Bruni, 50319 Florence, Italy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www nsche org/ip/repo rt?flgOutput=0&bSection=allWithInstructions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU in Madrid</th>
<th>NYU in Madrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>Calle Segre, 8 Madrid, 28002 Spain</td>
<td>Calle Segre, 8 Madrid, 28002 Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>NYU in Paris</td>
<td>NYU in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address, City, State, Postal</strong></td>
<td>56 rue de Passy Paris, 75016 France</td>
<td>56 rue de Passy Paris, 75016 France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location

| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 2 | 2 |
| Postbaccalaureate | 0 | 0 |
| Master's | 0 | 0 |
| Post-Master's | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's - Professional Practice | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's: Research/Scholarship | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's: Other | 0 | 0 |

Full-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 0 | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 295 | 318 |

Part-time Headcount at this location

| Graduate | 0 | 0 |
| Undergraduate | 3 | 0 |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>NYU Shanghai</th>
<th>NYU Shanghai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Address, City, State, Postal</strong></td>
<td>East China Normal University Room 353-355, The Physics Building, No. 3663 North Zhongshan Road Putuo. Shanghai, P.R. China</td>
<td>East China Normal University Room 353-355, The Physics Building, No. 3663 North Zhongshan Road Putuo. Shanghai, P.R. China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location

| Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year) | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Associate's | 0 | 0 |
| Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years) | 0 | 0 |
| Bachelor's | 1 | 1 |
| Postbaccalaureate | 0 | 0 |
| Master's | 0 | 0 |
| Post-Master's | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's - Professional Practice | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's: Research/Scholarship | 0 | 0 |
| Doctor's: Other | 0 | 0 |

Full-time Headcount at this location
### NYU TSOA Asia

**Name:** NYU TSOA Asia  
**Street Address, City, State, Postal:** 3 Kay Siang Road, Singapore City, Singapore  
**Status:** Active  

**Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year):** 0  
**Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years):** 0  
**Associate's:** 0  
**Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years):** 0  
**Bachelor's:** 0  
**Postbaccalaureate:** 0  
**Master's:** 1  
**Post-Master's:** 0  
**Doctor's - Professional Practice:** 0  
**Doctor's: Research/Scholarship:** 0  
**Doctor's: Other:** 0  

**Full-time Headcount at this location**  
**Graduate:** 148  
**Undergraduate:** 150  

**Part-time Headcount at this location**  
**Graduate:** 0  
**Undergraduate:** 0  

---

### Sarah Lawrence College

**Name:** Sarah Lawrence College  
**Street Address, City, State, Postal:** One Mead Way, Tweed Rear, Bronxville, NY 10708  
**Status:** Active  

**Postsecondary Certificate (< 1 year):** 0  
**Postsecondary Certificate (>=1 year, < 2 years):** 0  
**Associate's:** 0  
**Postsecondary Certificate (>= 2 years, < 4 years):** 0  
**Bachelor's:** 0  
**Postbaccalaureate:** 0  
**Master's:** 1  
**Post-Master's:** 0  
**Doctor's - Professional Practice:** 0  

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State University of New York College at Purchase</th>
<th>State University of New York College at Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address, City, State, Postal</td>
<td>735 Anderson Hill Rd Purchase, NY 10577</td>
<td>735 Anderson Hill Rd Purchase, NY 10577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of degree programs for which 50% of the program may be completed at this location</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&lt; 1 year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;=1 year, &lt; 2 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary Certificate (&gt;= 2 years, &lt; 4 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbaccalaureate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s - Professional Practice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s: Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor’s: Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Headcount at this location</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions**

**H3. ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS**

Please verify existing and provide new or additional information for the 2012-13 reporting period.

**Definitions:**
The Commission defines an Additional Location as a location, other than a branch campus or an other instructional site, that is geographically apart from the main campus and at which the institution offers at least 50% of an educational program, including corporate sites and locations for limited, rather than ongoing provisions or programs. If a location does not meet the 50 percent rule, it should be treated as an "Other Instructional Site." If it is currently approved as an "Additional Location," Substantive Change rules apply in order to deactivate or reclassify it.
Additional Locations are not considered to be temporary but may be rented or made available to the institution at no cost by another institution, organization, agency, or firm. The location may be organized and managed by the institution itself or by contractual agreement with a third party. Programs may be accredited by another recognized accreditor. The criterion for reporting is whether the degree or certificate is awarded in the name of your institution.

An Additional Location:

- **is geographically apart from the main campus; AND**
- **at which students may complete at least 50 percent of an educational program** (i.e., of at least one program) over the course of time.
- **may not also be listed as a “branch campus” or an “other instructional site.”**

**Reporting:**

*Note:* Provide a complete address for each Additional Location that is reported, including street address and zip code. Your institution’s Title IV funding could be in jeopardy if the address provided to MSCHE is not identical to the one provided to the federal government for Title IV purposes.

**Number of Degree Programs.** Verify the number of degree programs or specialties for which at least 50 percent of the program may be completed at each additional location over time. Include all certificate/diploma programs but exclude avocational/leisure courses. IPEDS defines a program as “A combination of courses and related activities organized for the attainment of broad educational objectives as described by the institution.” This question does not refer to the number of degrees awarded at each Additional Location by the institution.

For each Additional Location, click "Modify" and indicate the number of programs your institution offers for each of the following certificates and degrees:

- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 1 (less than one academic year)
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 2 (at least one but less than two academic years)
- Associate’s Degree
- Postsecondary award, certificate, or diploma 3 (at least two but less than four academic years)
- Bachelor’s Degree
- Postbaccalaureate certificate
- Master’s Degree (Including M.Div.)
- Post-master’s certificate
- Doctor’s degree - research/scholarship
- Doctor’s degree - professional practice
- Doctor’s degree - Other

**Headcount.** Provide the unduplicated full-time and part-time headcount at each additional location for the current year which is defined as July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013 (estimated if your numbers are not final), whether or not those students are matriculated in a specific degree or certificate program. If a student changes status from full-time to part-time or vice versa, count the student as only one of the two, making your best guess as to which status the student should be placed based on the number of credits the student has completed during the reporting year. Indicate any such situations in the Notes section at the bottom.

Report graduate and undergraduate students separately. The headcounts at each additional location may be duplicated if students attend multiple locations (i.e., across locations but not within a location). The objective here is to identify the totals served at each location. If duplicated across locations, indicate that in the Notes section.

**Exclude:**

- Distance education programs; Count all distance education programs offered by the institution
in section E. Distance and Correspondence Education.

- Any site used only in the Summer;
- Sites used only for internships or practica (However, if entire courses are available there for other disciplines, those sites should be counted.)

**Partial-year Reporting.** If an approved location opens or begins enrolling students in the middle of the reporting period, mark the location as Active and report the partial-year enrollment. In the notes section, provide an explanation and give the date activity began.

**Substantive Change:**

- **Inactive Additional Locations.** If an institution has no students at an additional location during the reporting period for this Institutional Profile, but the institution maintains contractual obligations to maintain the location, mark the Status as inactive, and the headcount for the current year will be displayed as zero. The purpose of designating a branch as inactive is to avoid the necessity of deleting a location that has been approved within the scope of your accreditation and then reinstating it on this report in a subsequent year when there are students.

- **Add or Close an Additional Location** Additional Locations may not be added or closed except through the Substantive Change process six months in advance of the addition or closing. See the relevant policy statement with instructions for submitting a Substantive Change request and the separate Frequently Asked Questions.

- Indicating that an Additional Location is permanently closed under "Modify" will NOT reflect that it is actually closed in the MSCHE database, and the location will continue to appear until you have successfully completed the Substantive Change process.

---
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**H-4. Other Instructional Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the site or facility at which courses are being offered</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Country</td>
<td>New York University IN DC</td>
<td>New York University IN DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (For Credit)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the site or facility at which courses are being offered</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Country</td>
<td>NYU in Buenos Aires</td>
<td>NYU in Buenos Aires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (For Credit)</td>
<td>Buenos Aires, Argentina</td>
<td>Buenos Aires, Argentina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the site or facility at which courses are being offered</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Country</td>
<td>NYU in Ghana</td>
<td>NYU in Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount (For Credit)</td>
<td>Ghana, Ghana</td>
<td>Ghana, Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the site or facility at which courses are being offered</th>
<th>Data on File (as of 4/24/2013)</th>
<th>IP Data (2012-13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Country</td>
<td>NYU in Prague</td>
<td>NYU in Prague</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/State/Country</th>
<th>Headcount (For Credit)</th>
<th>City/State/Country</th>
<th>Headcount (For Credit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU in Tel Aviv</td>
<td></td>
<td>NYU in Tel Aviv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tel Aviv, Israel</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Tel Aviv, Israel</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA Dublin</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dublin, Ireland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA Havana</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA Havana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana, Cuba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Havana, Cuba</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA Johannesburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Johannesburg, South Africa</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA London</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA Prague</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA Prague</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Prague, Czech Republic</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSOA Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
<td>TSOA Shanghai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ShangHai, China</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ShangHai, China</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions**

**H4. OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL SITES**

Please verify existing and provide new or additional information for the 2012-13 reporting period.

**Definitions:**

MSCHE defines an "Other Instructional Site" as any off-campus site, other than those meeting the definition of a Branch Campus or an Additional Location, at which the institution offers one or more courses for credit. These sites may include, but are not limited to, high schools, corporations, community centers, and churches. Other Instructional Sites may be added though the IP (and do not require Substantive Change approval), or they may be deleted if there are no plans to use the site in
the near future.

**A facility listed as an "Other Instructional Site" may not also be listed as a "Branch Campus" or "Additional Location."** If you believe that a site is currently classified incorrectly, please contact Amy Moseder at amoseder@msche.org for guidance about how to proceed. For example, sites that offer only teacher certification (conferred by the state and not the institution) should be classified as an Other Instructional Site, not an Additional Location because 50% or more of a program is not offered there. Also, sites that may have been initially intended as an Additional Location at the time of the Substantive Change request but in actuality only meet the definition of an Other Instructional Site should be re-classified from Additional Location to Other Instructional Site. Please contact Amy Moseder at amoseder@msche.org for guidance about how to proceed.

An "Other Instructional Site" located abroad is primarily for the benefit of local students (regardless of nationality, including U.S. national) living in that country. A Study Abroad site, for purposes of this report, is for U.S. students traveling to that country for a study abroad program, as specified in the instructions for section H1: Study Abroad.

**Reporting:**

- Report all Other Instructional Sites, and enter the city, state, and country in which each site is located. Report only sites at which **entire courses**, not partial courses, are offered.
- Indicate the name of the site or facility at which courses are being offered.
- Enter the **unduplicated** total number of students taking courses for credit for the current year which is defined as **July 1, 2012 - June 30, 2013**, whether or not those students are matriculated in a specific degree or certificate program. If students attend multiple sites, the headcounts at various sites may be duplicated (i.e., across sites but not within a site). The objective here is to identify the totals served at each site and the likely impact on an institution’s resources. Provide estimates if final counts are not available.

**Exclude:**

- Distance education programs;
- Study abroad programs;
- Sites already listed under Branch Campus or Additional location;
- Sites used only for internships or practica. However, if entire courses are available there for other disciplines, those sites should be counted.

---

**Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

**Institutional Profile 2012-13**

[0360] **New York University**

---

**I. Financial Information (Part 1)**

**REMINDER:** Please make sure to use the TAB key instead of the ENTER key to navigate from field to field. The ENTER key will cause the data to be submitted (i.e., clicking on the Update button).

Report the same data for Educational and General (E&G) expenses on the Institutional Profile that your institution reports to the Integrated Postsecondary Higher Education Data Systems (IPEDS). The IPEDS Part and Line numbers are noted for each data element listed.

Verify the beginning and ending date for your institution’s fiscal year. The default dates are 9/1/2011 through 8/31/2012 (the most recent year for which you would have audited financial statements). If your institution uses different dates, please change the default dates accordingly. For example, enter 1/1/2012 through 12/31/2012.
Report financial data in whole dollars. Round cents to the nearest whole dollar. For example, enter 124, not 123.65.

Do not enter data in thousands of dollars. For example, enter 1,250,000, not 1,250.

Enter negative numbers using a minus sign. For example, enter -100,000, not (100,000).

Complete every field for which you have financial data. Fields marked with an asterisk are required. You will not be able to "lock down" your data and submit the Institutional Profile if these fields are not completed.

Shaded information cannot be modified online. * denotes a required field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data on File Fiscal Year Ending 2011</th>
<th>IP Data Fiscal Year Ending 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FASB</td>
<td>FASB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which reporting standard is used to prepare your institution's financial statements? Your selection determines the value in the column IPEDS Part-Line below.

- FASB (Financial Accounting Standards Board)
- GASB (Governmental Accounting Standards Board)

Note: For Private and International institutions the value is set automatically and the field is disabled. The FASB Reporting Standard is the approximate equivalent of the standard used by International institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is your institution's Auditor's report on financial statements Qualified or Unqualified?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unqualified Unqualified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiscal Year Begin 9/1/2010 9/1/2011

Fiscal Year End 8/31/2011 8/31/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution allocate Operation &amp; Maintenance of Plant expense?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your institution allocate Depreciation Expense?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>Includes O&amp;M</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Instruction</td>
<td>E-01 $1,136,636,000 $57,903,000</td>
<td>E-01 $1,201,533,000 $65,793,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research</td>
<td>E-02 $565,615,000 $57,267,000</td>
<td>E-02 $644,027,000 $77,919,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Public Services</td>
<td>E-03 $0 $0</td>
<td>E-03 $5,798,000 $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic Support</td>
<td>E-04 $64,698,000 $5,327,000</td>
<td>E-04 $69,092,000 $5,029,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Services</td>
<td>E-05 $102,992,000 $11,668,000</td>
<td>E-05 $100,399,000 $10,082,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institutional Support</td>
<td>E-06 $350,199,000 $24,596,000</td>
<td>E-06 $348,083,000 $22,580,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scholarships and Fellowships</td>
<td>E-08 $0 $0</td>
<td>E-08 $0 $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Operation and Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>E-Col 4 $156,761,000 $181,403,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total E&amp;G Expenses*</td>
<td>$2,220,140,000 $2,368,932,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Institutional Profile 2012-13
[0360] New York University
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I. Financial Information (Part 2)

REMINDER: Please make sure to use the TAB key instead of the ENTER key to navigate from field to field. The ENTER key will cause the data to be submitted (i.e., clicking on the Update button).

Report the same data on the Institutional Profile in Section 2A below that your institution reports to IPEDS. The IPEDS Part and Line numbers are noted for each data element listed.

Report the data on the Institutional Profile in Section 2B below which can be obtained from your institution's audited financial statements and/or supporting documents.

Report financial data in whole dollars. Round cents to the nearest whole dollar. For example, enter 124, not 123.65.

Do not enter data in thousands of dollars. For example, enter 1,250,000, not 1,250.

Complete every field for which you have financial data. Fields marked with an asterisk are required. You will not be able to "lock down" your data and submit the Institutional Profile if these fields are not completed.

Shaded information cannot be modified online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Assets</td>
<td>A-02</td>
<td>$8,024,969,000</td>
<td>$8,352,786,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt Related to Property, Plant and Equipment</td>
<td>A-03a</td>
<td>$2,161,179,000</td>
<td>$2,169,356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>A-04</td>
<td>$2,076,962,000</td>
<td>$2,019,241,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>$628,944,000</td>
<td>$649,306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,312,968,000</td>
<td>$1,409,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>B-04</td>
<td>$358,433,000</td>
<td>$56,819,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets (Beginning of Year)</td>
<td>B-05</td>
<td>$3,662,441,000</td>
<td>$4,020,874,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment to Net Assets (Beginning of Year)</td>
<td>B-06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets (End of Year)</td>
<td>B-07</td>
<td>$4,020,874,000</td>
<td>$4,077,693,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowances/Scholarships (Applied to Tuition &amp; Fees)</td>
<td>C-08</td>
<td>$330,448,000</td>
<td>$360,915,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees Revenue (Net of Allowances)</td>
<td>D-01</td>
<td>$1,298,426,000</td>
<td>$1,366,187,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation Expense</td>
<td>E-Col 5</td>
<td>$224,639,000</td>
<td>$254,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2B -- Data from Audited Financial Statements and Supporting Documents

| Total Unrestricted Operating Revenue | $3,412,772,000 | $3,736,851,000 |
| Total Operating Revenue              | $3,412,772,000 | $3,736,851,000 |
| Total Unrestricted Operating Expense | $3,375,262,000 | $3,634,454,000 |
| Total Operating Expense              | $3,375,262,000 | $3,634,454,000 |
| Change in Unrestricted Net Assets    | $16,017,000    | $(59,721,000)                  |
| Deposits Held by Bond Trustees       | $119,676,000   | $113,784,000                 |
| Principal Payments on Long Term Debt | $64,634,000    | $29,715,000                  |
| Interest Expense on Long Term Debt   | $105,241,000   | $99,076,000                  |

Notes
Instructions

I. Financial Information (Part 1)

FINANCIAL PAGE INSTRUCTIONS

Report the same Educational and General (E&G) expenses that you reported to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Higher Education Data Systems) for similar fields. Where appropriate, the related part and line numbers from IPEDS are listed for easy reference. Note: Educational and General expenses include all operating expenses except auxiliary enterprises (food service, bookstore, etc).

Verify the beginning and ending date for your institution's fiscal year. The default dates are 07/01/2011 through 06/30/2012 (the most recent fiscal year for which you would have audited financial statements). If your institution uses different dates, please change the default dates accordingly. Also, if your institution has a December 31st year end, you should be submitting financial data as of 12/31/2012. If you do not have your final audited financial statements for fiscal year 2012, please email kjeffries@msche.org before completing this section.

The user is prompted to answer the following three questions immediately after logging in to the application for the first time. The answer to each of the questions can be revised on the financial page if it was answered incorrectly or the answer has changed.

- "Which reporting standard is used to prepare your institution's financial statements?" (e.g., FASB - Financial Accounting Standards Board or GASB - Governmental Accounting Standards Board)
- "Does your institution allocate Operation and Maintenance of Plant expense?" (The default response is the value your institution previously reported.)
- "Does your institution allocate Depreciation expense?" (The default response is "No".)

Report financial data in whole dollars. Round cents to the nearest whole dollar. For example, enter 124, not 123.65. (NOTE: Do not enter commas, decimal points or trailing zeros; they are used in these instructions for clarity.)

Do not enter data in thousands of dollars. For example, enter 1,250,000, not 1,250.

Foreign currency conversion. An institution that prepares its audited financial statements in a currency other than U.S. dollars should convert the value of their currency to U.S. dollars as of the date of their fiscal year end.

Enter negative numbers using a minus sign. For example, enter -100,000, not (100,000).

Report Educational and General expenses by expense category. (e.g., instruction, research, public service, etc.) The total expense for each category is the sum of restricted and unrestricted expenses.

The sum of your institution's total reportable E&G expense appears on the last line of the form. Last year's reported E&G expense is displayed for comparison.

Scholarship and Fellowship Expense:

Do not report as Scholarship and Fellowship Expense any tuition discounts, scholarship allowances, etc., reported in the income statement under revenue of your institution's audited financial statements. You may report the IPEDS calculated value (i.e., net scholarship and fellowship expense after deducting discounts and allowances).

Operations and Maintenance (O&M):

- **Institutions that allocate Operations and Maintenance (O&M) expense in the expense categories:** For each expense category, enter the total expense, including the pro-rated O&M expense in the column labeled "Expenses", then enter the pro-rated O&M expense in the column labeled "Includes O&M". The program will automatically total the O&M expenses and put the total at the bottom of the column labeled "Includes O&M". (This field is not accessible to the user.)
- **Institutions that do not allocate Operations and Maintenance (O&M) expense in the expense categories:** Enter the total O&M expense on Line 8.

Note: IPEDS requires institutions to allocate O&M even if it's not allocated on their audited financial statements. MSCHE does not require this, however, if it's easier to enter the same data as IPEDS, then you can choose "Yes" to the O&M Allocation question and enter the expenses in the O&M column in the IP. If you don't allocate O&M, you can choose "No"
to the same question and enter the total O&M expense on Line 8 in the IP. This amount should match the negative number found in Column 4, Line 11 of IPEDS (but should be entered as a positive number in the IP).

**Depreciation:**

- **If Depreciation expense is allocated in the expense categories:** No additional data entry is required.

- **If Depreciation expense is not allocated in the expense categories:** Enter the total Depreciation expense on Line 9.

**Net Assets and Change in Net Assets:**

The Net Assets (Beginning of Year) is carried forward from the prior fiscal year's ending net assets and cannot be changed. A line labeled Adjustments to Net Assets (Beginning of Year) has been added similar to IPEDS and your Audited Financial Statements. If your institution had an Adjustment to it's prior year's financial statements, or the Net Assets (Beginning of Year) has changed, use the Adjustment to Net Assets line to show the adjustment/difference.

Note: If the Net Assets (End of Year) does not equal the Net Assets (Beginning of Year), plus-minus Adjustment to Net Assets (Beginning of Year), plus-minus Change in Net Assets, you will be prompted to correct the data in one or more of these fields.

**Shareholder Equity and Change in Shareholder Equity:**

The Shareholder Equity (Beginning of Year) is carried forward from the prior fiscal year’s ending shareholder equity and cannot be changed. A line labeled Adjustments to Shareholder Equity (Beginning of Year) has been added similar to IPEDS and your Audited Financial Statements. If your institution had an Adjustment to it's prior year’s financial statements, or the Shareholder Equity (Beginning of Year) has changed, use the Adjustment to Shareholder Equity line to show the adjustment/difference.

Note: If the Shareholder Equity (End of Year) does not equal the Shareholder Equity (Beginning of Year), plus-minus Adjustments to Shareholder Equity (Beginning of Year), plus-minus Change in Shareholder Equity, you will be prompted to correct the data in one or more of these fields.

**Financial Information (Part 2)**

**FINANCIAL PAGE INSTRUCTIONS**

Please report all financial data requested in this section for fiscal year 2012. Enter the required data on the appropriate lines following the same instructions above (whole dollars, foreign currency, etc). Be sure to complete every line, unless the line is not applicable. For example, if your institution does not have Long Term Debt, you should place a -0- on that line, but put a short explanation in the “Notes” section as to why the line is zero. (e.g., "Institution has no long term debt.") If you leave a zero in any field you will get an error message. If you cannot lock down, please contact us for assistance.

**Note the following changes/additions:**

'Long-Term Debt and Principal & Interest Payments' **Warning** - All three fields are linked together so if you enter your Long-Term Debt amount, you must enter your Principal/Interest payments. Likewise, if you enter your Principal/Interest Payments you must enter your Long-Term Debt amount. **Note:** If your institution is part of a "system" or parent company and you do not have your own Long-Term Debt, you **should not** enter any Principal or Interest Payments.

Part 2 is divided into two sections. Section 2A is labeled "Data from IPEDS". This section requires data that can be taken directly from IPEDS, the related IPEDS lines are listed to assist with completing each line (if available).

The Net Asset information (previously listed on the page where the Educational and General [E&G] expenses are reported), is on the page labeled "Part 2" under Section 2B.

Section 2B is labeled "Data from Audited Financial Statements and other Institutional Financial Documents". This section requires data which can be taken directly from the institution’s audited financial statements or other supporting financial documents, such as debt schedules, etc.

If your institution does not allocate Depreciation and you answered "No" to the question in Part 1, the Depreciation amount you enter in Part 1 will automatically fill into the Depreciation line in Part 2, Section 2A.
IMPORTANT: Verify that the Key Contacts section includes the name, telephone number and e-mail address of the person completing the Financial Information section of the Institutional Profile.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Why does the Commission request financial data on the Institutional Profile?

The Commission uses the financial data in several ways. First, the information is used to assess annual membership dues that are based on an institution’s Educational and General (E&G) expenditures as reported on its Institutional Profile. Second, the financial information is used, together with other Institutional Profile information, by staff and evaluators who want a quick “snapshot” of the institution prior to a visit. Third, the information is automatically fed into our database which is how the dues are calculated and the invoices sent electronically. Fourth, the information is downloaded for financial analysis and calculating the composite financial index. Finally, the information is used for various reports required both internally and externally by staff, evaluators, etc.

Why does the Commission request an audited financial statement?

Commission staff check the accuracy of the Educational and General (E&G) expenditures reported on the Institutional Profile by comparing it to the E&G expenditures reported in the institution’s audited financial statement. Because membership dues are assessed on the basis of an institution’s E&G expenditures, the Commission tries to ensure the financial data reported on the Institutional Profile are correct and that a member institution’s dues are properly assessed.

Staff use the audited financial statement (and management letter) to review financial information and perform financial analysis annually. Staff, evaluators, and financial reviewers also use these reports as part of the self-study evaluation, periodic review report, follow-up and substantive change processes.

Should an institution submit IPEDS financial data for the matching fields on the Institutional Profile?

Yes. Report the same data on the IP that your institution reports to IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Higher Education Data Systems). Line items from the IPEDS survey are provided (where applicable) next to each IP entry for your convenience.

In addition, the IPEDS financial data should cover the same period as the audited financial statement. If your institution has a 12/31 year end, you should be reporting the most current financial information available which may be different from what you reported to IPEDS.

What are the most common errors institutions make when completing the Finance section of the Institutional Profile?

Three common errors to avoid in reporting financial information are:

- Reporting tuition discounts or allowances in the IP as Scholarship and Fellowship Expense. (Exclude tuition discounts or allowances from the line item for Scholarship and Fellowship Expense, these discounts are net of revenue.)
- Entering data in thousands of dollars, rather than with the necessary zeros. (Type 1,270,000, not 1,270.)
- Reporting the financial data for the primary institution and for component units.* (Report only for the primary institution.)

*Note: A component unit is a legally separate organization for which the primary institution is financially accountable or closely related. Examples would include college housing corporations, a student government cooperative, or a university or college foundation.
**K. Required Attachments**

Please upload the required attachments listed below **as soon as all of the items are available** but no later than **April 19, 2013 (extended one week)**.

- A digital/electronic copy of the institution's fiscal year 2012 audited financial statements, including any management letter that the auditors may have attached to the statements.

- A digital/electronic copy of the finance section of the institution's IPEDS submission for fiscal year 2012 (if you submit annual financial data to IPEDS).

- A word document with the url of the institution's current catalog. Please copy and paste the url into a Word document and upload the Word document. If the catalog is not posted online, please upload a digital copy (.pdf format preferred). If the catalog is not available in any digital/electronic format, please contact Amy Shew at ashew@msche.org.

**Uploaded Files**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File Type</th>
<th>File Size</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NYU Course Catalogs Bulletins URLs 2012-2013.docx</td>
<td>DOCX File</td>
<td>16.88 KB</td>
<td>4/25/2013 2:30:05 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If you are not able to upload the required attachments, please contact:**

Mr. Tze Joe  
Information Associate  
Middle States Commission on Higher Education  
tjoe@msche.org
Appendix B: Self-Study Questionnaire Responses

I. Genomics and Systems Biology

1. Describe the organization and governing structure of your interdisciplinary activity. To whom does it report? How do constituent units relate to each other? Are faculty or units from either NYU Abu Dhabi or NYU Shanghai involved?

Genomics and Systems Biology is revolutionizing biological sciences in this century – impacting both research and education. Key questions in this area deal with studying the complete genome as the repository of the genetic code of a species, how it is shaped by evolutionary forces, and how what is encoded within it is used to guide complex biological and developmental processes. Understanding the networks of interactions of the molecular systems and how they respond and adapt to environmental and genetic changes are among the key questions being addressed in the Center for genomics and Systems Biology. The nature of the questions in this field require traditionally disparate disciplines, such as in computer science, physics, chemistry and biology to be brought together. NYU has made a strategic investment into this new area over the last decade, culminating into a new state-of-the-art building designed to accommodate informatic/computational and wet-lab science under one roof of interconnected space.

Structurally, the Center for Genomics and Systems Biology (CGSB) is an interdisciplinary Center that has grown from within the Biology Department. The Director reports to the Dean of Science, within the Faculty of Arts and Science, who acts in consultation with the Chair of Biology.

Within the Center, Faculty Directors in “Bioinformatics” (2), “Genome sequencing” (1) and “Core facilities” (1) form a core CGSB leadership group made up of four faculty plus the CGSB Director.

Fourteen faculty direct active research programs within the CGSB, currently funded by over $50M in external grants. The Center planned growth is still continuing and is expected to reach a steady-state of 16 faculty.

Each faculty mentors post-doctoral researchers, graduate students, undergraduates, and high school students. They employ numerous administrative and technical staff (including research scientists, technicians, computer programmers, and a high-performance computing (HPC) specialist). On average each faculty directly supervises about 8 people.

As part of a major initiative at NYU Abu Dhabi, CGSB in NY is developing a “sister” Center at NYU Abu Dhabi. The founding Director of the Center is also the Provost of NYU Abu Dhabi. Currently, the faculty hired at NYUAD in Biology link to both the Abu Dhabi and the New York CGSB.
2. How are faculty appointed? Are there dedicated faculty? If not, what is the relationship of faculty between their home unit and the interdisciplinary activity? What issues have arisen as a result of dual responsibilities?

Faculty are hired as part of a plan to build the CGSB based on the “Partners” and “Post-Partners” initiatives. Faculty members of the CGSB are vetted through a standard interview process for faculty hires in the Department of Biology, which is their primary departmental home. Some faculty hold additional appointments in Physics, Computer Science or the School of Medicine.

Faculty are dedicated to the CGSB, which houses their research laboratories and core research support facilities. Faculty responsibilities regarding recruitment, departmental committees, teaching, and curriculum development are managed through the home Department. Faculty responsibilities are clearly delineated according to their research programs (CGSB) and teaching duties (Dept of Biology), hence no issues regarding dual responsibilities have arisen.

3. Describe the budgetary and financial arrangements that support the interdisciplinary activity.

The University supplies an operating budget for the CGSB. The operating budget supports several staff, including an administrative aide, an HPC specialist, a facilities manager, and core facilities personnel.

4. How is the interdisciplinary activity staffed?

In addition to the one Administrative Aide dedicated to the CGSB, the administrative staff in the Department of Biology or in other Departments, when appropriate, provide some support for CGSB activities, such as helping to organize meetings and symposia, help with submission of and management of grants and general administrative needs.

Furthermore, several technical staff positions are dedicated to the support of the CGSB’s shared facilities (which are open to non-CGSB faculty from the Dept of Biology and elsewhere): one HPC specialist, two sequencing core technicians, one facilities manager, one receiving room staff.

NYU provides security officers, maintenance and custodial services.

5. If the interdisciplinary activity has students, how is advisement provided? What practices are in place to create a sense of identity and community among students? How are internships and career guidance/opportunities managed?

Advisement, and career guidance are provided by individual faculty mentors and graduate thesis committees through the auspices of the Department of Biology. Currently, the CGSB does not
manage its own graduate or undergraduate program, therefore, all students who perform research in the CGSB are from specific academic Departments. Mainly students are from the Department of Biology but they can also be from Computer Science or other graduate programs or undergraduate programs. These activities and community building are overseen by the Directors of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies and executed with assistance from departmental staff.

6. How is the interdisciplinary activity supported by various levels of the University administration?

The University administration supports the CGSB by direct allocation of budgetary funds, via the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

7. Is there an interdisciplinary curriculum? How was it developed? How does it relate to traditional disciplines? Are/were there appropriate teaching materials available or do/did they need to be created?

There is no separate CGSB curriculum, however the interdisciplinary research activities and expertise of Center faculty have helped the Department of Biology to develop its course offerings in areas such as genomics, systems biology, computational biology, bioinformatics, and data mining. The CGSB also provides a bridge to the Departments of Computer Science, Mathematics, and Physics through joint and affiliated faculty appointments and NYU’s Computational Biology graduate program.

8. How are both programmatic goals and student learning outcomes goals established? How are successful outcomes measured? Is there a timetable for carrying out assessment activities? Have assessment results been used to improve programs? If you have an assessment report, please provide a copy.

Goals are established between the Chair of the Department of Biology, the Directors of the Center, the Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate programs, the CGSB Faculty Directors, and various departmental committees. Assessment is dependent on the type of goal established. Goals and outcomes are communicated among faculty at Faculty Meetings, which occur four times per year. There is no set timetable for assessment, though activities are usually evaluated during the merit review and annual planning report processes each spring.

9. Are there adequate support services and resources available (e.g., library, IT) or are special arrangements needed?

The CGSB is a relatively young center and we learn and grow on an ongoing basis. Support and resources for the goals of the Center have been mostly adequate so far; appropriate support has grown in areas of IT as CGSB has developed a High Performance Computer Cluster that is hosted and managed by IT on a resource-sharing principle. In addition to IT support, the growth
in the technical support of the core facilities has enabled good management of the highly specialized facilities; however, our programs could be greatly enhanced by additional growth in doctoral students, and in support in budget and grants management, as well a more developed administrative structure that would enable expansion into managing interdisciplinary educational programs and developing more collaborative multi-PI projects. Currently, most of these activities are supported by Dept. of Biology personnel.
II. Media and Games

1. Describe the organization and governing structure of your interdisciplinary activity. To whom does it report? How do constituent units relate to each other? Are faculty or units from either NYU Abu Dhabi or NYU Shanghai involved?

MAGNET (the Media And Games NETwork at NYU) is a joint teaching and research facility opening in the Fall of 2013 on the 8th floor of 2 Metrotech, on NYU’s Brooklyn Campus (next to NYU-Poly). The facility is explicitly interdepartmental and inter-school. As such, it contains shared space and program-specific space for the following NYU programs:

- Game Design (MFA), Tisch School of the Arts.
- Games for Learning (MS), Digital Media Design for Learning (MA), and Educational Communications and Technology (Ph.D.) from Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development.
- Integrated Digital Media (BS, MS), Game Engineering (BS minor), NYU-Poly.

In addition, there is research space for the NYU Game Center (TSOA), the Brooklyn Experimental Media Center (NYU-Poly), and the Games For Learning Institute (multi-school, including Courant).

In the initial phase of development, joint facilities in the space will be governed by a faculty presidium consisting of faculty members directing the constituent academic and research units within MAGNET. Issues of joint concern will be reported to the office of the Provost at NYU. The participating departments and their NYU schools will administer their program-specific facilities. While no explicit GNU faculty/unit involvement has been implemented, students in the Interactive Media program at the global sites will have access to undergraduate curricula in the space through Technology, Culture, and Society and Computer Science and Engineering (the home departments of IDM and Game Engineering, respectively) at NYU-Poly.

2. How are faculty appointed? Are there dedicated faculty? If not, what is the relationship of faculty between their home unit and the interdisciplinary activity? What issues have arisen as a result of dual responsibilities?

Faculty residing in MAGNET are appointed by their individual schools. There are no dedicated MAGNET faculty lines, as of yet. Joint administrative responsibilities, as directed by the faculty presidium for MAGNET, are considered part of faculty members’ service load as participants in this facility. All participating programs have made a strong commitment towards incubating and sustaining interdisciplinary teaching, research, and public programs in the space, and participating faculty have spent nearly a year in planning and preparing this facility for its opening.
3. Describe the budgetary and financial arrangements that support the interdisciplinary activity.

There is a shared fiscal ‘buy-in’ from participating NYU, NYU-Poly, and CUSP programs towards maintaining the space. This fiscal arrangement was jointly developed by the various schools’ fiscal administration in coordination with the office of the Provost to allow for projected sustainable growth by the various programs in the facility.

4. How is the interdisciplinary activity staffed?

There is a full-time MAGNET coordinator on staff to manage interdisciplinary resources (rooms, equipment, scheduling, etc.). Interdisciplinary research activity will be coordinated at the faculty level, and every effort is being made to allow for cross-listing and joint development of curriculum in the space.

5. If the interdisciplinary activity has students, how is advisement provided? What practices are in place to create a sense of identity and community among students? How are internships and career guidance/opportunities managed?

Advisement and career services for the students are the responsibility of the individual programs and schools. Significant effort has been undertaken on the part of faculty involved in planning the facility to create a space with a shared identity, with large parts of the facility dedicated to community-related events (shared research/study/social spaces, shared lecture halls, exhibition space, pantry, etc.). It is the sincere desire of the faculty that students from the various programs make long-lasting educational and professional connections with one another through interdisciplinary study and research in the space.

6. How is the interdisciplinary activity supported by various levels of the University administration?

The planning phase of MAGNET has been accomplished with the incredible support of Carol Morrow, the Associate Provost for Academic Operations Planning at NYU and her staff. As we enter the operational phase of the facility, the desire from faculty is to have a sustained, Administration-level commitment towards the success of the space, including support from University-wide offices such as the Office of Sponsored Programs, ITS, etc.

7. Is there an interdisciplinary curriculum? How was it developed? How does it relate to traditional disciplines? Are/were there appropriate teaching materials available or do/did they need to be created?

Because the collaboration is new, there is not much interdisciplinary curriculum as of yet, but faculty in the participating units have made a commitment to use electives, requirements, and interdisciplinary cross-listing as a first step in developing joint curricula. As an example, the
Steinhardt MS in Games for Learning requires approximately 9-12 restricted elective credits in game design that can include courses from Tisch’s games programs as well as other existing games-related courses in Courant, Steinhardt Music Technology, and Steinhardt Media Culture and Communication. More informally, faculty have begun exploring coordination of courses with common application, e.g., MFA students in the Tisch Game Design program can take NYU-Poly Integrated Digital Media production courses in non-game-centric media areas (e.g. 3D modeling or sound); by the same token, graduate students at NYU-Poly will be able to take graduate Game Design or ECT classes based on their research goals. As the intersection of Digital Media and Game Design is a rapidly evolving field, the participating units need both autonomy within their own disciplines to develop cutting-edge curricula as well as the support for joint learning and research. Teaching materials for this sort of work do not exist and will be developed by MAGNET faculty.

8. How are both programmatic goals and student learning outcomes goals established? How are successful outcomes measured? Is there a timetable for carrying out assessment activities? Have assessment results been used to improve programs? If you have an assessment report, please provide a copy.

Assessment for courses and programs are maintained at the program/department level within individual schools. A copy of the IDM BS/MS assessment rubric from NYU-Poly is attached as a reference.

9. Are there adequate support services and resources available (e.g., library, IT) or are special arrangements needed?

Special support, particularly from ITS and OSP, will be required to maintain MAGNET as a viable facility. Its role as both first-of-its-kind at NYU and as one of the first non-NYU-Poly units to reside on the Brooklyn Campus require special arrangements that will serve as a model for interdisciplinary work at NYU.
III. Neuroscience

1. Describe the organization and governing structure of your interdisciplinary activity. To whom does it report? How do constituent units relate to each other? Are faculty or units from either NYU Abu Dhabi or NYU Shanghai involved?

The center for Neural Science is a department of FAS, reporting to the Dean for Science and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Science. A number of members of other departments in FAS – all of whom also hold courtesy appointments in CNS – play a significant role in the neuroscience community. The Neuroscience Institute at the School of Medicine is an administrative department, bringing together faculty from various academic departments including Physiology & Neuroscience. The Neuroscience Institute reports to the Vice Dean for Science and the Dean of the School of Medicine. The Director of the Neuroscience Institute is also the chair of the Department of Physiology and Neuroscience. The units have no formal relationship but have many informal connections through jointly taught courses, faculty with courtesy cross-appointments, collaborative research programs, etc. CNS has representation on Neuroscience Institute faculty search committees and vice versa. There is also a joint committee charged with developing synergies between the communities.

2. How are faculty appointed? Are there dedicated faculty? If not, what is the relationship of faculty between their home unit and the interdisciplinary activity? What issues have arisen as a result of dual responsibilities?

Faculty are all appointed in their home units. We plan to make a number of joint appointments in the next few years but none have yet been appointed. In the process of attempted recruitments, we have become familiar with disparities in responsibilities and privileges uptown and downtown and come up with ways of finding terms satisfactory to both.

3. Describe the budgetary and financial arrangements that support the interdisciplinary activity.

Apart from the budgets of the individual units, the Provost has made funds available for a variety of activities and programs. The full proposed program (not yet formally implemented) includes funds for renovation of laboratory spaces, for merging the doctoral programs, for recruiting joint faculty, for contributing to the joint development of a center for shared technology development, and for a variety of smaller-scale synergistic activities (retreats, fellowships to support collaborative research, etc.).

4. How is the interdisciplinary activity staffed?

Staffing is provided by the participating units. There is no dedicated staff.

5. If the interdisciplinary activity has students, how is advisement provided? What practices are in place to create a sense of identity and community among students? How are internships and career guidance/opportunities managed?
Ph.D. students from the Sackler Institute at the School of Medicine and from the Doctoral Program in Neural Science have partially-overlapping curricula and often work in the same laboratories. At the Ph.D. level, career guidance is handled mostly through the Directors of Graduate Study for the two programs. Recently, we have worked together to establish a pan-neuroscience website, that presents a central calendar and database of faculty and other resources. To create a sense of identity and community, we hold several joint live events like colloquia that alternate between the uptown and downtown campuses. As already mentioned, students enjoy the ability to rotate in labs freely across campuses. There is no relevant M.A. program. There are no undergraduate students formally involved in the school-wide neuroscience program, but many undergraduates from the CAS Neural Science Major do individual research projects in laboratories at the School of Medicine.

6. How is the interdisciplinary activity supported by various levels of the University administration?

See #3.

7. Is there an interdisciplinary curriculum? How was it developed? How does it relate to traditional disciplines? Are/were there appropriate teaching materials available or do/did they need to be created?

There is no formal interdisciplinary curriculum, except insofar as neuroscience is by nature interdisciplinary. However, a number of key courses are taught jointly by CNS and Medical School Faculty.

8. How are both programmatic goals and student learning outcomes goals established? How are successful outcomes measures? Is there a timetable for carrying out assessment activities? Have assessment results been used to improve programs? If you have an assessment report, please provide a copy.

There is no formal assessment component.

9. Are there adequate support services and resources available (e.g., library IT) or are special arrangements needed?

The participating units are adequately supported through their individual budgets.
## Appendix C: Self-Study Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistical and other preparations for self-study</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report to President</td>
<td>March 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee Appointed</td>
<td>March-April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meeting of Steering Committee</td>
<td>April 16, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation visit by Ellie Fogarty, Middle States liaison</td>
<td>April 25, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report to President</td>
<td>July 9, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Groups formed</td>
<td>July 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of Self-Study Design submitted to Middle States</td>
<td>September 15, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to meeting of provosts and deans</td>
<td>September 19, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement of Middle States Self-Study to NYU community</td>
<td>September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response from University community</td>
<td>October 10, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations for Evaluation Team Chair submitted to Middle States</td>
<td>October 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group chairs interim report to Steering Committee meeting</td>
<td>December 12, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team Chair selected by Middle States</td>
<td>January 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group chairs initial draft reports to Steering Committee meeting</td>
<td>February 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report to President</td>
<td>February 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft questionnaire to be sent to sample of inter-school programs sent to Steering Committee for comments and suggestions of other groups.</td>
<td>February 27, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire sent to sample of inter-school programs</td>
<td>March 12, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary draft reports from working groups sent to Steering Committee</td>
<td>April 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee meeting to discuss working group reports and integrating chapter</td>
<td>April 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee comments on working group reports</td>
<td>April 22, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group reports revised; draft introduction, integrating chapter, and financial sections prepared</td>
<td>May, June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report to President</td>
<td>June 25, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information received from NYU offices for Document Review</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report, excluding conclusion, sent to Steering Committee</td>
<td>July 19, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Steering Committee to discuss draft report</td>
<td>August 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report to President</td>
<td>September 6, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report at Common Days</td>
<td>September 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 2 of report (including conclusion) sent to University community</td>
<td>September 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States conference call with Middle States Team Chair, document reviewers, President, and Self-Study Chair and Coordinator</td>
<td>September/October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses received from those who received draft 2</td>
<td>October 3, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Review Roadmap submitted</td>
<td>October 14, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft 3 of report sent to Steering Committee</td>
<td>October 15, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit by document reviewers</td>
<td>October 28, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit by Evaluation Team Chair</td>
<td>October 29, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Committee comments received</td>
<td>October 30, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team appointed by Middle States</td>
<td>December 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status report at University Senate</td>
<td>December 5, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft for President Sexton</td>
<td>December 10, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents to verify compliance with federal regulations submitted to Middle States</td>
<td>January 13, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Self-Study due to Middle States</td>
<td>February 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study distributed to University community on website</td>
<td>February 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit of Evaluation Team member to study abroad sites</td>
<td>March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site visit by Evaluation Team</td>
<td>March 24-27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Team draft report to NYU to correct factual errors</td>
<td>April 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU response to team report</td>
<td>April 20, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Chair sends formal report to Middle States</td>
<td>April 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYU formal response to final report</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States Commission on Higher Education meeting on NYU accreditation</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This timetable does not include the extensive consultation with individuals at the University.
Highlights of Strategic Plan and Vision

Cheryl Healton
Dean, Global Public Health; Director, Global Institute of Public Health
Mission Statement

Taking advantage of the interdisciplinary model for public health at NYU, the GIPH and partner schools seek to contribute to the improvement of the health status of the world.

Through training, degree programs, service, and research we work to accelerate progress toward health outcomes as measured by Healthy People 2020, the Millennium Development Goals (2015 and beyond), the recently-updated Global Burden of Disease profile, WHO and other global entities’ sustainability goals established through national and international collaboration.
Current NYU Global Academic Centers
Proposed Global Health Sites

– Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates
– Accra, Ghana
– Berlin, Germany
– Buenos Aires, Argentina
– Florence, Italy
– London, United Kingdom
– Madrid, Spain
– Paris, France
– Prague, the Czech Republic
– Shanghai, China
– Sydney, Australia
– Tel Aviv, Israel
– Washington, DC, USA*
12 Goals for 4 Year Strategic Plan

– Research Goals

– Academic Goals

– Service Goals

– Development Goals
Research Goals

Goal 1:
Double NYU’s overall public health research base in five years through diversifying funding sources (most will remain federal), recruiting star researchers already funded and improve funding success of current faculty across global campuses

Goal 2:
Grow at least 5 significant affinity groups or institutes from the list of potential candidates based on need in public health, capacity at NYU (strengths) and funding potential

Goal 3:
Leveraging the affinity groups in goal 2, develop successful effort to become a “program office” for at least one critical global health effort area identified by the affinity groups and led with GIPH faculty depth
Academic Goals

Goal 4:
Enhance Degree and Other Academic Offerings

Goal 5:
Recruit at least 10 new faculty with start-up funds based on the assumption that “on average” each will generate 50% of their support through outside sources. These new faculty should expand the breadth or depth of NYU’s public health footprint.

Goal 6:
Position NYU as the leader in global public health practice.
Academic Goals

Goal 7:
Capitalize on GNU as a vehicle for innovation and Explore CEPH-accredited Global School of Public Health

Goal 8:
Increase the number of schools and departments collaborating with the GIPH

Goal 9:
Address all concerns raised by CEPH site visit team in a timely manner
Service and Development Goals

Goal 10:
Identify a small number of ambitious global public health goals that NYU is uniquely suited to successfully tackle through interdisciplinary multi-modal approach (research, service, training) and engage a broad range of faculty and students in these goals.

Goal 11:
Become active in creating 21st century healthcare workforce solutions addressing shortages in the healthcare workforce domestically and globally.

Goal 12:
Articulate a global development plan in concert with the development office and participating schools to raise funds to name the institute, support endowed chairs, underwrite student tuition, support pilot research and build regional centers (e.g. China, Africa).
Introduction

Overview
The mission of New York University’s Master of Public Health Program is to prepare students to become effective public health practitioners, researchers and leaders by advancing public health knowledge and practice through research, education, outreach, and community engagement. By doing so, we aim to improve the health of diverse population groups at the local, national, and global levels.

Uniting public health students and scholars around their shared commitment to improving the health of all people, the NYU Master of Public Health Program is a collaboration of six graduate and professional schools at NYU:

- The College of Dentistry
- The College of Nursing
- The Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
- The School of Medicine
- The Silver School of Social Work
- The Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development

The NYU MPH program’s unique university-wide configuration allows it to draw upon faculty and other professionals from across the university and from partner organizations worldwide to design and deliver multidisciplinary educational, research, and practice-based training to enhance student experiences and promote continued professional development. Our three concentrations within the MPH program draw from academic strengths in community and international health, global health leadership and public health nutrition. Our reach extends beyond the borders of our own institution, to the nations, communities and individuals whose health and well-being inform the core purpose of our public health enterprise.

We welcome the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) accreditation at a key part of our development as a university-wide program and we understand that with several unique features that differentiate our program from others with CEPH accreditation, and with a relatively new organization structure that consolidates two programs, ideas for continued improvements will emerge.

History of the NYU MPH
For over 40 years, NYU has been offering public health education through the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree. In 1971, the MPH program offered through the former School of Education – now the NYU Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development – became one of the first programs accredited by the CEPH. Developing professionals in community health, international health, nutrition and health education, the Steinhardt MPH in Community Public Health established a tradition of excellence in public health education.

In 2006, NYU launched its first university-wide degree program in the NYU Master’s Program in Global Public Health. A collaboration of six of NYU’s graduate and professional schools, the NYU Global MPH program aimed to prepare individuals with advanced degrees to become leaders in global public health.

Recognizing that both programs bring unique strengths to NYU’s public health portfolio, NYU faculty and university leadership began discussing the possibility of consolidating the two MPH programs into a single university-wide
NYU MPH program and submitting a substantive change to CEPH. While work on the consolidation was continuous, a timeline highlighting important steps follows:

Spring 2007: Initial conversations with university and program leadership as well as faculty of the two MPH programs began

NYU submitted interim report to CEPH and was granted an accreditation until July 2012

May 2007: Initial meeting with Laura Rasar King, CEPH Executive Director, to discuss preliminary ideas regarding a consolidated program

June 2007 – Sept. 2008: Faculty and administration began working together to incorporate CEPH’s feedback; review results of programs’ assessments and strategize on revised, unified curriculum and infrastructure; approvals from faculty and governance groups

November 2008: Follow up call with Laura Rasar King to discuss progress and clarify CEPH criteria

April 2009: Request for substantive change submitted to CEPH


Begin establishing formal standing faculty committees for unified program.

November 2009: NYU requests additional time to implement the proposed substantive change and file all updated curricular changes with the NY State Education Department, as required.

February 2010: CEPH approves next accreditation review by July 1, 2012; Faculty retreat to plan implementation; begin developing new promotional materials, website, communication strategies, etc.

May 2010: Consultation meeting with Laura Rasar King at NYU to review progress

July 2010: Revisions to the MPH programs submitted to the NY State Education Department

December 2010: Received approval from NY State Education Department

March 2011: Announcement to all MPH students regarding the unified program; series of three Town Hall meeting to discuss change; individual student advising sessions.

April 2011: Celebratory kick-off breakfast for consolidated NYU MPH program with students, faculty and administration featuring guest speaker Dr. Nirav Shah, NY State Health Commissioner

Students submit decision to remain in his/her existing program or transfer to the unified NYU MPH program. Nearly all students transferred to the NYU MPH, or graduated from the Steinhardt Community Public Health Program in May 2011.
May 2011: First class of students graduating from the unified NYU MPH students received their degrees at NYU’s 179th Commencement Exercises in Yankee Stadium.

Fall 2011: First class of students admitted into the revised NYU MPH

Overall, the program revisions were extremely well received by students. The revised NYU MPH combines Steinhardt’s legacy of excellence in public health education with the innovation of the Global MPH interdisciplinary approach. The benefits include the following:

- Enhanced course offerings, with greater flexibility in course selection throughout the university
- A broader, multi-professional and multidisciplinary faculty, drawing from interdisciplinary expertise across the university
- A stronger student community, bringing together diverse individuals with a wider range of interests and experiences
- Enriched student resources, including enhanced training and fieldwork experiences, collaborative student groups, and a larger pool of career opportunities
- Full accreditation by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH) – meaning that all students in the unified MPH program will graduate from a single accredited MPH program

While we feel extremely confident in the positive results of the merged program, we recognize that we remain in a state of transition and bringing together faculty, students, staff, policies, procedures and program culture takes time. On one hand, the timing of this self-study so soon after the consolidation did not allow the time required to fully fine-tune all aspects of the program. On the other hand, the timing of the self-study was perfect as it allowed us to thoughtfully and systematically assess the consolidated, university-level program; as a result, we were able to recognize programmatic issues that require additional attention. We believe in continuous improvement.

We recognize that the model of the NYU MPH program, as a six-school collaboration, is unique and complex. At the same time, we strongly believe that the model supports the growing need for interdisciplinary, cross-professional training in public health and is an innovative structure to deliver one of the characteristics of a public health program as defined by CEPH:

*The program shall function as a collaboration of disciplines, addressing the health of populations and the community through instruction, research, and service. Using an ecological perspective, the public health program should provide a special learning environment that supports interdisciplinary communication, promotes a broad intellectual framework for problem-solving, and fosters the development of professional public health concepts and values.*

With that in mind, the NYU MPH was thoughtfully developed to meet all accreditation standards while meeting the needs of a diverse set of students and drawing on the strengths of NYU. We have very strong institutional support and adequate resources; we have succeeded in developing a strong set of goals and objectives as well as assessment tools to inform and direct change as needed; we have created a robust governing structure that oversees both broad strategic issues as well as day-to-day operation of the program; the curriculum is current, practice-oriented and competency-based; we actively engage in service to the larger community; the faculty are well-qualified, interdisciplinary and dedicated to public health and the students in the program; and our students – the cornerstone of the program – are an accomplished and diverse group with a true passion for public health. We are confident that the revised and unified NYU MPH program will allow these students to become promising public health practitioners who will help to improve the health of diverse population groups at the local, national, and global levels.
Given the recent consolidation of the two MPH programs and the unique multi-school collaborative model as well as our commitment to quality assurance, we invited three trained CEPH reviewers to visit the program and conduct a mock site visit this past February. The reviewers were David Gregorio (Connecticut), Charles Hamilton (Tennessee), and Anthony Schlaff (Tufts). Their visit was incredibly helpful as it not only provided an opportunity to prepare for the site visit in April, but also served as a peer review of the program in general. As program directors themselves, Drs. Gregorio, Hamilton and Schlaff offered insight, constructive advice, and suggestions for improvement which are captured throughout this final self-study document.

The Self-Study Document
What follows is the self-study of the unified NYU MPH program. Although there is historical information and data from the prior MPH programs in Community Public Health and the Master’s Program in Global Public Health, we present to CEPH our new organizational structure and curriculum for the NYU MPH Program, as requested. The information presented on outcomes, governance, resources, faculty, and students includes data that speak solely to the current program, and are drawn from 2010 – 2011, the first academic year of the revised NYU MPH program.

Throughout the document we will identify areas of recent change and transition and highlight those areas in which we feel we are particularly strong and those where we recognize the need for ongoing improvement. It took a great deal of planning, but the time and effort expended were invaluable in allowing us to assess the result of the unified MPH program through this self-study. CEPH’s guidance throughout the process was invaluable and for that we are extremely grateful.

Criterion 1.0 The Public Health Program

Mission, Goals and Objectives
The mission of New York University’s Master of Public Health Program is to prepare students to become effective public health researchers, practitioners, and leaders by advancing public health knowledge and practice through research, education, outreach, and community engagement. By doing so, we aim to improve the health of diverse population groups at the local, national, and global levels.

The major functions of the NYU MPH program include instruction, research and service, and the goals for each function are defined as follows:

**Instruction:** To educate students about fundamental public health principles, provide the skills needed for effective public health practice, and maintain an environment conducive to learning and public health practice.

**Research:** To contribute to the advancement of public health knowledge and action through collaborative research among faculty, students, and members of the community.

**Service:** To promote involvement of the program’s faculty, staff and students in public health leadership and service in the community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-1</strong></td>
<td>To educate students about public health fundamentals by offering core courses in biostatistics, epidemiology, research methods, environmental health, health services administration, social and behavioral sciences, and program planning and evaluation.</td>
<td>Percent of classes that students rate objectives as having been almost or fully met</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-2</strong></td>
<td>To provide students with structured public health training in an area of specialization – Community &amp; International Health, Global Health Leadership and Public Health Nutrition.</td>
<td>Percent of students in each concentration whose internship/practicum/capstone is aligned with their concentration.</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students indicating satisfaction with their concentration</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-3</strong></td>
<td>Through appropriate, relevant, and applied curricula, to prepare students to enter the public health workforce.</td>
<td>Percent of students in exit interviews reporting leaving the program feeling prepared for PH jobs</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students graduated: FT within 3 years</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students graduated: PT within 6 years</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of alumni who responded to bi-annual survey reporting employment in PH field 2 years post-graduation</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | Percent of students evaluated by culminating experience preceptors as having core competencies * | 85% in each of 8 core competencies | 1) Analytic assessment – 92%  
2) Policy devel/program planning – 93%  
3) Communication – 91%  
4) Cultural competency – 98%  
5) Community dimensions of practice – 98%  
6) Basic public health sciences – 96%  
7) Financial planning & mgmt. - 96%  
8) Leadership & systems thinking – 98% |
| | | Percent of students who are willing to talk to current & prospective students, as noted on the exit interview | 80% | 85% |
| **E-4** | To provide a supportive and nurturing educational environment. | Percent of students satisfied with advising procedures, as indicated on the student survey | 80% | 74% |
| | | Percent of students enrolled in internship/practicum who are satisfied with how their experience meets their interest | 90% | 92% |
| | | Percent of students with GPAs below 3.0 | 5% or less | Fall 2010 = 5%  
Spring 2011 = 5% |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-5) To staff the program with qualified, diverse and interdisciplinary faculty.</td>
<td>Percent of faculty who are non-white</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of courses in which faculty are rated as knowledgeable by students on evaluation forms</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>Fall 2010 = 91% Spring 2011 = 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6) To recruit qualified, diverse, and interdisciplinary students to the program.</td>
<td>Percent of newly enrolled students from outside greater NY area</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Fall 2011 CIH: 48.6% GHL: 32.0% PHN: 36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of accepted students who enroll annually</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Fall 2011 CIH – 60.0% GHL – 64.1% PHN – 36.1% Overall – 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of applicants who are non-white</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Fall 2011 CIH – 60.0% GHL – 64.1% PHN – 36.1% Overall – 58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of annual program applicants by race/ethnicity to % by race/ethnicity of US population</td>
<td></td>
<td>African American 14.0% Caucasian 41.7% Hispanic/Latino 7.2% Asian / Pacific Islander 24.4% Native American/Alaska 0% Unknown/Other* 12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7) To encourage students to participate actively in the program’s planning, evaluation, and decision-making processes.</td>
<td>Percent of students who attend annual MPH Town Halls</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Scheduled April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of students annually involved in a student group</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESEARCH**

| | | |
| R-1) To establish a research program consistent with current and future public health needs in New York City, the United States, and international settings. | Tenure track faculty (TTF) have a description of the research agenda that is part of their tenure process | 90% TTF have one by 3rd year review | 100% |
| | Tenured faculty (TF) have a description of the research agenda that is part of their annual review | 90% of TF progress in their research annually | 94% |
| R-2) To advance faculty research activities, including community-based research projects in domestic and international health. | Publications per year (TTF and TF) | 1 publication per year | Faculty average = 3.7 |
| | Professional presentations per year (TTF and TF) | 2 presentations/year | Faculty average = 4.4 |
| | Research grants per year (TTF and TF) | 1 funded research grant/2 years | Faculty average = 2.5 |
| R-3) To encourage NYU MPH students to participate in public health research. | Percent of students who attend at least one public health meeting of professional organizations/year | 15% | 15% |
| | Percent of students in practice-based courses (internship, practicum, Capstone) working on research projects | 30% | 39% |
**SERVICE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S-1) To encourage faculty and students to serve as advocates for public health initiatives, programs and policies.</th>
<th>Faculty membership in professional organizations annually</th>
<th>2 memberships per faculty member</th>
<th>Faculty average = 3.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of public health organizations, task forces, boards of directors, advisory boards, etc. in which faculty are engaged annually</td>
<td>1 per faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty average = 2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student membership in professional organizations annually</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2) To support public health service in the community through the program’s curriculum and outreach activities.</td>
<td>Number of guest lectures, conferences or presentations made throughout public health community annually</td>
<td>8 per year</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses per year with course assignments that require community based activities</td>
<td>2 per year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unknown/Other includes those with two or more races, as well as those who did not report race or ethnicity.*

**Using census figures for white Hispanic and Latino Americans; Latinos identifying as other races are captured in those categories to avoid double counting.**

**Evaluation and Planning**

The NYU MPH program relies heavily on evaluation and planning to ensure the program meets the current needs of our constituent groups, which include our MPH students, faculty, alumni, the NYU community, public health practitioners/potential employers and community partners. We employ a variety of tools to do so, which are outlined below.

- **MPH Standing Committees** – the program’s committees, consisting of program faculty and staff, were established to allow in-depth review and discussion of key programmatic areas. They include 1) Admissions; 2) Curriculum; 3) Faculty and Governance; 4) Public Health Practice; and 5) Student Affairs. These committees are discussed in further detail in Criterion 1.5c.
- **Student Organizations** – the program sponsors two student organizations; the Public Health Student Group and the Global Public Health Action Network. Both organizations have an NYU MPH faculty advisor and provide a valuable link to student concerns, interests, and ideas as well as to other constituent groups such as practitioners, community partners and the larger NYU community.
- **Surveys** – the NYU MPH program conducts several surveys throughout the year as a means of collecting information from our stakeholders. Those surveys include: 1) an admissions survey included as part of the online admissions process; 2) annual survey of continuing students; 3) annual exit surveys with graduating students; 4) an alumni survey conducted one year post graduation and 5) annual surveys of internship, practicum and capstone preceptors.
- **Coursework** – we also obtain valuable information from student course evaluations, conducted for all courses in the NYU MPH program. The practice based courses (internships and Capstone) include additional evaluation through preceptor evaluations and student evaluations.
- **Events** – most of our events include a participant evaluation, including all of the program’s professional development workshops.
- **External Advisory Board** – the program’s external advisory board, consisting of academics, practitioners, employers, community partners, and alumni, meets annually to review and discuss the program’s mission and objectives, strategic planning efforts and proposed curricular changes.
- **Deans Council** – the NYU MPH Deans Council meets at least once per academic year to review the results of evaluation efforts and provides guidance on future planning and activities. A description of the Deans Council can be found in Criterion 1.5.

**Governance**

The NYU MPH program is a multi-school collaboration housed and administered through the Office of the Executive Vice President for Health. Due to the multi-school nature of the program, the program reports to the
Executive Vice President for Health, though it functions as an independent, autonomous academic unit with regard to standard functions such as policies, budgets, enrollment planning, registration, financial aid, development. In this case the EVPH serves the function of the dean. The program is governed by interdisciplinary standing committees who report to a steering committee consisting of the Program Director, the Concentration Directors, and the Executive Director for Public Health Initiatives. The steering committee reports to the Executive Vice President for Health. There are five standing committees representing key aspect of the NYU MPH program: Admissions, Curriculum, Faculty and Governance, Public Health Practice, and Student Affairs. The steering committee reviews all proposed program policies and recommendations and reports final recommendations directly to the Executive Vice President for Health.

The Program Director, Sally Guttmacher, regularly consults with concentration leaders, program administrative staff, faculty committees, the External Advisory Committee, and NYU MPH student organizations to facilitate the processes necessary to carry out the NYU MPH’s mission, goals and objectives.

Leadership Committees

- **Deans Council** – the Deans Council consists of the Deans for each of the six collaborating schools, as well as the Executive VP for Health. Also participating in Deans Council meetings is the NYU MPH Program Director, Concentration Directors and the Executive Director for Public Health Initiatives. The Deans Council meets annually for review of program performance and strategic planning. Decision making by this group is generally by consensus, and it is advisory to the Executive VP for Health.

- **Steering Committee** – the NYU MPH steering committee consists of the Program Director, Concentration Directors, and the Executive Director, Public Health Initiatives and the NYU MPH Student Representative. The committee provides oversight of program planning and policies, and through feedback and recommendations from the External Advisory Board and the program standing committees, makes final recommendations to the faculty and the Executive VP for Health.

- **External Advisory Committee** – the NYU MPH External Advisory Committee consists of public health professionals locally and abroad whose charge it is to provide professional guidance and feedback on the program’s mission, goals, and objectives as well as programmatic activities and strategic plans.
Standing Committees
The NYU MPH Standing committees are composed of NYU MPH faculty and administrators. The committees support the academic and administrative functions through deliberative review and strategic assessment of programmatic matters. A summary of the functions of each standing committee is as follows:

- **Admissions Committee**: review and assess MPH admissions requirements and standards; ensure high quality staffing of the faculty review committee; review and assess admissions data and provide recommendations as needed.
- **Curriculum Committee**: examine course and curricular objectives as well as competencies and assess how they are met; review electives and other courses to ensure appropriateness and avoid overlap; examine courses to ensure accreditation standards are met; provide recommendations as needed.
- **Faculty and Governance Committee**: propose improvements in the MPH governing structure and architecture; identify, coordinate and communicate programmatic matters to constituents; review and assess program quality, policies and procedures, and provide recommendations as needed; assess quality and diversity of MPH faculty; manage accreditation process.
- **Public Health Practice Committee**: review university-wide public health practice opportunities; examine professional development opportunities for students; compare and review culminating experiences.
- **Student Services Committee**: assess resources for students (including international students and student groups); ensure a harmonious and fluid experience for all students, regardless of concentration; oversee student advisement and coordinate with other committees related to issues of job placement (Public Health Practice), policies and procedures (Faculty and Governance), and academics (Curriculum).

Faculty recruitment, retention, promotion and tenure
As six-school collaboration within NYU, the NYU MPH program does not appoint or promote faculty. Rather, appointments, promotion and tenure proceedings reside within the respective schools participating in the program. Faculty interested in affiliation with the NYU MPH program, or those recommended by his/her respective chair or dean, are reviewed by the NYU MPH Faculty and Governance Committee for appropriate qualifications, with all participation approved by the Executive VP for Health.

Policies and Procedures
The NYU MPH program follows the policies and procedures of New York University, which are maintained online [here](http://www.nyu.edu/about/policies-guidelines-compliance.html). Those policies fall under several categories, including: academic and faculty affairs, environmental health and safety, financial operations and treasury, governance and legal, human resources, information technology, student services, and research. The NYU MPH program also houses its program specific policies online at [here](http://mph.nyu.edu/student-resources/program-policies.html), in the New Student Guide and the NYU MPH Bulletin.

Student Governance
The NYU MPH program values the ideas of our students and encourages students to play active roles in program governance in a variety of ways:

- **Faculty and Committee Meetings** – Officers of the student organizations are also invited to NYU MPH faculty meetings to provide updates, express concerns and learn of new program initiatives and plans. The NYU MPH program does not appoint specific students as official members to the standing committees (primarily to protect student confidentiality and allow an opportunity for faculty to openly discuss programmatic matters), however we do invite students to the standing committee meetings when agenda items would benefit from student participation. For example, recently the editors of the student newsletter attended the Student Affairs committee to update the faculty on the new newsletter and
obtain feedback and guidance. However, as a result of the self-study exercise, the program will start “open forum” committee meetings for each of the standing committees at least once per academic year, inviting program stakeholders (including students) to discuss committee activities, new ideas and proposals, and answer questions.

- **Student Organizations** – one of the key ways for students to get involved with the program is through membership in one or both of our student organizations. The Public Health Student Group (PHSG) seeks to develop professional skills, leadership skills and provide networking opportunities for public health students. The PHSG encourages MPH students to be more active and hands-on in their graduate experience at NYU. The Global Public Health Action Network (GPHAN) is an action-oriented, University-wide, student organization that raises awareness and builds the capacity of global health communities within NYU and beyond. GPHAN provides opportunities to build the skills and interests of the NYU community in global public health. Both student organizations have an NYU MPH faculty advisor and annually elect officers to hold leadership positions.

- **Town Halls** – At least once per academic year the NYU MPH runs a Town Hall meeting with faculty and students. The Town Hall meetings provide an opportunity for students to hear from program leadership on program updates and new initiatives, ask questions and share ideas. The Town Hall meetings were particularly important this last year during the consolidation of the MPH programs into the NYU MPH program. The Town Hall meetings allowed faculty and staff to provide clarification, assurance, and address any concerns that arose.

- **Accreditation** – Officers (typically the presidents) of the student organizations participate on the NYU MPH accreditation committee and serve as a voice of the student body during the self-study process.

**Program Resources**

The NYU MPH program is fully supported by the University, and maintains adequate resources to support its mission, goals and objectives. A strength of the revised NYU MPH is the breadth and depth of faculty, now totaling 54 faculty contributing to the MPH program – 17 primary faculty and 37 secondary faculty. Our overall student to faculty ratio is 9.59:1, however in the Community and International Health concentration it is slightly above target at 11.42. To help meet the student to faculty ratio target for all concentrations, the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development is currently recruiting a new public health faculty member to join the department and MPH program Community and International Health concentration in academic year 2012-2013.

The program budget meets the current needs of all students, faculty and staff. As this is the first full academic year of the revised, consolidated MPH program we will monitor resources carefully. In the 2004 self-study of the NYU Community Public Health program, the target for expenditures per FTE student was set at $15,000. In the NYU MPH model, we reduced this target slightly to account for the removal of full faculty salary support, including benefits, in our budget model. It should also be noted that although the current faculty compliment for Public Health Nutrition is adequate at the current student population, we are seeing a significant increase in applications for this concentration for the Fall 2012 entering class (as of the submission of this report, there is an increase of 26% with the highest number of applications in at least six years). The program will closely monitor enrollment in the Public Health Nutrition concentration to ensure adequate faculty to serve those students.

Close to 50% of our students receive program sponsored scholarship with an average annual award of $6,376, meeting our goal of $6,000 (or 20% of annual tuition). As a program with an international reach, we also plan to seek external funding to further support students from low and middle income countries, given the additional burden of the cost of living in New York City.
### Table 1.6.m NYU MPH Performance Measures for Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student:faculty ratio</td>
<td>&lt;10:1</td>
<td>9.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per FTE student</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$12,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research dollars/FTE faculty*</td>
<td>Each year exceed the previous year</td>
<td>$6,400,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of students receiving program scholarships</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average annual student award</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criterion 2.0 Instructional Programs

#### Curriculum

**Overview**
The NYU MPH program offers the professional Master of Public Health degree with three areas of concentration: Community and International Health; Global Health Leadership; and Public Health Nutrition. In addition to the stand-alone MPH degree, NYU offers five dual degree options with the MPH in Global Health Leadership: the DDS/MPH with the NYU College of Dentistry; the MD/MPH with the NYU School of Medicine; the MPA/MPH with the NYU Wagner Graduate School of Public Service; the MS/MPH with the NYU College of Nursing; and the MSW/MPH with the NYU Silver School of Social Work.

The NYU MPH program meets all of the basic requirements for the awarding of the MPH degree. With the exception of three of the dual degree programs mentioned previously, the minimum credit requirements for the MPH degree is 46-54 (depending on concentration). All students take a set of core public health courses to meet the major knowledge areas of public health while concentration specific courses allow students to go into greater depth in a particular area. All MPH students complete an integrated practice and culminating experience which allows them to put into practice the knowledge and skills they have acquired during their degree program. All concentrations and dual degree offerings were developed to meet the overall program’s mission, goals and objectives.

**Practical Skills and Culminating Experience**
The goal of the practice experience, whether through an internship or capstone project, is to provide students an opportunity to cultivate mentoring relationships with public health professionals though meaningful hands-on work that builds public health competencies. All NYU MPH students are required to complete a practice experience prior to graduation, although requirements vary by concentration (see Table 2.4a) and that experience also serves as the culminating experience. The course sequences provide students with the opportunity to develop an understanding of basic public health concepts, acquire the skills needed to apply these concepts, and through the culminating experience, demonstrate the ability to synthesize and integrate knowledge and competencies. For Community and International Health and Public Health Nutrition students, the Internship serves as the culminating experience. For Global Health Leadership students, the Capstone in Global Health Leadership meets this requirement. Regardless of concentration, the culminating experience allows students the opportunity
to apply knowledge as graduate level public health practitioners. Differences in the culminating experiences of the concentration reflect differences in the type of roles the students are expected to assume upon graduation.

In academic year 2010-2011, 81 students completed practice experiences as part of the MPH degree requirements. Practice experiences have occurred in a variety of settings including government, non-profit organizations, and private agencies. Of those experiences, 57% took place in New York and 43% internationally.

**Competencies**

Starting in academic year 2011-2012, the NYU MPH program follows an adapted version of the MPH Core Competency model developed by the Association of Schools of Public Health (ASPH). Our curriculum uses this model as a foundation for ensuring that our graduates are well-prepared to enter rewarding careers in public health. The thirteen Core Competencies are divided into two categories: Discipline-Specific Competencies and Interdisciplinary/Cross-Cutting Competencies in which it is increasingly important that MPH students meet upon graduation. As an interdisciplinary program, our curriculum is designed to ensure that all MPH students are competent in each of these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.7.b. NYU MPH Outcome Measures for Student Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students in exit interviews that they left the program feeling prepared for public health jobs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Percent of students evaluated by culminating experience preceptors as having core competencies | 85% in each of 8 core competencies** | 1) Analytic assessment – 92%  
2) Policy devel/program planning – 93%  
3) Communication - 91%  
4) Cultural competency – 98%  
5) Community dimensions of practice – 98%  
6) Basic public health sciences – 96%  
7) Financial planning & mgmt. - 96%  
8) Leadership & systems thinking – 98% |
| Percent of students graduated: FT within 3 years | 90% | 94% |
| Percent of students graduated: PT within 6 years | 90% | 83% |
| Job placement rates one year post graduation | 80% | NA* |
| Percent of students with GPAs below 3.0 | 5% or less | 5% |

* To capture the assessment of the revised NYU MPH program, the first survey of alumni one year post graduation will take place in June 2012, one year after the first cohort of NYU MPH graduates.
** Council on Linkages between Academia and Practice competencies used in 2010-2011. Starting in fall 2011, the NYU MPH will assess competencies described in 2.6.a.
Research

Faculty Research
Faculty in the NYU MPH program demonstrate an impressive and active research program with a strong emphasis on community-based activities. Although faculty appointments are conducted at the school-level, faculty recruitment into health departments and divisions across the university involve interdisciplinary search committees who strive to ensure that new faculty bring current and/or potential population-based research. When identifying faculty to participate in the MPH program, consideration is given to the extent the faculty member’s research aligns with the mission, goals and objectives of the program.

The NYU MPH values research and collaborations that directly contribute to improving the health status of the community, locally and internationally. Therefore, a great deal of faculty research is grounded in community-based approaches to public health issues. To advance public health research efforts in the community, NYU MPH faculty and staff have addressed the importance of community-based research activities that utilize participatory collaborations in New York City, the U.S., and international communities.

Program faculty also view professional and academic collaborations as useful for advancing public health initiatives, especially when drawn from multidisciplinary perspectives. Such collaborations also enhance professional networking resources that can provide internships, jobs, professional contacts, adjunct instructors, and speakers for the program.

Student Involvement in Research
Students in the NYU MPH program are encouraged to participate in public health research through a variety of activities (listed below).

- **Coursework**: The curriculum the NYU MPH program is designed to give students fundamental knowledge about public health research at the start of the program and then to build on and apply research skills throughout their course of study.
- **Practice/Culminating Experience** – Students are encouraged to gain research experience through internship, practicum and or Capstone opportunities. The public health listserv sends frequent announcements of research opportunities available in the local New York City area, in the U.S. and abroad. Based on a recent student survey, 40% of our MPH students are engaged in research projects through coursework.
- **Independent Study** – Independent study with individual faculty members, ranging from 1-3 elective credits, is available to NYU MPH students when approved by both the faculty advisor and faculty supervisor. This route can be used to enhance public health research skills by assisting in ongoing faculty research or in small pilot projects initiated by the student in collaboration with community sites.
- **Work Experience** – Students apply research skills in paid job opportunities during the program. Research-related opportunities are posted through the public health listserv.
- **Faculty Research** – When available, faculty can recruit NYU MPH students to participate in current research projects. Such positions are limited and competitive.

In a recent survey of current students, 73% reported having participated in research activities while a student in the NYU MPH program. Of those:
• 64% received research experience through the internship/practicum requirement
• 25% through their place of employment
• 16% through the Capstone experience
• 13% through an faculty-led independent study
• 11% working individually with an NYU MPH faculty member (outside of program requirements)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1.d – NYU MPH Research Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track faculty (TTF) have a description of the research agenda that is part of their tenure process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured faculty (TF) have a description of the research agenda that is part of their annual review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Among TF and TEF:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications per year (peer-reviewed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research dollars/FTE faculty*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students who attend at least one public health meeting of professional organizations/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students in practice-based courses (internship, practicum, Capstone) working on research projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students participating in faculty research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students presenting at public health/scientific meetings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reported as aggregate funding in that given academic year.

Service

Faculty Service
Although specific requirements vary across schools, NYU MPH faculty are expected to engage in as a criteria for promotion and tenure. Faculty service is accomplished through a wide variety of ways, including direct community outreach, service to professional organizations, consultation with community partners, technical assistance, and advocacy. In addition, NYU MPH faculty actively engage MPH students in many of their service activities, serve as role models, and encourage MPH students to be actively engaged citizens in the community.

In summary, 100% of our primary faculty are engaged in service activities:

• 94% are active members of professional organizations
• 88% are engaged in community/ professional task forces or other service outside of professional organization membership
• 53% hold active leadership roles within his/her service activity
• 76% are involved in research activities working directly with community groups

Student Service
As graduate students in public health, our MPH students are naturally drawn to service activities and typically come into the program already actively engaged in the community. The NYU MPH seeks to enhance that passion by not only providing additional service opportunities, but by providing the skills required to conduct appropriate and effective service within diverse community settings.
In a recent program survey, 45% of our students indicated that they are current members of a professional public health organization (of which 8% hold leadership positions), 38% are active members of one of the NYU MPH student organizations, and 56% have participating in community service events while matriculated in the MPH program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.c. NYU MPH Service Performance Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measure</strong></td>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty membership in professional organizations annually</td>
<td>2 memberships per faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of public health organizations, task forces, boards of directors, advisory boards, etc., in which faculty are engaged annually</td>
<td>1 per faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students holding membership in public health or related organizations, annually</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of guest-lectures, conferences or presentations made throughout public health community annually</td>
<td>8 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses per year with course assignments that require community-based activities</td>
<td>2 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of faculty providing service to the community (consulting, technical assistance, community-based collaborations)</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students involved in community-service activities, annually</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workforce Development**

The NYU MPH program values workforce development, and the consolidation of the NYU MPH program serves as a catalyst in offering workforce development activities. While we have begun those efforts as a unified program, we need to more fully develop our activities to reach beyond our own students, alumni and faculty. We plan to do so by conducting a needs assessment this summer. That online survey, with potential focus groups to follow, will help to inform our efforts and support our commitment to developing the current workforce. The Public Health Practice Committee will assume responsibility for exploring and developing the workforce development components of the program.

**Criterion 4.0 Faculty, Staff and Students**

**Faculty**

**Faculty Qualifications**

The program offers a clearly defined and interdisciplinary set of qualified faculty whose scholarship, expertise and field perspective fully support the program’s mission, goals and objectives. We are proud of the vast array of accomplishments, dedication, and professional passion of the faculty affiliated with the NYU MPH program and all play an active role in shaping the future of public health and the next generation of professionals. Our target of 95% for “courses in which faculty are rated as knowledgeable by students on evaluation forms” is set very high, and on purpose, and although we are close to achieving that goal, we will continue to strive toward that high standard set for our faculty.

Tables 1.6.d.1 and 1.6.d.2 list the NYU faculty associated with the NYU MPH program. Those designated as Primary Faculty include full-time NYU faculty with at least 50% effort to the MPH program. Those listed as Secondary faculty include individuals who actively contribute to the MPH program but at less than 50% effort. At the current
time, there are a total of 54 faculty contributing to the NYU MPH program, 17 Primary Faculty and 37 Secondary Faculty. Together, they contribute 1845% or 18.45 FTE for teaching, advising, leadership and service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School/ Affiliation</th>
<th>Primary Concentration</th>
<th>MPH Teaching (%)</th>
<th>MPH Advising, Administration, and Program Service (%)</th>
<th>Total MPH Effort (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ananda Dasanayake</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Day</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Dixon</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gershman</td>
<td>Associate Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Grepin</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Guttmacher</td>
<td>Professor (Director)</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farzana Kapadia</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simona Kwon</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ying Lu</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Macinko</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Nestle</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Padgett</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niyati Parekh</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yumary Ruiz</td>
<td>Clinical Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Shelley</td>
<td>Clinical Associate Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Silver</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Van Devanter</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total% 535% 620% 1115%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>School/ Affiliation</th>
<th>Primary Concentration</th>
<th>MPH Teaching (%)</th>
<th>MPH Advising, Administration, and Program Service (%)</th>
<th>Total MPH Effort (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary Belkin</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Berman</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Berne</td>
<td>Professor; EVP Health</td>
<td>EVPH/Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bojana Beric</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Berliner</td>
<td>Visiting Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Berry</td>
<td>Associate Research Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Billings</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Blustein</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Burgie</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Elbel</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Med/Wagner</td>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Foran</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Fried</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>PHN</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Green</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Public Health/EVP</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Hakitis</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hayes</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Herman</td>
<td>Clinical Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keng-Yen Huang</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Islam</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Katz</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Kumar</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Kurth</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Macphail</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>CII</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>School/Affiliation</td>
<td>Primary Concentration</td>
<td>MPH Teaching (%)</td>
<td>MPH Advising, Administration, and Program Service (%)</td>
<td>Total MPH Effort (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick More</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas O’Connell</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Public Health/EVP</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danielle Ompad</td>
<td>Adjunct Associate Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Psoter</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Rasmussen</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Restrepo</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Rodwin</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Wagner</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renata Schiavo</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Public Health/EVP</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Scott</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyssa Sharkey</td>
<td>Adjunct Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Public Health/EVP</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Thurston</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chau Trinh-Shevin</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Vernillo</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Weitzman</td>
<td>Professor; Associate Dean</td>
<td>Steinhardt</td>
<td>CIH</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorice Vieira</td>
<td>Associate Curator</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>GHL</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Head Count</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CIH = Community and International Health; GHL = Global Health Leadership; PHN = Public Health Nutrition. FTE calculations are based on the Washington Square 9-month appointment model, using the following formula:
- Instructor of MPH core course = 15%
- Instructor of MPH concentration course = 10%
- Instructor of MPH elective = 5%
- Service on an MPH committee = 5%
- MPH Faculty advisor = 10%
- MPH Concentration director = 25%
- MPH Admissions Reviewer = 5%
- Investigator in community based research with student involvement = 10%

Faculty Policies and Procedures
The interdisciplinary and multi-school collaborative nature of the NYU MPH ensures that faculty development takes place both through the participating schools which make the primary appointments as well as the MPH program itself. Although faculty development for full-time faculty is primarily a responsibility of the school which holds a faculty member’s primary appointment, the MPH program carefully manages the allocation of teaching and advising responsibilities and closely monitors the performance of its teaching faculty.

Faculty participation in the NYU MPH entails a closely coordinated process between the MPH program and the faculty member’s school. The underlying arrangement between the MPH program and its partner schools underscores the value that participation in the MPH lends to both the MPH itself as well as the faculty member’s teaching, research and service portfolio. If an MPH faculty member fails to meet expectations for the MPH, the MPH program may discontinue their participation. Similarly, if a faculty member wishing to participate in the MPH does not meet such expectations, the MPH program will not approve their initial participation. By participating in the MPH program, faculty gain valuable opportunities to strengthen their teaching, research and service performance and records outside of the channels normally offered by their schools. In turn, the MPH program expects that faculty will contribute to the MPH community, both inside the classroom and out of it, and play active roles in guiding the program and its students.

When considering faculty for participation, faculty contributions such as teaching, research or other service are first considered by the Faculty and Governance and Curriculum committees. If the faculty member’s qualifications are approved at the program level, the dean of the faculty member’s respective school (or a representative appointed by the dean) is then asked to approve the faculty member’s participation. This approval is vital in ensuring that there is adequate support from the faculty member’s school as well as coordination when considering faculty development, time, effort, promotion and tenure. If issues or conflicts arise in terms of faculty...
contributions, the Executive VP for Health, Bob Berne, works closely with the dean (or department chair if applicable) to identify and pursue possible solutions. There are instances where, due to the somewhat different norms and culture in the participating schools, variability is sometimes required to find the most workable and preferred arrangements.

In addition to the above policies and procedures, NYU MPH faculty development is governed by University policies addressing appointment, promotion and tenure, as outlined in the NYU Faculty Handbook. They are summarized below. When MPH faculty members prepare their portfolios for school-level action such as annual review, promotions, and tenure decisions, often they will include their contributions to the NYU MPH program.

**Faculty Development**

NYU provides a wide range of resources and opportunities to support faculty development. In particular, NYU MPH faculty take advantage of the following:

- The NYU Center for Teaching Excellence supports and nurtures effective teaching and learning at NYU.
- The Faculty Resource Network hosts professional development programs for faculty members from a consortium of over 50 colleges and universities.
- The Curricular Development Challenge Fund (CDCF) promotes innovative curricular programs and projects at New York University.
- The University Research Challenge Fund (URCF) supports faculty-initiated research on a competitive basis and is administered by the URCF Advisory Committee, composed of senior faculty reflecting a cross-section of disciplines at the University.
- The Goddard Junior Faculty Fellowships support tenure-track faculty who have passed their third-year review with a one semester leave including full pay during their fourth year of instruction.
- The Global Public Health Research Challenge Fund (GPHRCF) supports faculty-initiated research on a competitive basis and is administered by the Executive Vice President for Health and a GPHRCF Selection Committee, composed of senior faculty representing a cross-section of disciplines at the University. The purpose of the GPHRCF is to serve as an incentive for faculty to explore new areas of global public health research that are likely to attract outside support and to support those engaging in productive global public health scholarship in areas where there are few sources of existing support.
- Service Learning Course Development Grants are available to support service learning courses. These funds may be used to develop or enhance undergraduate or graduate courses that include a practicum of a volunteer experience either organized by the instructor or developed by students as an integral part of the course.
- The Distinguished Teaching Award, established in 1987, is presented annually to approximately five outstanding fulltime faculty members in recognition that, along with research, exceptional teaching, both within and outside the classroom, is among our institutional priorities.

**Faculty and Staff Diversity**

The NYU MPH program always strives to achieve a diverse faculty and staff compliment. Currently 56% of faculty and staff are female and 44% male. Overall, 78% of faculty and staff identify as Caucasian, 14% as Asian/Pacific Islander, 4% as African American, 4% as Hispanic/Latino and 2% as a combination of ethnicities. Eight percent of our faculty hold citizenship outside of the US, and close to 50% of our faculty and staff speak at least one language other than English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3.f.1 NYU MPH Faculty and Staff Diversity Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Measure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of faculty and staff who are non-white</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.3.f.2 NYU MPH Summary Demographic, Faculty and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** International faculty staff are not counted as a mutually exclusive category and include faculty and staff members who are also counted in individual ethnicity categories. To avoid double counting, international numbers are not included in totals.

---

Students

Admissions and Recruitment

The NYU MPH seeks to enroll an academically qualified class and to equip all students with essential public health competencies, regardless of which MPH concentration they choose. Nonetheless, the NYU MPH program recognizes that the broad field of public health offers different types of opportunities to public health practitioners with different experiences and backgrounds. As such diversity contributes to the richness of public health as an academic discipline and field of study, the MPH program offers three different concentrations from which students may choose to enroll.

The three concentrations of the MPH are designed to attract and enroll different target cohorts. The Community & International Health concentration seeks to train qualified applicants with bachelor’s degrees in the promotion of health and the prevention of disease in communities around the world, with an emphasis on the needs of vulnerable populations. The Global Health Leadership concentration seeks to prepare qualified applicants with advanced graduate or professional degrees to leadership roles in global public health settings across the world. The Public Health Nutrition Health concentration seeks to train qualified applicants with bachelor’s degrees to promote health and reduce the risk of chronic diseases and obesity through educational and environmental approaches to improved nutrition and physical activity.

Table 4.4f describes measures by which the program may evaluate its success in enrolling the most appropriate students to the program. These measures include mean undergraduate GPA, mean GRE scores broken out by section as well as totals, and mean graduate GPA.

Table 4.4.f. NYU MPH Program Admission Performance Measures for Enrolling Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Measure</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean undergraduate GPA</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GRE Total</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Graduate GPA*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based only on Global Health Leadership applicants, who are required to have a graduate degree in order to apply. Average based on those applicants who have reportable averages on a US 4.0 grade average scale.

The program attracts and enrolls high quality applicants who are able to perform well academically once enrolled. We have made a special effort to achieve student diversity along many dimensions and have enrolled an incoming class for Fall 2011 that represents:

- Over 35 different disciplines (i.e. previous course of study)
- 11 different degree types (e.g. MD, JD, Ph.D.)
- 15 different countries of origin
• 11 different native languages spoken
• 5 different dual degree programs

The policies and procedures that govern admissions are subject to ongoing review and revision by the NYU MPH Admissions Committee as well as by senior program leadership. Admissions Committee faculty and senior leadership receive regular admissions reports detailing the success of the program’s recruitment and admissions strategies. These review procedures have been instituted to ensure that the program is able to recruit an appropriate class in future years, as both program needs as well as the prospective student pool for public health programs evolve.

Student Diversity
The NYU MPH seeks to enroll a student body whose diversity mirrors that of the general United States population, as our prospective student population reaches far outside the NYC area. By those standards, the program has largely been largely successful. Table 4.5d above indicates that the program has enrolled a greater proportion of African American, Native American/Alaskan and Asian/Pacific Islander students than found in the broader population. The only underrepresented group that the program failed to enroll in equal proportion to the general population is Hispanic/Latino students. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the NYU MPH is not alone in facing a challenge in recruiting Hispanic/Latino students to public health and that other MPH programs have had similar experiences. These metrics will be monitored closely in future years to ensure continued success in drawing students from diverse backgrounds and especially from traditionally underrepresented populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>US Population (2010 Census)</th>
<th>NYU MPH Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>8.7%**</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaska</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Other*</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unknown/Other includes those with two or more races, as well as those who did not report race or ethnicity.
**Using census figures for white Hispanic and Latino Americans; Latinos identifying as other races are captured in those categories to avoid double counting.

Student Advising
As soon as students are admitted into the NYU MPH program, the NYU MPH Academic Administrator assigns an academic advisor from among the full-time faculty, but within the student’s concentration. Advisors serve as mentors for the duration of the student’s period of study and assess the student’s progress through the program and achievement of the program’s learning objectives. All attempts are made to match students with advisors working in a selected area of interest. Students are free to change advisors at any time during the course of the program. All NYU MPH faculty serving as advisors are provided with a Faculty Advisor Supplement to the NYU Faculty Guide (both are available on site). The Advising Supplement reviews policies and procedures, student resources, degree requirements and checklists, and procedures for documentation and reporting.

Advising Resources
• Administrative Advising. NYU MPH students are expected to navigate through a complex system in a large, decentralized institution. Although every effort is made to provide students with the resources needed upfront to ensure a smooth and successful trajectory through the MPH program, students often face issues regarding the bursar, financial aid, ITS, and other administrative matters. The NYU MPH administrative staff prides itself on being a knowledgeable and available resource to all NYU MPH students. The staff are committed to assisting students with such matters so that their time and energy can be spent on the academic and practice-based aspects of the program. Each year, students are informed of the resources available to
them in the administrative office, including a summary of the responsibilities and contact information of each of the staff members.

- **The New Student Guide.** The NYU MPH program provides every matriculated student a New Student Guide (available on-site) prior to arriving at NYU for the fall semester. The Guide provides a variety of useful information including steps to activate their NYU email account, registration instructions, program and university policies and procedures, a faculty and staff directory, degree requirements, and helpful resources for getting started at NYU.

- **New Student Orientation.** All students admitted into the program are required to attend a program orientation held a few days before the start of the academic year. The orientation provides an opportunity for new students to meet each other as well as faculty and staff in the program. During the orientation, students receive information and an orientation packet which includes information on program policies and expectations, important contact information, student biographies, library resources, student organization information, public health practice opportunities, study abroad, academic integrity policies, and advising procedures. They also have the opportunity to hear from current students and alumni and ask questions.

- **The NYU MPH Listserv.** The Academic Administrator moderates a listserv for all students and faculty in the program. The listservs post announcements about job and internship opportunities; scholarships and fellowships trainings, workshops and conferences; public health events and news; and notices specific to the program.

- **Alumni.** Faculty and staff of the NYU MPH program view alumni of the program as a valuable resource for students. The program maintains a strong working relationship with NYU’s Alumni Relations Office to track and contact alumni from the MPH program. The program has developed and put systems in place to encourage contact between alumni and students and to offer professional development opportunities and resources to alumni. These include:

- **Career Counseling Services.** As mentioned previously, the NYU MPH program provides a variety of resources to students and alumni on career counseling and professional development, in addition to faculty advisement. Amy Joyce, Associate Director of Public Health Practice, administers all aspects of public health practice initiatives (local and international) for the NYU MPH, including the administration of professional development and career service activities.
Summary

Overview
Over the past several years, the Community Public Health Program and the Master’s Program in Global Public Health at NYU have been involved in a consolidation process leading to the creation of the University-wide NYU MPH program, which came to fruition in Spring 2011. Although still fairly early in this transition, the newly consolidated program has already generated several benefits, including a strengthened community of faculty and students, improved student involvement in program governance and planning, stronger curricular cohesion, synergy in events and student services and a well-developed evaluation system.

The current self-study has been incredibly helpful during this consolidation period, allowing faculty and program leadership to thoroughly assess the program’s mission, goals and objectives and to identify programmatic strengths as well as areas for improvement. Although we feel we have made great progress in a short amount of time, we know there are areas in which we can do better. A summary follows:

NYU MPH Areas of Strength
• The program has established an in-depth and transparent performance assessment system to monitor the program’s ability to meet its mission, goals and objectives.
• The program is built around an innovative and fully supported institutional structure which allows for interdisciplinary and collaborative participation across multiple NYU schools and departments.
• The well-designed curriculum and culminating experience takes advantage of the interdisciplinary nature of NYU and its faculty and prepares students to meet established public health competencies.
• MPH students benefit from an extensive array of fieldwork and practice-based opportunities and resources both locally and globally.
• The interdisciplinary nature of the program provides diverse research opportunities and collaborative research potential for faculty and students.
• The program, along with its faculty and staff, provides a wide range of services both within NYU and in the community and has established an extensive professional development portfolio to serve students, alumni and the community at large.
• The NYU MPH faculty brings together an interdisciplinary set of scholars and practitioners contributing to instruction, research, advisement, service and governance.
• Our student body demonstrates academic excellence and is diverse in ethnic, academic and professional backgrounds.
• The interdisciplinary, cross-school nature of the consolidated NYU MPH Program is now being used as a model for other appropriate areas across the University such as environmental studies and urban studies.

NYU MPH Areas for Improvement and Ongoing Evaluation
• Given the recent changes to the MPH program as a result of the consolidation, our data regarding outcome and performance measures are limited. Therefore, we will be monitoring data very closely to inform future policy recommendations and programmatic decision-making.
• The NYU MPH governance structure is well-defined, but we feel we can more fully engage our stakeholders in areas of governance and administration.
• There appears to be some uncertainty among our constituent groups regarding lines of authority and leadership, particularly among students. While this may be typical during a period of restricting, the program has made it a priority to ensure our organizational structure is clearly communicated and reinforced to assure the stability, integrity and success of the unified program.
• Although there is some funding available for student practice-based travel, the program can benefit from additional resources and we will be exploring strategies over the coming year to identify such resources.
• The consolidated MPH program expands our alumni network and we plan to increase our alumni outreach over the coming years. We have already begun this effort by establishing an NYU MPH Alumni Network and we look forward to strengthening our communication and follow-up with this cohort.
• We would like to increase student participation in service outside of the classroom, and feel confident that the consolidate program organization will support those efforts.
• As a program, we need to fully assess, plan and implement a more robust workforce development strategy and set of activities; the plans to do so are in place.
• While our faculty are diverse in discipline and area of research, we could achieve greater racial and ethnic diversity among them.
• Current data indicate we could achieve greater student satisfaction in advising; therefore we have restructured and enhanced programmatic advising policies and procedures and will work closely with students to improve overall satisfaction.

The consolidation of the prior MPH programs in Community Public Health and Global Public Health has been a success along many dimensions but the self-study process highlights areas for improvement. As detailed throughout the document, the program governance and leadership will collaborate with the program’s constituent groups to review our progress toward meeting our goals and objectives and to develop strategies for continued improvement.
NYU MPH Self-Study – Summary of Criteria Assessment

1.1 Mission. The program shall have a clearly formulated and publicly stated mission with supporting goals and objectives. The program shall foster the development of professional public health values, concepts and ethical practice.

This criterion is met. The mission, goals and objectives were developed through a thorough, interdisciplinary process involving all program stakeholders and are made public primarily through the program website but also via internal faculty and student guides. The NYU MPH has developed a comprehensive structure to monitor and assess progress toward the program’s mission and goals.

1.2 Evaluation and Planning. The program shall have an explicit process for evaluating and monitoring its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the program’s effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for planning to achieve its mission in the future.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH program has collaboratively developed a thorough and diverse set of performance measures to monitor its progress in meeting the program’s mission, goals and objectives. The indicators (and targets) are a key part of a feedback process to assess our effectiveness in serving the needs of our faculty, students and community partners. The evaluation tools and mechanisms also allow us to plan strategically for the future.

Our goal throughout the self-study process was to actively engage students, all MPH faculty and our community partners in the preparation of the self-study document. Although we sent emails and discussed the process at several meetings, we learned during our mock visit that program stakeholders, while aware that the self-study was underway, felt as if they were not invited to contribute or review the study’s content. Therefore, requests and invitations by email and in person at meetings may not be adequate means to elicit such participation. The steering committee has recognized the need to explore alternative strategies to ensure all constituents feel they have a contributory voice in the program’s assessment process. For example, as a result of this self-study, we have decided to create periodic open forum committee meetings in which stakeholders are invited to attend and participate. We also plan to engage the student groups and alumni networks in discussions regarding the best way to communicate information; actively soliciting their insight regarding ways to improve participation in program assessment.

1.3 Institutional Environment. The program shall be an integral part of an accredited institution of higher education.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH program is included in the structure of a well-established, accredited institution of higher education. Program faculty are highly integrated into the academic and professional life of the university. The program complies with university policies and standards on all academic and personnel matters.

1.4 Organization and Administration. The program shall provide an organizational setting conducive to teaching and learning, research and service. The organizational setting shall facilitate interdisciplinary communication, cooperation and collaboration. The organizational structure shall effectively support the work of the program’s constituents.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH supports an organizational structure conducive to teaching and learning, research and service. As a six-school collaboration with strong support from university leadership, the backbone of the organizational setting is its commitment to interdisciplinary
communication, cooperation and collaboration. The organizational structure was developed to ensure that we are meeting the needs of our students, faculty and community partners.

As a program which was recently consolidated from two stand-alone programs (one school-based and one university-based) and thus two organizational cultures, we are aware that there is a period of acclimation for all stakeholders – students, faculty, staff, university administration, alumni and community partners. We learned from our recent mock site visit that faculty and students felt the merging of the two cultures is progressing, but requires more time and effort and on several occasions constituent groups identified more with their prior program than with the current one. We suspect this is a vestigial by-product of having recently been two separate programs. We are confident as new cohorts acclimate to a fully integrated program, students will fully identify as NYU MPH students. There also appears to be some uncertainty regarding lines of authority and leadership, particularly among students. In consulting with peers and other academic units who have undergone similar organization change, we feel this transition period is quite typical. However, as a result of the self-study process, the program has made it a priority to explore strategies to ensure our organizational structure is clearly communicated and reinforced to assure the stability, integrity and success of the unified program.

1.5 Governance. The program administration and faculty shall have clearly defined rights and responsibilities concerning program governance and academic policies. Students shall, where appropriate, have participatory roles in conduct of program evaluation procedures, policy-setting and decision-making.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH program has developed a strong governance structure that allows for ongoing collaboration from multiple constituents, including university leadership, faculty, staff, students and community partners. The NYU MPH program has drawn from years of experience to establish an ethical foundation as well as a core set of governance and academic policies to support its mission, goals and objectives.

As described above, the self-study process has encourage us to better engage our constituent groups in program governance in part, as a reflection of collaborative shared decision-making that is valued by the profession. While we continue to explore strategies for doing so, we will immediately begin by 1) offering open forum meetings to include our stakeholder groups for each of the standing committees and 2) requiring more frequent meetings of all of the standing and leadership committees.

1.6 Resources. The program shall have resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals, and its instructional, research and service objectives.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH program is fully supported by the University, and maintains adequate resources to support its mission, goals and objectives. A strength of the revised NYU MPH is the breadth and depth of faculty, now totaling 54 faculty contributing to the MPH program – 17 primary faculty and 37 secondary faculty. Our overall student to faculty ratio is 9.59:1, however in the Community and International Health concentration it is slightly above target at 11.42. To help meet the student to faculty ratio target for all concentrations, the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development is currently recruiting a new public health faculty member to join the department and MPH program Community and International Health concentration in academic year 2012-2013.

The program budget meets the current needs of all students, faculty and staff. As this is the first full academic year of the revised, consolidated MPH program we will monitor resources carefully. In the 2004 self-study of the NYU Community Public Health program, the target for expenditures per FTE student was set at $15,000. In the NYU MPH model, we reduced this target slightly to account for the removal of full faculty salary support, including benefits, in our budget model. It should also be noted that although the current faculty compliment for Public Health Nutrition is adequate at the current student population, we are seeing a significant increase in applications for this concentration for the Fall 2012 entering class (as of
the submission of this report, there is an increase of 26% with the highest number of applications in at least six years). The program will closely monitor enrollment in the Public Health Nutrition concentration to ensure adequate faculty to serve those students.

Our faculty research portfolio is impressive, with on average approximately $6 million dollars in research funding per FTE faculty. Given the public health priorities at NYU, increasing intuitional support, and the growing number of collaborations and partnerships, we fully expect that figure to grow annually and will monitor faculty research funding closely over time.

Close to 50% of our students receive program sponsored scholarship with an average annual award of $6,376, meeting our goal of $6,000 (or 20% of annual tuition). As a program with an international reach, we also plan to seek external funding to further support students from low and middle income countries, given the additional burden of the cost of living in New York City.

2.1 Master of Public Health Degree. The program shall offer instructional programs reflecting its stated mission and goals, leading to the Master of Public health (MPH) or equivalent professional masters degree. The program may offer a generalist MPH degree or an MPH with areas of specialization. The program, depending upon how it defines the unit of accreditation, may offer other degrees, professional and academic, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH is designed to ensure that students in any of the three concentrations or dual degree programs can complete the degree requirements as outlined. The program website was designed to allow students to understand degree requirements, sequencing, course options and prerequisites and program policies regarding registration and advisement.

2.2 Program Length. An MPH degree program or equivalent professional masters degree must be at least 42 semester credit units in length.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH program meets all of the basic requirements for the awarding of the MPH degree. With the exception of three of the dual degree programs mentioned previously, the minimum credit requirements for the MPH degree is 46-54 (depending on concentration). All students take a set of core public health courses to meet the major knowledge areas of public health while concentration specific courses allow students to go into greater depth in a particular area. All MPH students complete an integrated practice and culminating experience which allows them to put into practice the knowledge and skills they have acquired during their degree program. All concentrations and dual degree offerings were developed to meet the overall program’s mission, goals and objectives.

It should be noted that one of the current agenda items for the MPH Curriculum committee is revisiting the difference in credit requirement between the Community and International Health and Public Health Nutrition concentrations as compared to the concentration in Global Health Leadership concentration. There is faculty and student interest in exploring a more unified credit requirement while still maintaining the added focus on leadership development in the Global Health Leadership concentration. We are currently exploring creative strategies to do so, aiming to present recommendations in Fall 2012.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge. All professional degree students must demonstrate an understanding of the public health core knowledge.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH program assures that all MPH students, regardless of concentration, have a broad understanding of the areas of knowledge basic to public health and does so through a mixture of coursework and applied practice experience.
2.4 Practical Skills. All professional degree students must develop skills in basic public health concepts and demonstrate the application of these concepts through a practice experience that is relevant to the students’ areas of specialization.

This criterion is met. All NYU MPH students, regardless of concentration, are required to demonstrate the application of basic public health concepts through a practice experience that is relevant to the students’ concentration. The NYU MPH makes public health practice a priority, and offers a wealth of opportunity, faculty advisement, infrastructure, and administrative support to ensure that all MPH students have appropriate, safe, and professionally rewarding experiences.

Once of the strengths of the consolidated MPH program is the development of the Public Health Practice committee (which includes, but is not limited to the faculty instructors of the internship and capstone practice requirements and the Associate Director, Public Health Practice). The charge of this committee is to review public health practice opportunities; examine professional development opportunities for students; and review culminating experiences across concentrations.

2.5 Culminating Experience. All professional degree programs identified in the instructional matrix shall assure that each student demonstrates skills and integration of knowledge through a culminating experience.

This criterion is met. The course sequences provide students with the opportunity to develop an understanding of basic public health concepts, acquire the skills needed to apply these concepts, and through the culminating experience, demonstrate the ability to synthesize and integrate knowledge and competencies. All NYU MPH students are required to demonstrate skills and integration of knowledge through a culminating experience. For Community and International Health and Public Health Nutrition students, the Internship serves as the culminating experience. For Global Health Leadership students, the Capstone in Global Health Leadership meets this requirement. Regardless of concentration, the culminating experience allows students the opportunity to apply knowledge as graduate level public health practitioners. Differences in the culminating experiences of the concentration reflect differences in the type of roles the students are expected to assume upon graduation.

2.6 Required Competencies. For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of educational programs.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH faculty have spent considerable time reviewing, discussing and revising the set of competencies that guide the development of the MPH as a whole as well as the three concentrations. Though daunting, the review proved extremely beneficial in reviewing not only the competencies but the courses, activities and programs to support those competencies. The process of consolidating the MPH program provided a wonderful opportunity to evaluate this aspect of the program, and to engage in that discussion with an interdisciplinary and expanded set of NYU faculty. Attainment of core competencies are assessed through preceptor evaluations in the student’s culminating experience, and concentration competencies are evaluated through graduating student exit surveys. The program is currently in the first academic year utilizing the revised set of competencies and the application and evaluation of those competencies will be discussed at an end of the year faculty retreat.

2.7 Assessment Procedures. There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated competence in the required areas of performance.
This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH has developed and extensive set of procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which students have demonstrated established competencies. Although alumni and employer survey results are pending, we do have data from culminating experience preceptors and faculty indicating that the program is succeeding in preparing a cohort of graduates prepared to perform the core public health competencies in practice settings. The curriculum and public health practice committees are also exploring additional comprehensive mechanisms for assessing student performance and achievement of competencies, including the possibility of an e-portfolio requirement for all MPH students. Data collected over the next year will further inform program leadership and facilitate curricular and policy changes where needed.

2.8 Academic Degrees. If the program also offers curricula for academic degrees, students pursuing them shall obtain a broad introduction to public health, as well as an understanding about how their discipline-based specialization contributes to achieving the goals of public health.

Not applicable.

2.9 Doctoral Degrees. The program may offer doctoral degree programs, if consistent with its mission and resources.

Not applicable.

2.10 Joint Degrees. If the program offers joint degree programs, the required curriculum for the professional public health degree shall be equivalent to that required for a separate public health degree.

This criteria is met. The NYU MPH program offers five dual degree options with five of our collaborating NYU schools. Currently the dual degree programs are available only with the Global Health Leadership concentration but additional opportunities will be explored over time as student interest and demand are further assessed. The dual programs were carefully developed to ensure that students meet all requirements of both degrees and are adequately integrated into both degree programs.

2.11 Distance Education or Executive Degree Programs. If the program offers degree programs using formats or methods other than students attending regular on-site course sessions spread over a standard term, these degree programs must a) be consistent with the mission of the program and within the program’s established areas of expertise; b) be guided by clearly articulated student learning outcomes that are rigorously evaluated; c) be subject to the same quality control processes that other degree programs in the university are; and d) provide planned and evaluated learning experiences that take into consideration and are responsive to the characteristics and needs of adult learners. If the program offers distance education or executive degree programs, it must provide needed support for these programs, including administrative, travel, communication, and student services. The program must have an ongoing program to evaluate the academic effectiveness of the format, to assess teaching and learning methodologies and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements. Int Degrees. If the program offers joint degree programs, the required curriculum for the professional public health degree shall be equivalent to that required for a separate public health degree.

Not applicable.

3.1 Research. The program shall pursue an active research program, consistent with its mission, through which its faculty and students contribute to the knowledge base of the public health disciplines, including research directed at improving the practice of public health.

This criterion is met. Our faculty are active and productive in research, are engaged in collaborative and community-based projects, are called on frequently to discuss their work with community and
professional audiences, and are advocates for engaging students in research activities. The majority of our students engage in practical application of research skills, and many of them present their original work at professional conferences.

3.2 Service. The program shall pursue active service activities, consistent with its mission, through which faculty and students contribute to the advancement of public health practice.

This criterion is met with commentary. Service is strength of the NYU MPH community as represented by our student and faculty activities. Our faculty far exceeds the program’s expectation for service. Efforts to provide program-sponsored events to the larger community have proved successful, one of the many positive outcomes of the revised NYU MPH program. While over half of our students report involvement in community-service, we hope to reach our target of 75% in the coming year. We are confident we can achieve that target over time through our strengthening student organizations and alumni network.

3.3 Workforce Development. The program shall engage in activities that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

This criterion is partially met. The NYU MPH program values workforce development, and the consolidation of the NYU MPH program serves as a catalyst in offering workforce development activities. While we have begun those efforts as a unified program, we need to more fully develop our activities to reach beyond our own students, alumni and faculty. We plan to do so by conducting a needs assessment this summer. That online survey, with potential focus groups to follow, will help to inform our efforts and support our commitment to developing the current workforce. The Public Health Practice Committee will assume responsibility for exploring and developing the workforce development components of the program.

4.1 Faculty Qualifications. The program shall have a clearly defined faculty which, by virtue of its distribution, multidisciplinary nature, educational preparation, research and teaching competence, and practice experience, is able to fully support the program’s mission, goals and objectives.

This criterion is met. The program offers a clearly defined and interdisciplinary set of qualified faculty whose scholarship, expertise and field perspective fully support the program’s mission, goals and objectives. We are proud of the vast array of accomplishments, dedication, and professional passion of the faculty affiliated with the NYU MPH program and all play an active role in shaping the future of public health and the next generation of professionals. Our target of 95% for “courses in which faculty are rated as knowledgeable by students on evaluation forms” is set very high, and on purpose, and although we are close to achieving that goal, we will continue to strive toward that high standard set for our faculty.

4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures. The program shall have well-defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty, and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH model is uniquely arranged in that faculty appointments and responsibility for most development activities primarily reside in the participating schools. Nonetheless, both the schools and the MPH program itself have put in place policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty as well as to monitor and recognize faculty performance at both the school and program levels. The process is coordinated at the program level via the Faculty and Governance and Curriculum committees, while closely working at the school level with the Deans Council members. The school-level annual reviews that take place are taken into account along with student course evaluations to create a full picture of faculty performance and provide feedback mechanisms to individual faculty. This process ensures that faculty both benefit from participation in the MPH while at the same time contribute meaningfully to the MPH program and community. Offering such opportunity is a key element
of the MPH program’s success in recruiting qualified and interdisciplinary faculty to participate in MPH activities.

4.3 Faculty and Staff Diversity. The program shall recruit, retain and promote a diverse faculty and staff, and shall offer equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is met with commentary. NYU and the NYU MPH program has an extensive infrastructure to recruit, retain and promote a diverse faculty and staff and offers equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin. However, our data indicate that we could be achieving greater diversity particularly in recruiting new and/or engaging existing African American and Hispanic/Latino faculty, especially in light of the diversity of New York City.

4.4 Student Recruitment and Admissions. The program shall have student recruitment and admissions policies and procedures designed to locate and select qualified individuals capable of taking advantage of the program’s various learning activities, which will enable each of them to develop competence for a career in public health.

This criterion is met. Admission policies and procedures meant to enroll a student body of appropriate quality and diversity have been formulated by faculty governance and program leadership and followed by the MPH Admissions Committee and program staff. Our recruitment strategies have been highly successful in recruiting a class that meets or exceeds established program goals for academic quality. As illustrated in Table 4.4f above, average student GPAs and GRE scores exceed the baseline program standards. The program attracts and enrolls high quality applicants who are able to perform well academically once enrolled. We have made a special effort to achieve student diversity along many dimensions and have enrolled an incoming class for Fall 2011 that represents:

- Over 35 different disciplines (i.e. previous course of study)
- 11 different degree types (e.g. MD, JD, Ph.D.)
- 15 different countries of origin
- 11 different native languages spoken
- 5 different dual degree programs

The policies and procedures that govern admissions are subject to ongoing review and revision by the NYU MPH Admissions Committee as well as by senior program leadership. Admissions Committee faculty and senior leadership receive regular admissions reports detailing the success of the program’s recruitment and admissions strategies. These review procedures have been instituted to ensure that the program is able to recruit an appropriate class in future years, as both program needs as well as the prospective student pool for public health programs evolve.

4.5 Student Diversity. Stated application, admission, and degree-granting requirements and regulations shall be applied equitably to individual applicants and students regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH enrolls a class of impressive diversity, both in terms of ethnic background as well as academic and professional backgrounds and experiences. The program’s success in enrolling substantial cohorts from traditionally underrepresented groups indicate that the program’s targeted recruitment strategies are effective in encouraging applicants and enrollees from those populations. Additionally, the robust academic characteristics of the enrollees indicate that the NYU MPH is able to admit and enroll a diverse class while adhering to its own standards of academic excellence.
4.6 Advising and Career Counseling. There shall be available a clearly explained and accessible academic advising system for students, as well as readily available career and placement advice.

This criterion is met with commentary. The NYU MPH program has in place functioning systems for academic advising and career counseling of all MPH students. These systems are supported by additional resources through the University. The consolidation of the program has encouraged a strengthening of the MPH advising infrastructure, including selecting appropriate faculty advisors and providing training and support for improvements in advising. That said, we recognize that during this transition from two programs to one, time is needed to fully execute, monitor, assess, and revise our advising structure to ensure our students receive adequate resources. This semester, the Student Service Committee will be discussing and putting forth recommendations to improve student satisfaction in faculty advising.
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Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH), the recognized accrediting body for public health schools and programs, regarding the New York University (NYU) MPH Program. The report assesses the program's compliance with the Accreditation Criteria for Public Health Programs, amended June 2005. This accreditation review included the conduct of a self-study process by program constituents, the preparation of a document describing the program and its features in relation to the criteria for accreditation, and a visit in April 2012 by a team of external peer reviewers. During the visit, the team had an opportunity to interview school and university officials, administrators, teaching faculty, students, alumni and community representatives, and to verify information in the self-study document by reviewing materials provided on site in a resource file. The team was afforded full cooperation in its efforts to assess the program and verify the self-study document.

NYU is one of the largest private institutions in the US. The university enrolls over 40,000 students in 18 schools and colleges and operates the NYU Langone Medical Center. The university’s main campus is in New York’s Greenwich Village, but the university aims to become a “Global Network University, a university that challenges the idea that a university can only deliver education at a single home campus.” NYU operates locations in Abu Dhabi, Singapore, Ghana, Germany, Argentina, Italy, England, Spain, France, the Czech Republic, China and Israel and has established direct exchange programs with 12 international partner institutions.

The MPH program is a collaboration between six of NYU’s 17 schools and colleges. The participating schools include the following: Dentistry; Nursing; Public Service; Medicine; Social Work; and Culture, Education and Human Development. The program’s current administrative home is in the Office of the Executive Vice President for Health, and a program director and several administrative staff are fully dedicated to the program. The program’s current structure was developed as the result of a university-wide strategic planning process that identified public health as a priority area for the university as a whole.

NYU has had a CEPH-accredited MPH program since 1972. This degree program was offered through the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development. The Steinhardt School program was last reviewed in 2005 and received a five-year accreditation term with the option to extend the term for two years based on the submission of an appropriate interim report relating to resources and to evaluation and planning. In 2007, the Council accepted the interim report and extended the accreditation term. In 2009, the program notified CEPH that it intended to begin a substantial restructuring process, including changing the governance model to the one presented in this report and adding a concentration to the existing MPH program. This is the program’s first review since this substantial reorganization and expansion of the program.
Characteristics of a Public Health Program

To be considered eligible for accreditation review by CEPH, a public health program shall demonstrate the following characteristics:

a. The program shall be a part of an institution of higher education that is accredited by a regional accrediting body recognized by the US Department of Education.

b. The program and its faculty shall have the same rights, privileges and status as other professional preparation programs that are components of its parent institution.

c. The program shall function as a collaboration of disciplines, addressing the health of populations and the community through instruction, research, and service. Using an ecological perspective, the public health program should provide a special learning environment that supports interdisciplinary communication, promotes a broad intellectual framework for problem-solving, and fosters the development of professional public health concepts and values.

d. The public health program shall maintain an organizational culture that embraces the vision, goals and values common to public health. The program shall maintain this organizational culture through leadership, institutional rewards, and dedication of resources in order to infuse public health values and goals into all aspects of the program’s activities.

e. The program shall have faculty and other human, physical, financial and learning resources to provide both breadth and depth of educational opportunity in the areas of knowledge basic to public health. As a minimum, the program shall offer the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree.

f. The program shall plan, develop and evaluate its instructional, research and service activities in ways that assure sensitivity to the perceptions and needs of its students and that combines educational excellence with applicability to the world of public health practice.

These characteristics are evident in the NYU MPH Program. The program is located in a regionally-accredited university, and the program and its faculty have the same rights, privileges and status as other NYU programs. The program is, by design, interdisciplinary, drawing on faculty from six NYU schools who combine their unique disciplinary foci with an understanding of professional public health concepts and values. Despite the disparate training and backgrounds of faculty and students, the program maintains a focus on a consistent public health vision. The breadth and depth of faculty and student service and of faculty’s community-based research projects exemplify this focus. The program has appropriate resources to offer the MPH degree in three concentrations, and it has developed administrative and governance structures that ensure that program instruction and other activities continue their relevance to the world of public health practice.
1.0 THE PUBLIC HEALTH PROGRAM.

1.1 Mission.

The program shall have a clearly formulated and publicly stated mission with supporting goals and objectives. The program shall foster the development of professional public health values, concepts and ethical practice.

This criterion is met. The NYU MPH program has a clearly articulated mission statement that highlights the dimensions of public health unique to this program, including a focus on outreach and community engagement and an aim to improve the health of diverse populations at the local, national and global levels. Program faculty and administration reconsidered and refined the current mission statement as part of the consolidation process of its two MPH programs and during the preparation of the self-study. The program’s mission is as follows:

The mission of New York University's Master of Public Health Program is to prepare students to become effective public health researchers, practitioners, and leaders by advancing public health knowledge and practice through research, education, outreach, and community engagement. By doing so, we aim to improve the health of diverse population groups at the local, national, and global levels.

The program has broad goal statements related to each of the program’s activities: education, research and service. These goals support the program’s mission to prepare students for public health research, practice and leadership through a strong curriculum in the foundations of public health practice and through community service embedded in the curriculum. Goals and objectives also support the program’s mission to prepare public health leaders through the encouragement of faculty and students to serve as advocates for public health initiatives and to undertake community research.

The mission, goals and objectives are provided on the program website, in faculty and student guides, promotional materials, the program bulletin and at the new student orientation. Assessment data to monitor whether the program meets its objectives are collected through a variety of tools, including course evaluations, surveys, exit interviews, faculty CVs and minutes from meetings.

During the site visit, faculty provided information about the way that MPH committees, the administration and other stakeholders engaged actively in the process of combining the two MPH programs, including blending and establishing the current mission, goals and objectives. Program leaders and faculty also described their plans, given the recent changes, for the new MPH program committees to monitor and revise objectives and targets this spring and annually thereafter.

The program faculty has developed a set of its own core values, which are reviewed annually at the first faculty meeting of the academic year. The program draws upon the American Public Health Association
1.2 Evaluation and Planning.

The program shall have an explicit process for evaluating and monitoring its overall efforts against its mission, goals and objectives; for assessing the program’s effectiveness in serving its various constituencies; and for planning to achieve its mission in the future.

This criterion is met with commentary. The program has an evaluation process that includes a defined set of goals, measurable objectives and targets; systems to collect and analyze data; and mechanisms, such as program committees, to act on the data analyses. The program uses a variety of tools as part of its evaluation procedures, such as surveys of various constituent groups, including continuing students, graduating students, alumni and preceptors. The program also uses course evaluations, evaluations of program events and feedback from numerous MPH standing committees, as well as input from an External Advisory Board and from two student organizations. Through these mechanisms, the program garners input from and fosters information exchange among major program constituents. The timing and details of some procedures and processes for evaluation and planning are still evolving in this newly consolidated program.

To enhance the quality of the program and provide ongoing review of policies and recommendations, the program utilizes standing program committees, which continuously gather and assess information about all aspects of the program. Faculty told site visitors that they were actively engaged in committee work that addressed the major issues of curriculum development, recruitment of new faculty and student evaluation. In site visit meetings, faculty confirmed that they and other faculty from across the six schools have a strong commitment to the MPH program and believe they are integrally involved in creating the program’s new identity as a university-wide initiative connected to the university’s strong focus on global public health. Faculty described the excitement of working with others from across disciplinary lines. The program also asks that officers of the student organizations report to the faculty at faculty meetings and other times.

The program undertook a self-study and provided a self-study report with evaluation data for its one year of performance under the newly consolidated administrative structure. The self-study document is the product of collaborative efforts among university, faculty, and community stakeholders. For the self-study report, stakeholders, including students, community partners, faculty, alumni and advisory board members, were asked – via listerv announcements, website, accreditation information sessions and town halls – to provide feedback and send comments to the preliminary self study.

The self-study included an extensive table showing 32 outcome measures and targets. The table also presented one-year (2010-2011) achievement data, and the targets were met or exceeded for 23 of the
30 measures for which one-year data were available. The program outlined its plans to evaluate the outcome measures and targets this spring.

Commentary relates to a lack of alignment, in some instances, between the mission and goals and the measurable objectives. For example, the mission statement emphasizes improving the health of diverse populations at the local, national and global levels, but measurable objectives do not assess to what extent the program works with diverse populations or to what extent the program has activities at the local, national and global levels. While the research goals R1 and R2 do mention a goal to have projects in domestic and international settings, the objectives are general assessments about research that do not measure whether the research takes place in different geographical settings or with diverse populations.

Commentary also relates to the extent to which some constituent groups actively participate in program evaluation. For example, the program acknowledges in the self-study report that some program stakeholders, including students and alumni, despite program efforts, had not been engaged sufficiently in the self-study and that the program needed to identify ways to more actively engage them in the future. During the site visit, site visitors also heard from alumni, preceptors, and community stakeholders that they would welcome more opportunities to provide input to the program. As an example, community stakeholders cited their interest in encouraging the program to offer better biostatistical training as an asset to students seeking employment. Alumni also told site visitors of their interest in more structured avenues for involvement with the program.

1.3 Institutional Environment.

The program shall be an integral part of an accredited institution of higher education.

This criterion is met. NYU is one of the largest private institutions in the US. The university enrolls over 40,000 students in 18 schools and colleges and operates the NYU Langone Medical Center. The university’s main campus is in New York’s Greenwich Village, but the university aims to become a “Global Network University, a university that challenges the idea that a university can only deliver education at a single home campus.” NYU operates locations in Abu Dhabi, Singapore, Ghana, Germany, Argentina, Italy, England, Spain, France, the Czech Republic, China and Israel and has established direct exchange programs with 12 partner institutions. NYU is accredited by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

The MPH program is a collaboration between six NYU schools: Dentistry, Nursing, Public Service, Medicine, Social Work, and Culture, Education and Human Development. All program faculty have a home for appointment, promotion and tenure in one of these schools and report to department chairs and deans. Organizationally, the program itself falls under the auspices of the Office of the Executive Vice President (EVP) for Health, who reports directly to the university president. Deans of the schools of
Dentistry, Nursing and Medicine report to the EVP for Health, while deans of the schools of public service, social work, and culture, education and human development report to the university provost. The EVP for health and the provost have adjoining offices and often confer with one another and coordinate decisions on matters, such as faculty hires, that affect the MPH program as well as one of the constituent schools. Figure 1 presents the placement of the MPH program within the NYU organizational structure.

**Figure 1. New York University Organizational Structure**

The Board of Trustees has overall fiduciary duty for the institution. The University Senate and Office of Budget and Planning make recommendations to the Board of Trustees through the president. The University Senate is responsible for academic policies, proposals for changes, personnel and budgetary policies and definition of educational terms used in catalogs and bulletins. The Office of Budget and Planning oversees the development and management of annual budgets for all components of the university except the NYU Langone Medical Center.

The six schools that participate in the MPH program have internal policies and procedures for faculty appointment and promotion, and the program itself has an autonomous budget through the Office of the EVP for Health.

There are unique challenges to operating a program in this cross-school model. Initial challenges included working out logistics of funding, operations and faculty time allocation to the program. Deans of
the six schools and the EVP for health indicated that, for the most part, these issues have now been resolved, although some residual issues relating to the funding model for the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development remain. Deans indicated that most of their work in coordination, at this point, is more collegial sharing of research opportunities. Site visitors were impressed with the smoothness of the collaborative relationship. Faculty and administrators were consistent in their description of a relatively seamless process that brings benefits to all participants. Administrators posited that the culture and existing operations with NYU may uniquely support such cross-school collaborations. Deans of all NYU schools meet weekly, and the president has asked that each present, on a weekly basis, what his or her school is doing in two areas: 1) global work and 2) cross-disciplinary collaboration. Deans involved in the public health program are proud to have regular accomplishments to list in both areas. Deans of the six participating schools meet more often than this in various arrangements, and they have a great deal of familiarity with the other schools and a great deal of personal and professional respect for one another. Faculty and administrators note that the priority on making NYU a Global Network University means that working in disciplinary silos is not an option.

1.4 Organization and Administration.

The program shall provide an organizational setting conducive to teaching and learning, research and service. The organizational setting shall facilitate interdisciplinary communication, cooperation and collaboration. The organizational structure shall effectively support the work of the program’s constituents.

This criterion is met. Figure 2 presents the MPH program’s organizational structure. As a six-school collaboration, the program supports many of the administrative functions traditionally found in standalone academic units. The program supports its own admissions, recruitment, marketing, registration, financial aid, IT services, student affairs and career services.

The executive director for public health initiatives reports to the EVP for health and is responsible for resource allocation, administrative issues, adherence to university policies and accreditation, among other areas. The program director also reports to the EVP for health and is responsible for development and monitoring of faculty and program curriculum. The program director provides guidance on admissions and enrollment, is responsible for faculty teaching assignments, addresses academic concerns, chairs MPH faculty meetings and serves as the program spokesperson at external meetings. During a meeting with site visitors, program leaders explained that the program director works with the faculty to make decisions on curriculum, policy, etc. and the executive director works with faculty and staff to implement these decisions.
Figure 2. New York University MPH Program Organizational Structure
Concentration directors provide faculty leadership and oversight for each of the three MPH concentrations, and they report to the program director. The program also has a director of administration, associate director of public health practice, program administrator and academic administrator. Most issues or concerns are addressed through the program’s faculty, staff and committee structures, but issues of greater complexity require involvement of the EVP for health. The EVP, in turn, can resolve many issues on his own but works with the provost and/or one or more of the six schools’ deans to resolve more complex issues.

Interdisciplinary training is fundamental to the program and is evident from its multi-school structure and the array of faculty who participate in the program.

Because of the program’s history as separate MPH programs in separate academic units, students and, to a lesser extent, faculty are still in the process of defining and embracing a single organizational culture. Nonetheless, the program provides an effective setting for teaching, learning, research and service. During the site visit, the success of unification efforts was apparent. All participants were candid about the fact that experience with administering the current program model is limited and that data are still lacking; however, some initial successes, such as a smooth and collaborative first consolidated admissions process have increased stakeholders’ confidence. Faculty and program leaders noted that the intent in merging two existing MPH programs into the current structure would be that the sum is greater than its parts, and they believe that this theory has been borne out and has brought greater visibility and resources to all NYU faculty and students involved in public health.

1.5 Governance.

The program administration and faculty shall have clearly defined rights and responsibilities concerning program governance and academic policies. Students shall, where appropriate, have participatory roles in conduct of program evaluation procedures, policy-setting and decision-making.

This criterion is partially met. The program has an effective structure that defines decision making roles for faculty and students. The Steering Committee, which consists of the program director, concentration directors and executive director for public health initiatives, plays a primary role in coordinating program governance. In addition to the Steering Committee, the program has five standing committees: admissions, curriculum, faculty and governance, public health practice and student affairs. Each standing committee includes representatives from at least three of the six collaborating schools.

The Deans Council, which consists of the six collaborating schools’ deans, meets annually for review of program performance and strategic planning. The program director, concentration directors and executive director also participate in Deans Council meetings. This group is advisory to the executive VP for health.
In addition, the program has an External Advisory Committee (EAC), which consists of public health professionals and leaders from the area and around the globe. This committee meets once a year and provides feedback on the program’s mission, goals and objectives, strategic plan and other matters. The members include one representative from the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, several faculty members associated with public health and global health at other institutions and individuals affiliated with foundations and private enterprise. The EAC has only held one meeting to date, and discussion focused on how best to ensure that graduates are able to gain employment. EAC members provided several concrete steps, which relate both to curricular emphasis and to advising techniques.

The program had an ad hoc Accreditation Committee that included the program director, executive director, concentration directors, faculty volunteers and elected representatives from the MPH student organizations.

There are two MPH student organizations: the Public Health Student Group (PHSG) and the Global Public Health Action Network (GPHAN). Both groups elect leaders, and leaders or other representatives were invited to attend the first faculty meeting of the year. Site visitors met with leaders and members of both groups; the two groups see themselves as complementary, as PHSG has more of a professional development and academic focus, and GPHAN has a more service- and volunteer-oriented focus. Students have also been invited to standing committee meetings when the agenda contains items that faculty believe would benefit from student input. The program conducts at least one “Town Hall” meeting per year that allows students and faculty to hear from program leaders, ask questions and share ideas. As a result of discussions that arose in the self-study process, the program has committed to holding “Open Forum” meetings of each standing committee at least once a year: the Open Forum meetings will allow students or other faculty to ask questions and make comments.

The concern relates to the need for stronger student involvement in program governance. The self-study indicates that students have not been appointed as official members of standing committees because their presence might compromise confidentiality, and faculty believe that they can have more free and open discussion of ideas. During the site visit, faculty acknowledged the need for better methods for obtaining student input into program decisions. They also raised a number of thoughtful questions about the best way to facilitate student participation: for instance, is a single student representative on a committee sufficient? Would a student appointee be obliged to report to the student body in some formal way? Is participation in committee meetings by a limited number of students the most effective way to gather student input in decision making?
As noted above, the self-study process made evident the need for more stakeholder participation in program governance, but it is not clear that the addition of one “Open Forum” meeting a year will be sufficient to advance this aim. All academic program committees have the occasional need for confidential discussions without students present, but these discussions can easily be conducted in executive session when necessary. It is clear that the program wishes to pursue a thoughtful approach to involving these important stakeholders in program governance. The program must now implement methods to ensure that student engagement and feedback is thoroughly woven into the decision-making process.

1.6 Resources.

The program shall have resources adequate to fulfill its stated mission and goals, and its instructional, research and service objectives.

This criterion is met. The program, which operates under new administrative and fiscal models since the 2010-2011 academic year, provided two years of revenue and expenditure data in the self-study. Data demonstrate that current resources are adequate to support faculty teaching and mentoring, research, office and classroom space, computers and incidental expenses related to the program. The executive director of public health initiatives, within the Office of the EVP for Health, is responsible for the program budgetary and allocation processes, with input from the MPH program director and overall strategic direction from the Deans’ Council. Working with program faculty committees and leadership to assess programmatic resource needs, the executive director establishes budget parameters and proposed resource allocations and submits the budget proposal for approval to the EVP for health before it is presented to university leadership. A variety of factors go into establishing the program budget including, but not limited to: enrollment goals, trends and predictions; financial aid goals; faculty and student needs; personnel, program and university initiatives; inflation rates; and the overall economic environment. The executive director shepherds the program budget through the university planning and budget process each year, and the process ends with the final university budget approved by the NYU Board of Trustees in June.

The program has a separate operating budget, under the auspices of the Office of the EVP for Health, that is a break-even budget model with revenue almost entirely derived from student tuition. Enrollment data and trends are the basis for budget planning and revenue predictions and are monitored by the program in coordination with the NYU Office of Institutional Research. Expenditures fall into three primary categories: 1) program operations, 2) payments to school for faculty contributions and teaching and 3) university allocations and fees. Table 1 shows the sources of funds and expenditures by major category for fiscal years (FY) 2011 and 2012, the two years the program has operated under its new consolidated structure. FY 2012 is the first year for which tuition and fees are the same across all three MPH program concentrations.
Table 1. Sources of Funds and Expenditures by Major Category, FY 2011 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$2,231,423</td>
<td>$2,260,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>445,940</td>
<td>452,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Teaching Payments</td>
<td>764,905</td>
<td>769,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>256,724</td>
<td>258,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>437,776</td>
<td>439,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Overhead</td>
<td>282,350</td>
<td>296,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Funds</td>
<td>43,728</td>
<td>43,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$2,231,423</td>
<td>$2,260,474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the self-study document, the largest expenditure of resources is allocated to teaching faculty, who are appointed through one of the six collaborating schools. Each school receives a flat rate from the program for each course one of its faculty members teaches for the program. An exception to this model is the funding of courses taught by Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development faculty, for which all of the tuition revenue generated by the courses – and not a flat fee – is directed to Steinhardt accounts to be used to cover public health faculty salaries, benefits, offices, research, service and faculty support.

The self-study provides data about the current program faculty, which is comprised of a total of 54 faculty members, 17 primary and 37 secondary. Of particular note is the range and depth of faculty resources since the consolidation of the three MPH programs and the engagement of faculty from six different schools.

The self-study data show that the overall student to faculty ratio for the academic year (AY) 2010-2011 is 9.6, although the student-to-faculty ratio (SFR) for the program’s largest concentration, the community and international health track with 104 students (80 FTEs), is 11.4, which is slightly higher than the 10:1 SFR typically expected for graduate public health education.

During the site visit, the program provided the site visitors with faculty data for the AY 2011-2012. The overall SFR by total faculty FTE ratio is 9.5, while the SFR counting only core faculty members’ FTE is 15.2. The community and international health concentration has a SFR by total faculty ratio of 10.6 and an SFR of 16.6, when only core faculty members’ FTEs are included. The global health leadership concentration has a SFR by total faculty ratio of 9.0 and an SFR for core faculty of 16.0. The public health nutrition concentration has a SFR by total faculty ratio of 8.0 and an SFR for core faculty of 9.5.
The program has five full-time administrators and/or support staff who oversee the daily operations of the program, as well as three part-time student workers who assist with administrative duties. An academic administrator with ten years of experience with the MPH program provides primary student support for registration, course scheduling and academic program management, while an associate director for public health practice oversees student field placements and culminating experiences and other professional development and career service activities.

Faculty and staff space is adequate, with dedicated program office space comprising approximately 1600 square feet, primarily at the Washington Square location, and additional faculty offices in their respective home schools at other campus sites nearby. The program anticipates that more office and meeting space will become available when the NYU Global Institute of Public Health is launched in 2013.

NYU provides adequate computer labs and other environments with high-tech equipment to support teaching and research needs of faculty and students. The university’s ITS Faculty Technology Services (FTS) provides technological expertise to support faculty and graduate student projects and operates four large computer labs and a digital studio with multimedia and videoconferencing. In addition, the program offers several specific information technology resources, such as NYU MPH Public Health CareerLink, which is career services software that allows potential employers to post jobs and internships so that students can search for opportunities. Similarly, library resources are significant and include an eight-library, 4.6 million-volume system, as well as a subject librarian dedicated to public health who meets with public health students about the particular public health materials available to them, such as a dedicated public health library page with links to public health journals, databases and materials.

The program works with a wide variety of community partners at the local, national and international level, drawing on relationships at NYU’s ten international academic sites as a resource for experiential fieldwork. In addition, community practitioners guest lecture in a wide variety of MPH courses, and several courses involve community-based projects. In addition, the MPH program is involved in collaborations that NYU has launched with other academic institutions around the world, such as the NYU-University of Cape Town collaboration that includes a four-week course titled Community Health: A Society in Transition in Cape Town.

The program has identified five outcome measures and targets for resources, which include expenditure per FTE student, with a $10,000 target and a 2010-2011 outcome of $12,606, and percent of students receiving program scholarships, with a 50% target and a 2010-2011 outcome of 49%.

Of particular note is the breadth and depth of faculty resources that are committed to the program. During the site visit, the deans from the participating schools expressed great enthusiasm and support for
the new MPH program as a part of the university-wide global health initiative launched under the leadership of the EVP for health. One dean said, “We are believers in this new university-wide initiative that we are helping to architect, and when we come together, ideas ignite about new collaborations in global public health.” The deans reported that the new budget model from cross-university listing of courses has been working successfully.

The site visit team highlighted the SFR for the community & international health track, which was 10.6 SFR by total faculty FTE and 16.7 by core faculty FTE. Program leadership acknowledged the need for more faculty and told site visitors of current faculty recruitment efforts in this area that should result in new faculty resources within the next academic year. The program’s response documented progress; the additional faculty hires and planned hires should sufficiently improve the SFR to acceptable levels.

**2.0 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS.**

**2.1 Master of Public Health Degree.**

The program shall offer instructional programs reflecting its stated mission and goals, leading to the Master of Public Health (MPH) or equivalent professional masters degree. The program may offer a generalist MPH degree or an MPH with areas of specialization. The program, depending upon how it defines the unit of accreditation, may offer other degrees, professional and academic, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is met with commentary. The program offers the professional master’s degree in three concentration areas: community and international health (CIH), global health leadership (GHL) and public health nutrition (PHN). In addition, the program offers dual degrees that combine the MPH with degrees in dentistry, medicine, public administration, nursing and social work. Table 2 presents the program’s degree offerings.

In addition to the core courses required of all MPH students, each concentration defines a set of 12-21 credits of concentration-specific coursework.

The commentary relates to the minimal curricular distinction between the concentrations in community and international health and public health nutrition. In each case, students have one defined requirement (in the case of community and international health, students can choose one of two options for this course), a requirement to take three credits from a list approved for the concentration and six elective credits to be chosen with an advisor’s approval. The remainder of the curriculum is identical. While deeper preparation in the concentration area may be achieved with judicious advising, and faculty who met with site visitors indicated that this is, indeed, their practice, it is possible for students in these two tracks to have 39 of 46 credits of identical coursework. Concentrations must be sufficiently defined to guide the student in a particular field of study, and this approach could make the concentrations difficult to distinguish from one another.
Table 2. Degrees Offered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masters Degrees</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community &amp; International Health</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health Leadership</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Nutrition</td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>DDS/MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>MD/MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>MPA/MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>MS/MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>MSW/MPH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Program Length.

An MPH degree program or equivalent professional masters degree must be at least 42 semester credit units in length.

This criterion is met. The MPH concentrations in community and international public health and public health nutrition require the completion of 46 semester credits, and the MPH in global health leadership requires 54 semester credits.

The university defines one semester credit as 15, 50-minute sessions in class and at least 30, 50-minute sessions of work outside of class.

2.3 Public Health Core Knowledge.

All professional degree students must demonstrate an understanding of the public health core knowledge.

This criterion is met with commentary. Each of the program concentrations requires six core courses that cover the five areas of core public health knowledge. Courses are identical for all three concentrations in the areas of biostatistics and epidemiology, though GHL students enroll in a cross-listed version of the course with a different course number than the other two concentrations. In the other three core knowledge areas, GHL students take a different course than students in the other two concentrations; GHL students’ core courses use examples and readings that focus more directly on global and international settings and applications, and GHL students’ course in health services administration carries only three credit hours, while the other two concentrations complete a four credit hour course in this core area. These courses are taken toward the beginning of each student's program of study, and various teaching/learning methodologies are used to impart knowledge. Course syllabi were available for review, and reviewers verified that the courses addressed public health core knowledge areas in appropriate depth.
The commentary relates to the need for the program to pay continued attention to its delivery and coverage of the core area of biostatistics. Site visitors heard three specific issues raised by these stakeholder groups. First, current students pointed out the frustration of having students with widely different levels of skills in statistical preparation in the same course—students suggested that the experience was frustrating for students at both ends of the spectrum of skills and noted that faculty members appear to be struggling to target the material to an appropriate level. Second, faculty members mentioned that biostatistics had been an area in which they had received and responded to a number of serious student concerns. Faculty spoke of efforts early on to identify and rectify course deficiencies, including meeting with students and addressing their concerns through a variety of methods including hiring a specific tutor mid-semester. Faculty indicated an ongoing commitment to quality in this area, but students’ comments indicate that a concern still exists. Students suggested that one possibility might be to create separate sub-tracks that allow for students who have an interest and proclivity for epidemiology/biostatistics to take more advanced training, but ensure a minimum competency level for the other students. Finally, preceptors and alumni spoke of the need to strengthen the courses in biostatistics and epidemiology for all students as preparation for the workforce.

2.4 Practical Skills.

All professional degree students must develop skills in basic public health concepts and demonstrate the application of these concepts through a practice experience that is relevant to the students’ areas of specialization.

This criterion is met. The program requires CIH and PHN students to complete an internship, and GHL students must complete a practicum and a capstone experience, which also includes practice elements. The self-study lists student practice sites, and reviewers noted that sites are varied both in content and geography (regional and overseas).

The student’s experience in this practical application of classroom learning allows them to both demonstrate and develop their public health skills. Although the number of hours (180) required for the internship is somewhat limited, faculty advisors encourage students to engage in more time at the sponsoring organization if possible and, in the site visit team’s discussion with a group of preceptors, this indeed seems to occur on a regular basis. The preceptors lauded NYU MPH interns on their willingness to do what it takes to get the job done, though they also commented that students’ statistical and epidemiological preparation/education could be strengthened.

The program provides students with many resources to use in identifying and choosing an internship site, including previous organizations that have hosted MPH program students. The site selection approval process appears quite adequate to ensure the possibility for a successful assignment, including a site visit of the prospective organization for CIH and PHN students by the director for public health practice.
The internship experience is enhanced by an additional practice course that students in both the CIH and PHN concentrations must take for graduation. Combining the site experience with lectures or group discussion enhances the learning process, and in the site visitors’ meetings with students, students agreed this additional course work provides added benefit.

Students in the GHL concentration complete an individual practicum of 120 hours that is similar to the internship in terms of structure and documentation. The self-study presents the capstone, which will be discussed in Criteria 2.5, as a crucial element of GHL students’ practice development, since it emphasizes competencies related to communication and teamwork, as well as application of content-based competencies.

Students are evaluated on their practical experiences. This involves both mid-point and a final evaluation (instruments were supplied as supplementary material to the site visit team), which also assess the extent students can demonstrate the MPH core competencies. Additionally, the final evaluation instrument allows the preceptor to evaluate the supervision of the student by NYU faculty. An additional question might ask the preceptor how he/she believes the internship experience could be enhanced. Examples of final internship reports were supplied to site visit team members while on site, and were found to be adequate.

2.5 Culminating Experience.

All professional degree programs identified in the instructional matrix shall assure that each student demonstrates skills and integration of knowledge through a culminating experience.

This criterion is met. MPH students all complete a culminating experience, which is often connected to a practice experience or international fieldwork. The culminating experience for all students includes a public health project with mentorship by professionals, hands-on work that builds public health competencies and a presentation about the project, although the culminating experience varies by concentration.

For their culminating experience, MPH students in two concentrations, CIH and PHN, complete an individual assignment during their internships in a practice setting. The internship is well planned and evaluated through a number of mechanisms that ensure an integrative culminating experience project is completed. For example, as part of their initial Internship Learning Contract, students and their preceptors must provide details about an internship project, including an outline of its learning objectives, and describe how the student will gain experience and demonstrate competencies. In addition, through a course, students submit written reports and analyze the core functions of assessment, policy development and assurance relevant to their internship placements and project.
Students in the GHL concentration complete a team capstone project as their culminating experience. Students participate in a number of courses to prepare for the interdisciplinary team project that focuses on solving a problem proposed by an international or US-based organization. Each student is responsible for a particular aspect of the project and receives an individual evaluation of their project section as well as a team evaluation. As part of this capstone experience, students also must complete an assignment that includes reviewing the core public health and global health competencies, and keep notes in the field about and write a summary assessment of how they applied their public health skills during the capstone project. Students self-evaluate and evaluate other team members’ performance, and preceptors evaluate students on their performance, professionalism and public health competencies.

Site visitors reviewed several capstone projects, which showed rigorous scholarship and professionalism. Preceptors also told site visitors that the work of the students on the culminating experience projects was “impressive.”

2.6 Required Competencies.

For each degree program and area of specialization within each program identified in the instructional matrix, there shall be clearly stated competencies that guide the development of educational programs.

This criterion is met with commentary. Beginning with the 2011-2012 academic year, the program has adopted a list of core competencies, based on the Association of Schools of Public Health (ASPH) MPH Core Competency model. The 13 core competencies include six discipline-specific competencies and seven interdisciplinary/cross-cutting competencies. The program faculty identified and recommended the set of core competencies, and these competencies were then shared with the External Advisory Committee, from whom feedback was solicited. In addition, the program has identified a set of concentration-specific competencies for each concentration, which were vetted and approved by the faculty within each concentration.

The Curriculum Committee reviews courses to ensure that competencies are included in appropriate courses throughout the curriculum and in new course proposals. Currently, some, but not all, course syllabi list competencies.

Students and faculty are informed of the competencies through the program’s website and in the New Student Guide and Faculty Guide. Site visitors learned from faculty and students about the important role that competencies play in field placements and culminating experiences. Preceptors evaluate students’ attainment of competencies during the culminating experience, and students assess their concentration competencies in graduating student exit surveys.
The Public Health Practice Committee meets throughout the year to review competency changes as needed, drawing on information that the associate director of public health practice collects by working with preceptors, alumni, employers; by reviewing survey data from numerous groups; and by attending professional meetings.

The commentary relates to the need for the program to establish a systematic method by which program and concentration directors can ensure that competencies are linked to and well-integrated into required courses in the three program concentrations. For example, while most course syllabi provide learning objectives, numerous syllabi do not explicitly list competencies, and it is not clear how faculty and students understand and relate learning objectives with competencies. Mapping of competencies to required courses is less explicit in the concentrations than it is for the core MPH competencies.

2.7 Assessment Procedures.

There shall be procedures for assessing and documenting the extent to which each student has demonstrated competence in the required areas of performance.

This criterion is partially met. The program has defined a system to measure student competency through a combination of course-level assessments (since courses are mapped to competencies and, in some cases, to specific assessment activities), preceptor evaluation during the internship and capstone experiences and students’ self-assessment of competency attainment at the time of graduation. Site visitors reviewed the instruments developed for collecting these data and found them to be appropriately designed.

The program tracks graduation rates, and rates exceed minimum CEPH expectations: 94% of full-time students have graduated within three years and 83% of part-time students have graduated within six years. The self-study also presents existing data for students’ self-assessments and for preceptors’ assessment of competencies. Existing student self-assessment data only report whether students, upon graduation, felt that they were prepared for public health jobs. Existing preceptor data report whether students have attained a set of competencies no longer used by the program (based on the 10 Essential Public Health Services). Data indicate that the program far surpassed its targets in both cases: students and preceptors both believed that students/graduates were well-prepared within the parameters reported.

The program tracks job placement of graduates one year post-graduation. Because the program, in its current configuration, has not yet reached one year after graduation, the self-study does not have data to report. The self-study does report students’ employment as self-reported at graduation; of the 43 students for whom data are presented, 77% reported employment. Non-profit and healthcare settings were most common.
The concern relates to the fact that the program has not yet conducted its first employer or alumni survey, nor has it completed a cycle of student self-assessment. This is largely a function of timing: since the program’s current configuration and current curricula and competencies were only established for the first time in the 2010-2011 academic year, the program has not yet reached a time for some metrics. Additionally, the program can document that its constituent parts did track student outcomes individually before merging into the current structure. Nonetheless, the program cannot be assessed as compliant with this criterion in the absence of implementation of or data from all but one of its planned outcome measures. Preliminary data have been promising, but the program must fully implement all components of its student assessment plan.

2.8 Academic Degrees.

If the program also offers curricula for academic degrees, students pursuing them shall obtain a broad introduction to public health, as well as an understanding about how their discipline-based specialization contributes to achieving the goals of public health.

This criterion is not applicable.

2.9 Doctoral Degrees.

The program may offer doctoral degree programs, if consistent with its mission and resources.

This criterion is not applicable.

2.10 Joint Degrees.

If the program offers joint degree programs, the required curriculum for the professional public health degree shall be equivalent to that required for a separate public health degree.

This criterion is met with commentary. The program offers five dual degree programs. In all cases, students must be enrolled full-time and must meet the admissions standards of both degree programs independently. Students in the dentistry and medicine dual degrees may apply to the MPH through their second and third years of enrollment in the non-MPH degree.

Students in the dual degrees with dentistry and medicine complete all 54 credits of the MPH in global health leadership. They do this by adjusting the clinical training schedule and by completing some public health requirements in evening classes, typically completing some coursework for both degree programs concurrently.

In the dual degree programs with nursing, social work and public administration students complete 45 MPH credits for the global health leadership concentration, and up to nine credits of coursework from the non-MPH degree program are counted as fulfilling the MPH’s elective requirements. In social work and public administration, the public health core classes in biostatistics and epidemiology substitute for a required social work research course. Dual degree social work students also coordinate their practicum so that it is supervised by faculty from both fields and fulfills both sets of expectations. With regard to the
courses from the external degree that count as MPH electives, faculty explained that these must be approved on an individual basis by a public health advisor to ensure that the courses are appropriately relevant to public health.

The commentary relates to one additional aspect of the dual degree program in public administration. In addition to the course sharing noted above, this degree program allows the MPA capstone to substitute for the MPH capstone. Faculty explained that the MPH capstone was modeled on the MPA capstone—both use team-based projects with specific deliverables for an external agency. Faculty affiliated with this dual degree program explained that a number of the MPA capstone sites are sites with public health relevance, and dual degree students will be specifically matched to those sites. Additionally, a public health faculty advisor will work with the student and the public administration faculty member to ensure that the student’s experience is structured to allow demonstration of MPH competencies. Because of the fundamental role of the capstone in the MPH curriculum, it is imperative that the MPH faculty advisor play a strong role in coordinating with the public administration faculty responsible for the capstone. More specific, written guidelines for this process would be helpful, as they could ensure that all parties clearly understand the need to be particularly attentive to the MPH competencies, rather than simply allowing a dual degree student to enroll in the course and be placed in a site with health relevance. No dual degree students have yet reached this point in the curriculum, so the ability to tailor the experience on an ad hoc basis has not yet been tested.

Site visitors learned that a new format for the MD-MPH, a four-year program, has recently been approved by state authorities. This degree program will be subject to future Council review upon the program’s submission of a substantive change notice, which will occur prior to the first students’ enrollment.

2.11 Distance Education or Executive Degree Programs.

If the program offers degree programs using formats or methods other than students attending regular on-site course sessions spread over a standard term, these degree programs must a) be consistent with the mission of the program and within the program’s established areas of expertise; b) be guided by clearly articulated student learning outcomes that are rigorously evaluated; c) be subject to the same quality control processes that other degree programs in the university are; and d) provide planned and evaluated learning experiences that take into consideration and are responsive to the characteristics and needs of adult learners. If the program offers distance education or executive degree programs, it must provide needed support for these programs, including administrative, travel, communication, and student services. The program must have an ongoing program to evaluate the academic effectiveness of the format, to assess teaching and learning methodologies and to systematically use this information to stimulate program improvements.

This criterion is not applicable.
3.0 CREATION, APPLICATION AND ADVANCEMENT OF KNOWLEDGE.

3.1 Research.

The program shall pursue an active research program, consistent with its mission, through which its faculty and students contribute to the knowledge base of the public health disciplines, including research directed at improving the practice of public health.

This criterion is met. The MPH primary and secondary faculty contribute to an active MPH research program, with considerable emphasis on community-based activities. External funding comes from a wide range of government, private foundation and international funding sources. The current total for primary faculty’s research funding is $73,289,363, and the total for primary and secondary faculty combined is $94,640,333.

In addition, faculty also can apply for some research support from NYU funds, such as the University Research Challenge Fund and the Global Public Health Research Challenge Fund, both of which made awards to program faculty during the 2010-2011 academic year. Faculty research efforts also are supported by the NYU Office of Sponsored Programs and, for medical school faculty research, by the medical school’s Office of Science and Research.

NYU has a number of research centers and institutes focusing on public health research that involve MPH faculty from numerous schools, such as the NYU Health Promotion and Prevention Research Center, the Center for AIDS Research and the NYU Center for Health and Public Service Research. A faculty member’s research focus and whether it aligns with the program’s mission, goals and objectives are considerations in identifying faculty for affiliation with the MPH program. Faculty members negotiate research expectations and compensation with their department chairs and present the work on public health research initiatives as part of their annual departmental faculty evaluations.

The program has established targets for measurable outcomes for research. For example, for tenure track and tenured faculty, the program measures publications per year (target: one per year), presentations per year (target: two per year) and research grants per year (one per year). In each category faculty exceeded the target in the one year for which data was provided (2010-2011). Other outcome measures are 1) tenure-track faculty have a description of the research agenda that is part of their tenure process, 2) tenured faculty have a description of the research agenda that is part of their annual review 3) research dollars/FTE faculty, 4) percent of students who attend at least one public health meeting of a professional organizations/year, 5) percent of students in practice-based courses (internship, practicum, capstone) working on research projects, 6) percent of students participating in faculty research and 7) number of students presenting at public health/scientific meetings. For the measures above, the program met all of its targets in the year 2010-2011, except for the number of students presenting at public health/scientific meetings.
As described in the self-study and verified during the site visit, program faculty have a serious commitment to undertaking community-based research activities locally and internationally. They develop collaborations with numerous professional and community organizations, which can lead not only to research but also to student internships, jobs and speakers for courses. Collaborators range from global partners such as the Bomu Medical Centre in Mombasa, Kenya and the Primary Care System of the municipality of Petropolis, Brazil to the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene and the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation.

Students are strongly encouraged to participate in faculty research projects. A recent survey revealed that 40% of the MPH students are engaged in research projects, primarily through the internship, practicum or capstone courses. Examples include a student research project titled “The Women’s Pathways to Prison” study at the University of Cape Town and another student’s project assessing emergency medicine systems development in Ghana. The self-study documented a number of examples of MPH students presenting their research at professional meetings.

3.2 Service.

The program shall pursue active service activities, consistent with its mission, through which faculty and students contribute to the advancement of public health practice.

This criterion is met. The program’s commitment to service, aligns with the broader university-wide commitment to service, as indicated by the university’s motto: “a private university in the public service.” Program faculty conduct service through direct community outreach, service to professional organizations, consultation with community partners, technical assistance and advocacy. The self-study indicates that 100% of program faculty have documented public health service during the year reported in the self-study document: 88% are engaged in community or professional task forces or other service outside of professional organization membership and 53% hold active leadership roles within the service activity. The program notes that three regularly-offered MPH courses require extensive service-learning, and the self-study documents 27 lectures or presentations delivered by faculty throughout the public health community during 2010-2011.

Site visitors were able to review an extensive list of the program’s service activities, provided on site, and noted that most program faculty engage in several different types of service activities. One of the outcome measures is the number of public health organizations, task forces, boards of directors, advisory boards, etc. in which faculty are engaged annually, with a target of one per faculty member. The self-study indicates that for the 2010-2011 academic year, the program exceeded the target, with an average of 2.7 per faculty member.
The self-study states that 56% of students report involvement with service, a level that does not meet the program’s target of 75%. Examples of student service include the Global Public Health Action Network (GPHAN)’s volunteer work with Engineers Without Borders on a water distribution project and the Public Health Student Group (PHSG)’s service day at the Yorkville Common Pantry. Additionally, 45% of students reported current membership in a (non-NYU) public health organization, and 8% reported holding a leadership position in these organizations.

3.3 Workforce Development.

The program shall engage in activities that support the professional development of the public health workforce.

This criterion is partially met. The self-study documents an array of workforce development activities. These include a website portal, public events and workshops and health workforce training. The website portal, launched in 2010, was produced with support from a private foundation. The portal was established for people new to the public health field as well as those who have experience and knowledge but who want to learn more. It answers questions such as, “What knowledge and skills do I need?”; “What do public health careers look like and how do I get started?”; “What types of challenges do public health practitioners face?”; and “What are good ways to find, use, verify, analyze, and display health data?” The program has established a health workforce training program that focuses on building sustainable capacity in global health in collaboration with the Bellevue Hospital Center and the University of Ghana. The self-study lists 27 public events conducted during 2010-2011, designed as workforce development opportunities and advertised widely to students, faculty, staff and community stakeholders. These events include a lecture on improving maternal, newborn and child health in post-conflict settings (83 attended) and a lecture series on the globalization of medical care (seven attendees).

The concern relates to the fact that the program has not conducted a needs assessment or identified an appropriate existing assessment to guide its workforce development offerings. The program detailed numerous continuing education programs in the self-study, but most are singular speaker presentations or seminars with topics determined by faculty expertise or faculty members’ professional judgment on important/emerging issues. The program may wish to pursue learning programs that are more comprehensive or interactive in nature and that target, more directly, learning needs identified by a particular stakeholder group.
4.0 FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENTS.

4.1 Faculty Qualifications.

The program shall have a clearly defined faculty which, by virtue of its distribution, multidisciplinary nature, educational preparation, research and teaching competence, and practice experience, is able to fully support the program's mission, goals and objectives.

This criterion is met. The program has a multidisciplinary faculty with well-defined qualifications and relevant backgrounds to support each track. Of the 17 primary faculty, 16 have doctoral-level degrees (13 PhD, two DrPH, one MD) and one has an MS degree. Of the 17 primary faculty, five are full professors, four are associate professors, six are assistant professors, one is a research scientist and one is an associate clinical professor. Numerous primary faculty have dual degrees, such as the three faculty members who support the public health nutrition track: one has an RD credential in addition to the PhD degree, and the other two have both PhDs and MPH degrees. For the global health leadership track, four of the eight primary faculty have dual degrees, including one faculty member with a Bachelor of Dental Science, MPH and PhD degrees and one associate professor of nursing with RN, MPH, EdM and DrPH degrees. For the six primary faculty in the community and international health concentration, four have MPH degrees in addition to doctoral degrees. Of the 37 secondary faculty, only five do not have doctoral degrees. Adjunct and secondary faculty are recruited from the community when the program believes students would benefit from practitioner instruction.

The program has identified performance measures and targets for faculty. These include the percent of courses in which faculty are rated as knowledgeable by students on evaluation forms (target: 95%); publications per year for tenured faculty and tenure-track faculty (target: one); presentations per year for tenured and tenure-track faculty (target: two); funded research grants over a two-year period for tenured and tenure-track faculty (target: one); percentage of faculty with doctoral degrees (target: 75%); and percentage of faculty holding leadership roles in professional organizations (target: 50%). For the 2010-2011 academic year, the program exceeded its targets in all areas except for percent of courses in which faculty are rated as knowledgeable by students on evaluation forms: in fall 2010 the outcome was 91% and in spring 2011, the outcome was 93%.

The site visit team learned of the significant international and community-based public health experience and research of the faculty through a review of faculty CVs and publications and through site visit meetings with faculty and students. In a number of course evaluations, students explicitly noted the invaluable contribution of public health leaders from local and state agencies who participated in the course as guest lecturers.
4.2 Faculty Policies and Procedures.

The program shall have well-defined policies and procedures to recruit, appoint and promote qualified faculty, to evaluate competence and performance of faculty, and to support the professional development and advancement of faculty.

This criterion is met. Faculty policies and procedures for recruitment, appointment and promotion are governed by established university and school regulations and are published and readily available in the NYU Faculty Handbook, which is available online. The handbook clearly delineates the promotion and tenure process and the differences in timing for promotion and tenure among the various schools. Other university faculty policies are delineated in Office of the Provost guidelines—for example, the policy for the determination of full-time teaching loads, which includes limits for regular teaching assignments to the usual fall and spring terms to preserve the summer months for scholarly activities.

The program, in addition, has developed its own MPH Faculty Guide that provides the program’s mission, goals, and objectives and faculty policies and program expectations, since program faculty have their primary appointments in six different schools with varying policies, norms and cultures. For example, although faculty development is primarily a responsibility of the school that holds a faculty member’s primary appointment, the MPH program also monitors the performance of its teaching faculty based on its own expectations and may discontinue faculty participation in the MPH program, upon unsatisfactory evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching, research and service portfolio.

The program’s Faculty and Governance and Curriculum Committees first identify and vet NYU faculty for recruitment to the program faculty, and once approved by program committees, the MPH director or concentration director requests approval from the faculty member’s school dean to ensure coordination and adequate support for the faculty member’s development, promotion and tenure, etc. The executive vice president for health also works closely with both school deans and program leaders to facilitate the recruitment of MPH faculty and to resolve potential issues about faculty appointments or issues between schools.

Annual performance reviews for faculty take place through the faculty’s departmental peer review committee in the school where they have a primary appointment. Faculty submit documentation summarizing their accomplishments each year in the following areas: publications; grants, contracts and research; teaching; advising and administrative duties, and service within the university and with community and professional associations. Performance in the MPH program is used in various faculty assessments. The MPH program director and concentration directors provide feedback to faculty about their courses’ mid-semester and final evaluations. The MPH program director reserves the right to revise instructor course assignments and/or to end a faculty member’s relationship with the program, if the faculty member’s teaching is not in alignment with program needs and expectations.
4.3 Faculty and Staff Diversity.

The program shall recruit, retain and promote a diverse faculty and staff, and shall offer equitable opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is partially met. The program has a number of policies and procedures in place to attract and retain a diverse faculty and staff including special training for search committees, the ability to delay searches by a year in order to identify promising doctoral candidates and the presence of a strong base of scholarship and education that addresses diverse populations. Several university options are also available to enhance the quality of life of faculty and staff and to encourage successful recruitment of diverse candidates (e.g., Faculty Resource Network, NYU Postdoctoral and Transition Program, LiveSmart Program, etc.). The program’s faculty complement currently includes 54% females and 46% males. Seventy-five percent of program faculty are Caucasian, 15% are Asian/Pacific Islander and 13% are international.

The concern (which was noted by the program itself in the self-study as commentary) is the lack of minority faculty and staff, particularly in terms of African-Americans and Hispanics, who comprise only 4% of faculty and staff each. The 30% target of non-white faculty and staff has not been achieved (currently at 22%). Admittedly, both underrepresented groups have traditionally been difficult demographic groups from which to recruit for academic positions in public health, but a more coherent strategy with detailed efforts and specific recruitment steps must be developed and implemented to increase minority faculty representation.

4.4 Student Recruitment and Admissions.

The program shall have student recruitment and admissions policies and procedures designed to locate and select qualified individuals capable of taking advantage of the program’s various learning activities, which will enable each of them to develop competence for a career in public health.

This criterion is met. The program’s admissions policies and practices seem designed to attract students from various backgrounds and to attract an academically-qualified pool, based on reported mean undergraduate GPA and GRE scores.

Recruitment strategies focus on the program’s online presence as a major source of information to prospective students, but the program also conducts recruitment activities through faculty and staff members’ professional networks in public health organizations and through booths and publicity materials at conferences and national meetings.

The three concentrations of the MPH are designed to attract and enroll different target cohorts. The CIH and PHN concentrations seek to train qualified applicants with bachelor’s degrees, and the GHL
concentration seeks to prepare qualified applicants with advanced graduate or professional degrees to leadership roles in global public health settings. The different goals and target audiences of these three concentrations dictate some differences in admission requirements. All three concentrations require transcripts, letters of recommendation, a personal statement, a CV and TOEFL scores for international applicants for whom English is not the native language. The CIH and PHN concentrations also require submission of GRE scores. Two members of the program’s Admissions Committee review and score each application package based on established criteria. The review process is holistic and does not employ any numerical cutoffs in GPA or GRE scores.

The low enrollment rate – seven out of 10 applicants who are accepted do not end up enrolling (only 18% of those accepted into the CIH concentration end up enrolling) – may be of some concern in the future when attracting the most qualified applicants. Program staff conduct surveys of accepted students who choose not to attend the program. The program suggests that reasons for non-enrollment might include the myriad of other colleges/universities in the New York and surrounding region offering public health programs, and the fact that not having a rolling enrollment period for NYU may lead some applicants to accept other educational opportunities before gaining entry into this MPH program. Cost and lack of financial aid may also be contributing factors.

4.5 Student Diversity.

Stated application, admission, and degree-granting requirements and regulations shall be applied equitably to individual applicants and students regardless of age, gender, race, disability, sexual orientation, religion or national origin.

This criterion is met. The self-study document depicts a diverse student population. Program students come from 15 different countries of origin and include individuals with 11 different native languages. The program identified measures by which it may evaluate its success based on the percent of 2011 student enrollees by race/ethnicity as compared to percent of race/ethnicity in the US population. For instance, the program’s African-American enrollment percentage in 2011 was 13.4%, exceeding the US population of 12.6%. The program also exceeded the US population percentage for Asian/Pacific Islanders (18.6% to 5.0%). The Hispanic/Latino student population is somewhat below the percent found in the US population, but not dramatically so (4.1% as compared to 8.7%).

The program has a comprehensive recruitment plan with multiple strategies. Appropriate policies and procedures are in place, and numerous student recruitment efforts have been conducted. The program develops a recruitment plan annually and defines specific elements that will target underserved or underrepresented student communities. Elements include holding public events that focus on issues of local interest to underserved communities, waiving application fees for low-income applicants, highlighting diversity among current students on website and in student profiles, following up with admitted minority
students who do not enroll to determine which factors contributed to their decision and informing minority applicants of relevant extramural funding that may be available to support their MPH study.

4.6 Advising and Career Counseling.

There shall be available a clearly explained and accessible academic advising system for students, as well as readily available career and placement advice.

This criterion is met with commentary. The program assigns a faculty advisor to each student. Advisors are assigned within the student’s chosen concentration, and faculty serving as advisors have access to resource materials (the Faculty Advisor Supplement to the NYU faculty guide) to assist them in this role. The GHL concentration has prepared an additional resource guide for faculty advisors that is specific to the concentration, and this concentration’s leaders held a training, which they plan to repeat as needed, to orient new advisors in the concentration. Faculty advisors serve as mentors and assist students with course selection, transfer credits, career counseling and professional networking. The program’s administrative staff also assist students in navigating the university’s bureaucracy and facilitate students’ experiences in areas complementary to faculty advisors.

All students attend an orientation before beginning the program. The orientation allows them to meet other students, faculty and staff and includes the distribution of materials relating to program and university policies and procedures. Students also receive a New Student Guide that outlines policies, procedures and resources, and all enrolled students have access to the MPH listserv, which is moderated by the academic administrator. The listserv contains program announcements and information as well as scholarship, internship and employment opportunities and public health events and news.

The program has developed a series of ways to involve alumni in providing career advice and assistance to students; there is an alumni page on the website; the program maintains a list of alumni who are willing to mentor or meet with current students; and the program has just launched an alumni network to foster networking among alumni and current students.

The associate director for public health practice has primary responsibility for professional development and career services activities. She maintains and facilitates access to a number of web-based and print resources that can assist students with job searching and professional skills. She also coordinates a NYU MPH Professional Development Month each October. This month includes a career fair and numerous workshops and seminars, and it is open to current students and alumni. Students also have full access to the NYU Wasserman Center for Career Development, a university-wide center, and to the career centers in the schools of public service and business. These offices offer individual counseling, resume review, interview coaching and other services. Students who met with site visitors spoke very favorably about a
recent networking event sponsored by the program and appreciated the contacts that they were able to make at the event.

The self-study notes that available data indicate that 75% of students reported satisfaction with advisement and 81% reported satisfaction with career counseling.

The commentary relates to the fact that there remain some areas of significant student dissatisfaction with the structure of the advising system. The self-study indicates that some students have reported difficulty with advisors who are not fully familiar with degree requirements and course sequencing or the need to consult faculty members other than the designated advisor in order to obtain appropriate advice. The program intends to prioritize assessing and improving the current advising system at upcoming meetings of the Student Service Committee, and the self-study indicates that program leaders believe that satisfaction results are likely to improve as the current unified program continues to operate and becomes more firmly established.

Faculty who met with site visitors speculated that most of the dissatisfaction described above was specific to students in the GHL concentration and could be attributed to some challenges specific to the transition to a single program. Site visitors’ meeting with students, however, revealed the opposite concern: GHL students were quite content with their advising, and CIH students were nearly unanimous in their assertion that advising should be significantly approved. Students explained that their advising needs are ultimately met, since all program faculty are very open and willing to work with students, but that advising needs are often met by the student’s own initiative in approaching a faculty member who is not the assigned advisor. Students mentioned that there seems to be a disconnect: they must go to their assigned advisor each semester to obtain the sign-off required for registration, but their substantive advising needs are often met by a different individual. Other students indicated that the program’s approach to advising did not readily facilitate the type of one-on-one mentorship expected at the graduate school level. All students noted that, with personal initiative, students can attain such mentorship in the program; the current approach to advising, however, relies on students’ initiative, rather than facilitating the type of experience that students expressed a desire for.

The university has a clear set of procedures that govern student grievances. These procedures are outlined in the NYU Student Handbook and include possible resolution at the informal level, formal level or appeals level. Since the fall of 2010, one MPH student has filed a formal grievance.
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Steven Abramson, MD - Vice Dean for Education Faculty & Academic Affair, School of Medicine
Bob Berne, PhD – Executive Vice President for Health
Charles Bertolami, DDS, DMedSc – Herman Robert Fox Dean, College of Dentistry
Mary Brabeck, PhD – Dean, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development
Judith Haber, PhD, APRN, BC, FAAN – Interim Dean, College of Nursing
Ellen Schall, JD – Dean, Wagner Graduate School of Public Service
Lynn Videka, BSN, AM, PhD – Dean, Silver School of Social Work

Break

Executive Session
Exit Interview
Bob Berne, PhD – Executive Vice President for Health
Beth Dixon, PhD, MPH - Public Health Nutrition Director; Associate Professor of Nutrition and Public Health (Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development)
Sally Guttmacher, PhD - Program Director, Professor of Public Health (Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development)
Deborah Padgett, PhD, MPH - Global Health Leadership Director; Professor of Social Work (Silver School of Social Work)
Marcia Thomas, MS, MPH – Executive Director, Public Health Initiatives (Office of the Executive VP Health; NYU MPH Staff)
Beth Weitzman, PhD, MPA – Vice Dean, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development
NYU Program Assessment
September 1, 2011
Reviewer: Kelly Gebo, MD, MPH

1. Assess program purpose, structure, and requirements as well as formal mechanisms for program administration and monitoring.

The program is well conceptualized, structured and will fill an important need in undergraduate education, the need for public health education. The Association of Schools of Public Health is focused on expanding undergraduate universities offering public health programs due to increased demand for public health providers. This program will fit this niche perfectly.

The structure of the program is excellent in that it provides dual degree training for students to become certified in two fields of study. The curriculum covers the core components of Global Public Health, biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health, and health policy and management. A course that could potentially be helpful would be an introduction to public health course. The summative experiential learning component (GPH internship) to the program is essential in requiring the students to apply the knowledge they have from the classroom into real world opportunities.

There appears to an excellent administrator, Dr Marcia Thomas, who has been appointed the Executive Director of Public Health Initiatives. In addition, there will be oversight from the Undergraduate Public Health Governance Committee, comprised of faculty from relevant departments from participating schools. In addition, there will be a GPH curriculum committee comprised faculty with expertise in PH who will review the curriculum annually and provide ongoing review of the GPH curriculum and internships. She will report to Dr Robert Berne, the Executive Vice President for Health for NYU. The oversight seems both appropriate and consistent with other outstanding NYU programs.

2. Comment on the special focus of this program, if any, as it relates to the discipline.

The program is focused on dual majors in global public health with a variety of other fields (Anthropology, History, Food Studies, Nursing, Social Work, Sociology, Science etc) This will provide students the ability to develop expertise in Global Health as well as another

3. Comment on the plans and expectations for continuing program development and self-assessment.

As mentioned above, the program will have self-assessments annually by the GPH curriculum committee. This group will provide feedback on the curriculum and internship opportunities for
the students annually. This is consistent with most other academic programs at NYU and interdisciplinary programs at other universities.

4. Assess available support from related programs.

This program will be unique in that it will combine Public Health with a number of other already established departments at NYU. The program will use courses taught within those programs to create joint degrees. There are numerous letters of support from participating colleges within the proposal indicating their support of the program. There are also university resources available including libraries, computing labs, and scientific labs which will be available to the program.

One potentially small improvement that could be made is that the students could benefit from additional advising during their freshman year. Getting them engaged in the program and understanding long term options for travel abroad and their senior projects

5. (Only for programs requiring master plan amendment.) What is the evidence of need and demand for the program locally, in the State, and in the field at large? What is the extent of occupational demand for graduates? What is the evidence that demand will continue?

N/A

II. Faculty

1. Evaluate the faculty, individually and collectively, in regard to training, experience, research and publication, professional service, and recognition in the field.

I do not have CV’s on each of the faculty to evaluate their research, publication and professional service, though they are on the faculty of NYU and have been vetted by the university and their departments, presumably meeting criteria for academic promotion and therefore should be very appropriate faculty for the program.

2. Assess the faculty in terms of size and qualifications. What are plans for future staffing?

The faculty appear to be previously vetted for their teaching abilities as they are already parts of established departments. They will be teaching courses that are relevant to the PH curriculum and for the most part, are already taught within other existing programs. There appear to be enough faculty for the program at the proposed size of the program; however if the program goes, class size will need to remain small and other faculty may need to be added.
3. Evaluate credentials and involvement of adjunct and support faculty.
Like the full time faculty, I do not have information on the adjunct/support faculty. I do not have CV’s on each of the faculty to evaluate their research, publication and professional service, though they are on the faculty of NYU and have been vetted by the university and their departments, presumably meeting criteria for academic promotion.

Other substantive comments

1. Introduction of Public Health: this course could serve as a feeder into the program and has been very successful in other undergraduate PHS majors in exposing students who have no previous experience in PH to the topic area.

2. There is increased need for flexibility: One concern with the program is the need to enroll by first semester sophomore year. Many freshman have no had experience with Public Health and if they haven’t had exposure it may be difficult for them to choose PH by end of freshman year. In addition, many students who come to college as “pre-meds” find out that they do not want to go to medical school during their sophomore year (organic chemistry)

Minor Issues

a. Making sure that all core courses are available during both semesters. As currently listed, they are being offered by various departments. As listed, they are offered once per semester, this may not be enough given the complexity of double majoring.

b. I am also a bit concerned about undergraduates using SPSS, as many of our undergraduates have had trouble with this program, though it sounds as if this is a well-established program at NYU.
New York University  
Proposal for Undergraduate Programs in Global Public Health  
Statement in Response to External Program Review

We are incredibly grateful to Dr. Kelly Gebo for her thoughtful review and insightful comments to our proposal for undergraduate global public health at NYU. Her comments will help us to shape and enhance the programs.

Our responses are as follows:

Program Infrastructure
As a point of clarification, the position of Executive Director, Public Health Initiatives is a non-faculty position engaged in a variety of university public health activities, including but not limited to the development of the undergraduate global public health programs. The GIPH is currently preparing for a national search for the Institute Director. Reporting to the Executive Vice President for Health, the Director will be a recognized leader in global public health, with a proven track record who can head the new, innovative, multi-school and multi-disciplinary GIPH. Overall, the Director will be responsible for the Institute’s operation and for providing strategic direction for the development, implementation and evaluation of the Institute and will provide vision and direction to ensure successful development and implementation of the Institute and its academic public health programs (undergraduate and graduate). In addition, each of the undergraduate programs will be led by a faculty director directly involved in the major.

Also as a point of clarification, the programs proposed are not joint or dual degrees, but rather one major with one degree awarded (BS or BA). The majors are new majors at NYU and combine global public health courses with courses from another existing discipline at NYU.

Student Advisement
Dr. Gebo suggests that students could benefit from additional advising during their freshman year to help them get engaged in the program and understand long term options for travel abroad and their senior projects. We absolutely agree, and have revised the proposal to clarify the advising procedures. All students will be assigned a faculty advisor from the start of the program who will work with that student throughout their time at NYU. Students in the proposed program will also benefit from the new position of Associate Dean for Pre-Professional Advising which also serves as Schools’ Liaison for Undergraduate Global Public Health programs. This position is held by Brian Paquette, who has vast experience in student advisement and who himself has B.A. in Sociology, an M.S.W. in Social Work, an M.P.H., and an Ed.D. in Health Education. Dr. Paquette will work closely with the faculty advisors and program directors in the global public health undergraduate majors to ensure that all students are advised adequately and appropriately and to help students navigate resources across the GIPH and university. Finally, all
undergraduate advisors will be introduced to the undergraduate public health majors so that they can advise students appropriately.

**Inclusion of an Introduction to Public Health course**
Dr. Gebo suggested we consider offering a course, Introduction of Public Health which could serve as a feeder into the program by exposing students who have no previous experience in public health to the topic area. We also agree that such a course could be useful and we are currently in discussion on how such a course could count toward NYU general education requirements so that it is attractive to undergraduate students across the university. There are similar NYU courses at the master’s level which could be adapted to meet the needs of this undergraduate student population.

**Curricular Flexibility**
Dr. Gebo feels that there is increased need for flexibility in regards to matriculation into the global public health programs. She raises a concern that those students without prior exposure to public health will find it difficult to choose public health by the end of freshman year, particularly pre-med students. We find this a valid point and have discussed this very issue at length with faculty and university administration. One of the strengths of the proposed program is the collaboration among disciplines and the desire to advise students on his/her options in public health, whether that student is also interested in pre-health, the humanities, or clinical programs such as nursing or social work. Rather than needing to choose, students (with the assistance of in-depth advising structures) can now select a new major that combines both global public health and that field. Given the complexities involved in navigating fields and majors among undergraduate students at a large university, we have made advising a priority for the global public health programs, and have developed a strong student advising infrastructure and network across majors. Furthermore, through outside data as well as internal university polls, we are finding evidence that students are seeking public health programs upon matriculation to college, and the demand for the programs as freshman may be high. That said, we will monitor admissions, enrollment and transfer data very closely and adjust our approach as needed.

**Course Availability**
Dr. Gebo recommends that all courses in the major be offered each semester. That is our intent as well and we are working with the partnering schools on detailed enrollment planning.

**Statistical Software**
Dr. Gebo raises a concern about the ability of undergraduate students to use SPSS statistical software. The course presents at an introductory level, including the use of SPSS. To date undergraduate students have done well in this course, but we will certainly continue to monitor over time.
MPH Alumni Survey 2012

By completing this survey you will provide valuable feedback to the Master of Public Health Program, help us to improve the program, maintain accreditation and provide a profile of NYU MPH students.

Your input is essential to a comprehensive assessment of the MPH program. This online survey should take no more than 10 minutes to complete. All information will be kept confidential and is anonymous, and will be reported only as grouped data. Your participation in this survey is very much appreciated. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Amy Joyce at amy.joyce@nyu.edu.

ACADEMIC INFORMATION

1. What semester and year did you start the program?  Semester _______  Year _________

2. When did you graduate? Month ___________  Year ____________

3. Did you attend ______ Full-time   _____Part-time   _____Both Full-time and part-time

4. What was your concentration?
   ___Community and International Public Health
   ___Global Health Leadership
   ___Public Health Nutrition

5. How well did the career resources available to you as an NYU MPH student (networking, career services, workshops, online job databases, etc.) assist you in finding a job or pursuing further education?
   ___ Very Well
   ___ More than Adequately
   ___ Adequately
   ___ Less than Adequately
   ___ Very Poorly

6. Would you recommend the NYU MPH program to a friend considering an MPH degree?
   ___ Definitely would
   ___ Probably would
   ___ Maybe
   ___ Probably would not
   ___ Definitely would not

7. Overall, are you satisfied with the alumni services of the program?
   ___ Very satisfied
   ___ Generally satisfied
   ___ Ambivalent
   ___ Generally dissatisfied
EMPLEYMENT AND CAREER

8. Of the options below, which best describes your current employment status:
   _____ Currently employed full-time
   _____ Currently employed part-time
   _____ Not employed but actively seeking employment*
   _____ Not employed but NOT actively seeking employment*
   _____ I have pursued further education

* If you are not currently working, please skip to Question 12.

9. If you are presently employed, are you employed in a position where your primary role is in public health?
   ____ Yes    ____ No

Work Setting:
   _____ Government       ( __state __local __federal)
   _____ Nonprofit organization       ( __national __international)
   _____ Hospital or health care delivery facility    ( __national __international)
   _____ Private practice      ( __national __international)
   _____ University or research institute     ( __national __international)
   _____ Proprietary organization (industry, pharmaceutical company, consulting) ( __national __international)
   _____ University degree program    ( __national __international)
   _____ Non-health related     ( __national __international)
   _____ Other, please specify: _____________________________________________

10. Which of the following best describes your current position?
    _____ Entry level
    _____ Mid-level
    _____ Senior level
    _____ Executive level

11. How long did it take you to find your first job after graduating from the NYU MPH program?
    _____ I stayed in the same job
    _____ Less than 6 months
    _____ 6 to 12 months
    _____ My internship/practicum became my job.

12. Upon leaving the NYU MPH program, how well-prepared were you to undertake a public health job?
    _____ Very well prepared
    _____ Well prepared
    _____ Somewhat prepared
    _____ Poorly prepared
    _____ Not at all prepared
    _____ Not applicable
13. Please indicate your response to the following statement: I feel that my MPH degree from NYU prepared me to effectively perform in the following areas of competency.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biostatistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental health sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidemiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policy and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and behavioral sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and informatics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health biology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Overall, how satisfied are you with the course of your career thus far?

___ Very satisfied
___ Generally satisfied
___ Ambivalent
___ Generally dissatisfied
___ Very dissatisfied
___ Not applicable

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION (optional)

1. What is your sex? _____ Female _____ Male _____ Transgender or other

2. What is your age? _______ Years

3. How would you describe yourself?

___ Asian/Pacific Islander
___ Indian
___ African American/Black
___ Asian
___ Hispanic/Latino
___ White (non-Hispanic)
___ Other (please specify: ____________________________ )

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please use the space below to provide any additional information:

¹ A full explanation of competencies can be found at [http://mph.nyu.edu/academics/core-competencies.html](http://mph.nyu.edu/academics/core-competencies.html).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender or other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of alumni who are employed:</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of those employed, percent of alumni who secured employment within one year following graduation:</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work setting of those employed:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University or research institute</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organization</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital or health care delivery facility</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary organization</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University degree program</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-health related</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job status:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior level</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive level</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of alumni whose job involves working outside the United States:</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall satisfaction

- **Percent of alumni who would recommend the NYU MPH program to someone considering an MPH degree:** 82%
- **Percent of alumni who felt prepared upon graduation to undertake a public health job:** 84%
- **Percent of alumni satisfied with the course of his/her career thus far:** 81%

### Competencies

**Percent of alumni who felt that the NYU MPH degree prepared them to effectively perform in the following areas of his/her career (of those who responded)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and apply statistical reasoning</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize environmental factors that affect health</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand patterns of disease and injury</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand practices associated with health care delivery</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply managerial and policy approaches to public health</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply constructs of socio-behavioral determinants of health</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather, process and present information</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to interact with diverse populations</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to communicate a shared vision for a changing future</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate public health biology into public health practice</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ethical choices and professional values</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for the design, development and evaluation of public health strategies</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize a systems approach to public health challenges</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The New York University Global Institute of Public Health (GIPH) strives to enable our graduates and the general public health workforce to competently and confidently assume the responsibilities of public health professionals.

As part of our ongoing evaluation, we are seeking feedback from current or prospective employers of our graduates. Your responses will help us in the assessment of the current job market and of our program.

Your response to the survey will be kept confidential and taking part in this study is voluntary. We greatly appreciate your time and input. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us at giph@nyu.edu. Thank you in advance for your participation.

PART ONE: EMPLOYER INFORMATION

1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   a. Bachelor’s degree
   b. Master’s degree (MPH, MPA, etc)
   c. Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, DDS, JD, etc)
   d. Other ___________________________________

2. How long have you worked in the public health field?
   a. Less than 5 years
   b. 6-10 years
   c. More than 10 years

3. Which organization type best describes where you currently work?
   a. Local government
   b. State government
   c. Federal government
   d. Non-governmental organization (NGO)
   e. Community-based organization (CBO)
   f. Academic Institution
   g. Healthcare delivery organization (hospital, clinic, etc)
   h. Private, for-profit company (pharmaceutical, insurance, etc)
   i. Research institute
   j. Other _________________________________

4. What is the size of your organization?
   a. Less than 100 employees
   b. 100-1,000 employees
   c. 1,001 to 10,000 employees
5. How many employees do you supervise at any given time?
   a. Less than 5 employees
   b. 6-10 employees
   c. 11-20 employees
   d. More than 20 employees
   e. I do not directly supervise employees

6. Which of the following best describes your current position?
   a. Faculty at college or university
   b. Health educator
   c. Healthcare provider/clinician
   d. Researcher
   e. Policy analyst
   f. Program director or coordinator
   g. Executive
   h. Other, please specify: ________________

7. Is the scope of your work primarily focused on issues affecting the health of (check all that apply):
   a. New York City
   b. Other city ________________
   c. New York State
   d. Other state ________________
   e. United States (national level)
   f. International (outside the US)
   g. Other ________________

8. How does your organization typically recruit for new positions (check all that apply)?
   a. Listservs
   b. Newspapers
   c. Online job databases ________________
   d. Professional journals ________________
   e. Notifying specific schools and programs
   f. Other ________

PART TWO: EVALUATION OF STUDENTS AS EMPLOYEES

9. Has your organization employed an NYU Master of Public Health (MPH) graduate in the last 5 years?  (If NO, please skip to Part Three)
   ___ Yes
   ___ No

10. Have you personally supervised any of them?
    ___ Yes
11. On average, how would you rate NYU MPH graduates' knowledge and abilities in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical reasoning and methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public health knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. So that we might best prepare our graduates for successful employment, please rate how important the following skills and abilities are to your company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/administrative skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/fiscal management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. If your organization uses analytic software, please indicate which software packages are used most frequently by your employees (check all that apply).

___ SPSS
___ STATA
___ SAS
___ R
___ Other _______________________________________

PART THREE: CONTINUING EDUCATION

14. To help us plan our continuing education programs, please rate your and/or your organization’s interest in the following topics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and child health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse and addiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency preparedness and response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources for health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. To help us plan our continuing education programs, please rank your and/or your organization’s interest in the following skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Topic</strong></th>
<th><strong>Extremely Important</strong></th>
<th><strong>Important</strong></th>
<th><strong>Slightly Important</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not very important</strong></th>
<th><strong>Not at all Important</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing people and teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets, financing, cost-effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health policy analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any additional topics or skills of interest

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

16. If you were to engage in a continuing education opportunity, what time of day and week would work best for you? (please rank in order of preference, with 1 being most preferable).
   a. Week days
   b. Weeknights
   c. Weekends
   d. Flexible web-based training that I can complete on my own time

17. If you were to engage in a continuing education opportunity, what delivery format would you prefer? (please rank in order of preference, with 1 being most preferable).
   a. Webinar
   b. Online course
   c. Onsite workshop (in your workplace)
   d. Off-site workshop
   e. Short course (i.e. several days in a row)
   f. Conference

18. If offered an continuing education opportunity, what factors would limit your ability to participate? (please rank in order, with 1 being the most significant factor limiting your ability to participate).
   a. Lack of interest
   b. Lack of support from my supervisor to attend during working hours
   c. Work demands
   d. Inability to travel off-site
   e. Limited access to or inadequate technology (such as for video conferencing)
   f. Limited budget for additional training
   g. Other __________

19. Do you have any additional comments related to the content of this survey?

____________________________________________________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of degree earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time working in public health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of organization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based organization</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare delivery organization</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institute or center</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, for-profit company</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of organization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 employees</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-1000 employees</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-10,000 employees</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10,000 employees</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director or coordinator</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at college or university</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analyst</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health educator</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare provider/clinician</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population served (all that apply):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other city</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other state</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States/national level</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/outside US</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Method of recruitment for new positions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online job databases</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listservs</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notifying specific schools</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not certain</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional journals</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Skills and abilities important to company:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/program design and implementation</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and assessment</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial/administrative skills</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget/fiscal management</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation of MPH Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of organizations who have employed an NYU MPH student in the last 5 years</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of respondents who have personally supervised those graduates</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of employers who indicated satisfaction with NYU MPH hires in the following areas (does not include non-applicable responses) :</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional behavior</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral communication</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written communication</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation skills</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial skill</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural competency</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research design and implementation</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical reasoning and methodology</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program design</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and assessment</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data management</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public health knowledge</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall job performance</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest level of degree earned</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of time working in public health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of organization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic institution</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based organization</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare delivery organization</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research institute or center</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private, for-profit company</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of organization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 100 employees</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-1000 employees</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,001-10,000 employees</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10,000 employees</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current position:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program director or coordinator</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty at college or university</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy analyst</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health educator</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare provider/clinician</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population served (all that apply):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other city</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York State</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other state</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States/national level</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/outside US</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interest in Continuing Educational Opportunities

**Percent of respondents indicating interest in learning more about the following topics:**

- Maternal and child health: 67%
- Social media: 64%
- Emerging diseases: 63%
- Human resources for health: 62%
- Human rights and ethics: 59%
- LGBT health: 56%
- Emergency preparedness and response: 53%
- Aging: 48%
- Substance abuse and addictions: 43%

**Percent of respondents indicating interest in acquiring additional skills in the following area:**

- Managing people and teams: 80%
- Decision analysis: 79%
- Budgets, financing, cost effectiveness: 75%
- Data management: 64%
- Research design: 64%
- Health policy analysis: 63%
- Grant writing: 62%

### Preferences in Continuing Education Format and Offerings

**Percent of respondents ranking the following times as most preferable if engaging in a continuing education opportunity:**

- Flexible web-based training completed on his/her own time: 34%
- Evenings during the week: 26%
- Daytime during the week: 20%
- Weekends: 10%

**Percent of respondents ranking the following delivery formats as most preferable if engaging in a continuing education opportunity:**

- Webinar: 28%
- Online course: 21%
- Onsite workshop (at workplace): 19%
- Short course (several days in a row): 17%
- Off-site workshop: 8%
- Conference: 8%
Percent of respondents ranking the following factors as most likely to limit his/her participation in an NYU MPH sponsored continuing education opportunity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work demands</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited budget for additional training</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to travel off-site</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from supervisor to attend during work hours</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to or inadequate technology</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 responses

Summary

Basic Information

What semester and year did you start your MPH program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and Year</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, did you attend:

- Full-time: 18 (82%)
- Part-time: 4 (18%)

Employment Information

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, were you:

- Working full-time: 7 (32%)
- Working part-time: 7 (32%)
- Not employed: 8 (36%)

If you selected "working full-time" or "working part-time" in the previous question, was the work a public health related position?

- Yes: 8 (36%)
- No: 5 (23%)
- Other: 9 (41%)

Please select the type of organization that BEST describes your current employer:

- Government (state, local, federal, international): 3 (14%)
- Nonprofit Organization: 9 (41%)
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility: 6 (27%)
- Private Practice: 0 (0%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38idDIMvL2NNxUd3XzROYUN3bVh3TEEdSRmcl#chart
Higher education (staff, administration or faculty) 2 9%
Private (industry, pharmaceutical company, consulting) 2 9%

Of the options below, which BEST describes your career plan following graduation?
- I plan to stay in my current position 6 27%
- I am starting a new job within 3 months of graduating 8 36%
- I am continuing on for further education 0 0%
- I will be looking for a new position 8 36%
- I have chosen not to seek employment or further study at this time 0 0%

If you are starting a new position, please select the type of organization that BEST describes your new employer.
- Government (state, local, federal, international) 2 9%
- Nonprofit Organization 8 36%
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility 4 18%
- Private Practice 1 5%
- Higher education (staff, administration or faculty) 0 0%

During your time in the program, did you participate in any of the following? Check all that apply.
- Held membership in a public health related professional organization outside NYU 7 3%
- Held a leadership role in a public health related professional organization outside NYU 2 1%
- Held membership in a public health related student group at NYU 5 2%
- Held a leadership role in a public health related NYU student organization 2 1%
- Attended a meeting/conference of a public health or related organization 15 7%
- Participated in community service outside the classroom 10 5%
- Delivered a poster/oral presentation outside NYU 8 4%
- Participated in an NYU faculty-sponsored research project 7 3%

People may select more than one checkbox, so percentages may add up to more than 100%. 

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38IdDlmV2NVd3Xz3ROYUN3bVh3TEDSRmdc#chart
Program Evaluation

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Teaching

- Very satisfied: 0 (0%)
- Satisfied: 8 (36%)
- Mostly satisfied: 11 (50%)
- Not satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Program administrative support

- Very satisfied: 1 (5%)
- Satisfied: 8 (36%)
- Mostly satisfied: 4 (18%)
- Not satisfied: 9 (41%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Course content

- Very satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Mostly satisfied: 11 (50%)
- Not satisfied: 5 (23%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - International experiences and opportunities

- Very satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Satisfied: 9 (41%)
- Mostly satisfied: 7 (32%)
- Not satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Program events and speakers

- Very satisfied: 4 (18%)
- Satisfied: 8 (36%)
- Mostly satisfied: 11 (50%)
- Not satisfied: 3 (14%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38ldDIImV2NvLUd3XzROYUN3bVh3TEdSRecl#chart
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- Career services
  - Very satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Satisfied: 4 (18%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 4 (18%)
  - Not satisfied: 12 (55%)
  - Not Applicable: 2 (9%)

- Advisement
  - Very satisfied: 1 (5%)
  - Satisfied: 4 (18%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 5 (23%)
  - Not satisfied: 11 (50%)
  - Not Applicable: 1 (5%)

- Student participation in program planning and activities (including student group opportunities)
  - Very satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Satisfied: 3 (14%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 13 (59%)
  - Not satisfied: 3 (14%)
  - Not Applicable: 3 (14%)

- Dissemination of program information (website, listervs, etc)
  - Very satisfied: 2 (9%)
  - Satisfied: 8 (36%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 8 (36%)
  - Not satisfied: 3 (14%)
  - Not Applicable: 1 (5%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38IdDlmV2NuLUd3XzROYUN3bVh3TEdSRmc#chart
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- Networking opportunities (between students, faculty, practitioners and outside organizations)

Very satisfied 0 0%
Satisfied 4 18%
Mostly satisfied 9 41%
Not satisfied 7 32%
Not Applicable 2 9%

- Your culminating experience

Very satisfied 7 32%
Satisfied 2 9%
Mostly satisfied 4 18%
Not satisfied 8 36%
Not Applicable 1 5%

- Your concentration overall

Very satisfied 2 9%
Satisfied 6 27%
Mostly satisfied 7 32%
Not satisfied 7 32%
Not Applicable 0 0%

- The program overall

Very satisfied 1 5%
Satisfied 6 27%
Mostly satisfied 9 41%
Not satisfied 6 27%
Not Applicable 0 0%
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- Preparation for a job in public health

- Develop and apply statistical reasoning and methods in addressing, analyzing and solving problems in public health, health care, and biomedical, clinical and population-based research.

- Recognize environmental factors including biological, physical and chemical factors that affect the health of a community.

- Understand the patterns of disease and injury in human populations and apply to the control of health problems.

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.

- High level of competency
- Good level of competency
- Adequate level of competency
- Inadequate level of competency
- N/A (not applicable)

High level of competency
Good level of competency
Adequate level of competency
Inadequate level of competency
N/A (not applicable)
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Understand practices associated with the delivery, quality, and costs of health care for individuals and populations.

- High level of competency: 8 (36%)
- Good level of competency: 8 (36%)
- Adequate level of competency: 2 (9%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 4 (18%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply managerial and policy approaches regarding the structure, process and outcomes of health services including the costs, financing, organization, outcomes and accessibility of care.

- High level of competency: 5 (23%)
- Good level of competency: 11 (50%)
- Adequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 6 (27%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply constructs of behavioral, social and cultural theories related to individual and population health and health disparities over the life course.

- High level of competency: 9 (41%)
- Good level of competency: 9 (41%)
- Adequate level of competency: 3 (14%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 1 (5%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Gather, process, and present information to different audiences in-person, through information technologies, or through media channels.

- High level of competency: 6 (27%)
- Good level of competency: 7 (32%)
- Adequate level of competency: 8 (36%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 1 (5%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>Good level of competency</th>
<th>Adequate level of competency</th>
<th>Inadequate level of competency</th>
<th>N/A (not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interact with diverse individuals and communities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ability to create and communicate a shared vision</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate ethical choices, values and professional practices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate public health biology into public health practice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.
**Demonstrate the ability to plan for the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of strategies to improve individual and community health.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.
**Recognize system level properties that result from dynamic interactions among human and social systems and how they affect the relationships among individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and environments.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.
**Engage in collaborative capacity-building with local, national, and international organizations to facilitate and strengthen their ability to address current and future public health needs.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.
**Design and implement effective, efficient, equitable and appropriate global health programs, projects, and policies based on the strongest population-based evidence.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Work effectively within varied cultural settings and across different social and political environments

- High level of competency: 8 (36%)
- Good level of competency: 7 (32%)
- Adequate level of competency: 5 (23%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 2 (9%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Perform strategic assessment and evaluation to analyze factors shaping individual and institutional behaviors and measure their impact

- High level of competency: 4 (18%)
- Good level of competency: 11 (50%)
- Adequate level of competency: 3 (14%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 4 (18%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply principles of ethical reasoning and professional practice to advance health equity and social justice in the United States and in international settings.

- High level of competency: 7 (32%)
- Good level of competency: 11 (50%)
- Adequate level of competency: 3 (14%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 1 (5%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

What did you like most about the program?
I enjoyed 1) the program's emphasis on group collaboration in order to prepare students for similarly collaborative efforts in the real world; and 2) the program's coverage of social determinants of health and behavioral health, particularly Dr. Padgett's class. I really enjoyed socio-behavioral with Dr. Padgett. I liked the location, some of the professors, the focus on global health. I liked meeting new people such as my classmates and others at NYU. The study abroad classes Microeconomics 1- My writing skills improved tremendously. 2- The Capstone experience was amazing. 3- The quality of th...
Are there areas we can improve? If so, please provide further explanation for these items.

If a student has a particular area of interest, it would be nice for their coursework/assignments to reflect that interest a bit more. In other words, the program could allow more freedom for students to pursue their own public health interest and become a specialist in the process; this as opposed to, say, a disproportionate focus on HIV/AIDS. I think there needs to be a better effort made to ensure that professors are good professors. I found that many of the professors are very successful in their f ...

Please use the space below to provide additional comments regarding your experience in the MPH program.

I think the program needs to be restructured to ensure that the program keeps in mind that most of the students are working full-time. I was overall very disappointed with the program. As you can see from my comments, I was unhappy with my experience. I feel bad having paid so much for a NYU education. I had a negative experience. My overall experience has been below average. I would not recommend this program to anyone as it's still not organized and doesn't offer myriad courses for students interested in a specific area of public health. I didn't like my Capstone team mates very much. To ...

Number of daily responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5/2013</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18 responses

Summary See complete responses

Basic Information

What semester and year did you start your MPH program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and Year</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, did you attend:

- Full-time: 15 (83%)
- Part-time: 3 (17%)

Employment Information

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, were you:

- Working full-time: 5 (28%)
- Working part-time: 11 (61%)
- Not employed: 2 (11%)

If you selected “working full-time” or “working part-time” in the previous question, was the work a public health related position?

- Yes: 12 (67%)
- No: 3 (17%)
- Other: 3 (17%)

Please select the type of organization that BEST describes your current employer.

- Government (state, local, federal, international): 5 (28%)
- Nonprofit Organization: 7 (39%)
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility: 4 (22%)
- Private Practice: 1 (6%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38ldGFCVXNVVdoYmtDZlpxLTN5S0Vicmc&gridId=0#chart
Of the options below, which BEST describes your career plan following graduation?

- I plan to stay in my current position: 1 (6%)
- I plan to start a new job within 3 months of graduating: 7 (39%)
- I plan to continue on for further education: 3 (17%)
- I plan to be looking for a new position: 7 (39%)
- I have chosen not to seek employment or further study at this time: 0 (0%)

If you are starting a new position, please select the type of organization that BEST describes your employer.

- Government (state, local, federal, international): 2 (11%)
- Nonprofit Organization: 4 (22%)
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility: 2 (11%)
- Private Practice: 0 (0%)
- Higher education (staff, administration or faculty): 0 (0%)
- I am going on for further education in another degree program: 0 (0%)
- Private (industry, pharmaceutical company, consulting): 0 (0%)

Professional Development

During your time in the program, did you participate in any of the following? Check all that apply.

- Held membership in a public health related professional organization outside NYU: 4 (2)
- Held a leadership role in a public health related professional organization outside NYU: 1 (1)
- Held membership in a public health related student group at NYU: 7 (4)
- Held a leadership role in a public health related NYU student organization: 4 (2)
- Attended a meeting/conference of a public health or related organization: 14 (8)
- Participated in community service outside the classroom: 11 (6)
- Delivered a poster/oral presentation outside NYU: 5 (3)
- Participated in an NYU faculty-sponsored research project: 5 (2)

People may select more than one checkbox, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.
Program Evaluation

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Teaching

- Very satisfied: 1 (6%)
- Satisfied: 7 (39%)
- Mostly satisfied: 10 (56%)
- Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Program administrative support

- Very satisfied: 7 (39%)
- Satisfied: 7 (39%)
- Mostly satisfied: 3 (17%)
- Not satisfied: 1 (6%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Course content

- Very satisfied: 2 (11%)
- Satisfied: 5 (28%)
- Mostly satisfied: 10 (56%)
- Not satisfied: 1 (6%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - International experiences and opportunities

- Very satisfied: 1 (6%)
- Satisfied: 8 (44%)
- Mostly satisfied: 1 (6%)
- Not satisfied: 3 (17%)
- Not Applicable: 5 (28%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Program events and speakers

- Very satisfied: 6 (33%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YXbX_38IdGFCVXNViVdoYmtDZjtpxLTN5S0Vicmc&gridId=0#chart
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- **Career services**
  
  - Very satisfied: 4 (22%)
  - Satisfied: 7 (39%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 6 (33%)
  - Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Not Applicable: 1 (6%)

- **Advisement**
  
  - Very satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Satisfied: 6 (33%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 6 (33%)
  - Not satisfied: 6 (33%)
  - Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

- **Student participation in program planning and activities (including student group opportunities)**
  
  - Very satisfied: 3 (17%)
  - Satisfied: 7 (39%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 3 (17%)
  - Not satisfied: 3 (17%)
  - Not Applicable: 2 (11%)

- **Dissemination of program information (website, listervs, etc)**
  
  - Very satisfied: 6 (33%)
  - Satisfied: 9 (50%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 3 (17%)
  - Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Not Applicable: 0 (0%)
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Networking opportunities (between students, faculty, practitioners and outside organizations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Your culminating experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Your concentration overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - The program overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- Preparation for a job in public health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Develop and apply statistical reasoning and methods in addressing, analyzing and solving problems in public health; health care; and biomedical, clinical and population-based research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Recognize environmental factors including biological, physical and chemical factors that affect the health of a community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Understand the patterns of disease and injury in human populations and apply to the control of health problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Understand practices associated with the delivery, quality, and costs of health care for individuals and populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Apply managerial and policy approaches regarding the structure, process and outcomes of health services including the costs, financing, organization, outcomes and accessibility of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Apply constructs of behavioral, social and cultural theories related to individual and population health and health disparities over the life course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gather, process, and present information to different audiences in-person, through information technologies, or through media channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Level</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below: - Demonstrate the ability to plan for the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of strategies to improve individual and community health

| High level of competency | 6 | 33% |
| Good level of competency | 10 | 56% |
| Adequate level of competency | 1 | 6% |
| Inadequate level of competency | 1 | 6% |
| N/A (not applicable) | 0 | 0% |

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below: - Recognize system level properties that result from dynamic interactions among human and social systems and how they affect the relationships among individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and environments

| High level of competency | 9 | 50% |
| Good level of competency | 7 | 39% |
| Adequate level of competency | 1 | 6% |
| Inadequate level of competency | 1 | 6% |
| N/A (not applicable) | 0 | 0% |

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below: - Identify and assess preventable health problems among diverse population groups in the United States and internationally

| High level of competency | 11 | 61% |
| Good level of competency | 5 | 28% |
| Adequate level of competency | 2 | 11% |
| Inadequate level of competency | 0 | 0% |
| N/A (not applicable) | 0 | 0% |

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below: - Identify the social, cultural, economic, environmental, and institutional factors that contribute to the risk of health problems among diverse populations

| High level of competency | 11 | 61% |
| Good level of competency | 6 | 33% |
| Adequate level of competency | 1 | 6% |
| Inadequate level of competency | 0 | 0% |
| N/A (not applicable) | 0 | 0% |
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Develop educational and other population-based intervention strategies to improve morbidity and mortality and to improve quality of life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Develop policies to reduce barriers to improved health status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Apply population-based research findings to the development and implementation of health policies and programs in the United States and in low-income and developing countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below:

- Apply principles of ethical reasoning and professional practice to advance health equity and social justice in the United States and in international settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did you like most about the program?

Coming from not a public health background, I really enjoyed the wide scope of the program. I feel I have become well versed in the many aspects of public health and have been given the opportunity through the program to explore said aspects and find my particular niche. Classmates, breadth and depth of experiences and interests; I like the large amount of networking events and seminars available to the students. NCD Epi and research methods with Ompad. My cohort and learning from/working with the diverse group of students admitted to the program. I liked the practical nature of the majority of ... 

Are there areas we can improve? If so, please provide further explanation for these items.

Though it was difficult, it would have been a great to have more experiences with other community-based organizations. I understand the logistics and cooperation that such partnerships entail, however I feel like our time with CBO's are some of the most rewarding experiences from the program. A stronger emphasis on practice. Many classes focused on research, but fewer focused on the implementation of said research. I think the teaching staff were not as accessible as I would have liked them to be. Further develop the international component. Most of the profs leading the international course: ... 

Please use the space below to provide additional comments regarding your experience in the MPH program.

I have truly enjoyed my time in the MPH program. Having had very little exposure to the field, I feel like I am leaving with a depth and breadth of knowledge that will be vital to finding the particular sub-specialty of public health I would like to pursue as well as ensure my effectiveness in said field. I entered the program simply as an admirer of the public health and I am leaving the program as a budding professional with hopes of making my mark in public health and society. Doing the MPH program was the best decision I made. I felt that on the whole, the faculty were very invested ...
10 responses

Summary See complete responses

Basic Information

What semester and year did you start your MPH program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, did you attend:

- Full-time: 8 (80%)
- Part-time: 1 (10%)

Employment Information

During the MAJORITY of your time in the program, were you:

- Working full-time: 0 (0%)
- Working part-time: 7 (70%)
- Not employed: 2 (20%)

If you selected “working full-time” or “working part-time” in the previous question, was the work a public health related position?

- Yes: 4 (40%)
- No: 2 (20%)
- Other: 4 (40%)

Please select the type of organization that BEST describes your current employer:

- Government (state, local, federal, international): 3 (30%)
- Nonprofit Organization: 2 (20%)
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility: 2 (20%)
- Private Practice: 0 (0%)
Of the options below, which BEST describes your career plan following graduation?

- I plan to stay in my current position: 2 (20%)
- I am starting a new job within 3 months of graduating: 0 (0%)
- I am continuing on for further education: 1 (10%)
- I will be looking for a new position: 6 (60%)
- I have chosen not to seek employment or further study at this time: 0 (0%)

If you are starting a new position, please select the type of organization that BEST describes your new employer.

- Government (state, local, federal, international): 0 (0%)
- Nonprofit Organization: 1 (10%)
- Hospital or Health Care Delivery Facility: 1 (10%)
- Private Practice: 0 (0%)
- Higher education (staff, administration or faculty): 0 (0%)
- I am going on for further education in another degree program: 1 (10%)
- Private (industry, pharmaceutical company, consulting): 0 (0%)

Professional Development

During your time in the program, did you participate in any of the following? Check all that apply.

- Held membership in a public health related professional organization outside NYU: 1 (1)
- Held a leadership role in a public health related professional organization outside NYU: 0
- Held membership in a public health related student group at NYU: 3$
- Held a leadership role in a public health related NYU student organization: 4$
- Attended a meeting/conference of a public health or related organization: 6$
- Participated in community service outside the classroom: 7$
- Delivered a poster/oral presentation outside NYU: 2$
- Participated in an NYU faculty-sponsored research project: 0

People may select more than one checkbox, so percentages may add up to more than 100%.
Program Evaluation

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Program administrative support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Course content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- **International experiences and opportunities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Program events and speakers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Career services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Advisement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Student participation in program planning and activities (including student group opportunities)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly satisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program:

- **Dissemination of program information (website, listervs, etc)**

  - Very satisfied: 2 (20%)
  - Satisfied: 4 (40%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 3 (30%)
  - Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

- **Networking opportunities (between students, faculty, practitioners and outside organizations)**

  - Very satisfied: 1 (10%)
  - Satisfied: 5 (50%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 2 (20%)
  - Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Not Applicable: 1 (10%)

- **Your culminating experience**

  - Very satisfied: 1 (10%)
  - Satisfied: 4 (40%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 3 (30%)
  - Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
  - Not Applicable: 1 (10%)

- **Your concentration overall**

  - Very satisfied: 1 (10%)
  - Satisfied: 3 (30%)
  - Mostly satisfied: 3 (30%)
  - Not satisfied: 2 (20%)
  - Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

https://docs.google.com/a/nyu.edu/spreadsheet/gform?key=0Aq52YX6xK_38IdFdkMVQ0TQ0N2b2jhU5i0LTRJb2RKYmc&gridId=0#chart
Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - The program overall

- Very satisfied: 0 (0%)
- Satisfied: 4 (40%)
- Mostly satisfied: 5 (50%)
- Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Using the following scale, please tell us how satisfied you were with the following aspects of the MPH program: - Preparation for a job in public health

- Very satisfied: 1 (10%)
- Satisfied: 5 (50%)
- Mostly satisfied: 3 (30%)
- Not satisfied: 0 (0%)
- Not Applicable: 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Develop and apply statistical reasoning and methods in addressing, analyzing and solving problems in public health; health care; and biomedical, clinical and population-based research

- High level of competency: 1 (10%)
- Good level of competency: 4 (40%)
- Adequate level of competency: 2 (20%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 2 (20%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Recognize environmental factors including biological, physical and chemical factors that affect the health of a community

- High level of competency: 7 (70%)
- Good level of competency: 1 (10%)
- Adequate level of competency: 1 (10%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Understand the patterns of disease and injury in human populations and apply to the control of health problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Understand practices associated with the delivery, quality, and costs of health care for individuals and populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply managerial and policy approaches regarding the structure, process and outcomes of health services including the costs, financing, organization, outcomes and accessibility of care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply constructs of behavioral, social and cultural theories related to individual and population health and health disparities over the life course
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>High level of competency</th>
<th>Good level of competency</th>
<th>Adequate level of competency</th>
<th>Inadequate level of competency</th>
<th>N/A (not applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. -</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather, process, and present information to different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audiences in-person, through information technologies, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through media channels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to interact with both diverse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals and communities to produce or impact an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intended public health outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. -</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate the ability to create and communicate a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared vision for a changing future; champion solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to organizational and community challenges; and energize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitment to goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. -</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate public health biology – the biological and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>molecular context of public health – into public health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.

1. Demonstrate ethical choices, values and professional practices implicit in public health decisions while considering the effect of choices on community stewardship, equity, social justice and accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Demonstrate the ability to plan for the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of strategies to improve individual and community health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Recognize system level properties that result from dynamic interactions among human and social systems and how they affect the relationships among individuals, groups, organizations, communities, and environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Identify and assess diet-related health problems—of both undernutrition and overnutrition—among diverse population groups in the United States and internationally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A (not applicable): 1 10%
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below.

1. Identify the social, cultural, economic, environmental, and institutional factors that contribute to the risk of undernutrition and overnutrition among populations.

- High level of competency: 7 (70%)
- Good level of competency: 2 (20%)
- Adequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

2. Demonstrate the linkages between agriculture, food, nutrition, and public health.

- High level of competency: 7 (70%)
- Good level of competency: 2 (20%)
- Adequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

3. Develop educational, institutional, and other population-based intervention strategies to improve food security and reduce obesity.

- High level of competency: 5 (50%)
- Good level of competency: 4 (40%)
- Adequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)

4. Develop policies to reduce barriers to food insecurity and to improve the food and activity choices and nutritional status of diverse population groups.

- High level of competency: 5 (50%)
- Good level of competency: 3 (30%)
- Adequate level of competency: 1 (10%)
- Inadequate level of competency: 0 (0%)
- N/A (not applicable): 0 (0%)
Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Promote policies to ensure the safe production, distribution, and consumption of food

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Develop effective strategies for advocating for improved nutrition and physical activity among diverse population groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate your level of competency on the scale below. - Apply population-based research findings to the development and implementation of nutrition policies and programs in the United States and internationally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High level of competency</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of competency</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate level of competency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate level of competency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (not applicable)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What did you like most about the program?

- Very interesting elective courses, and courses overall.
- coursework specific to the nutrition concentration
- The diversity of the student body and the wide range of public health experience of both the faculty and the students. I appreciated how our program was connected into the community of New York City.
- Hunger and Food Security study abroad.
- Lisa Kroin was a fantastic resource. Wagner's study abroad program in Ghana was an excellent course and learning experience.
- Classmates represented a broad range of professional industries and backgrounds, and I thoroughly enjoyed learning from them.
Are there areas we can improve? If so, please provide further explanation for these items.

For the MPH in Public Health Nutrition in particular, I believe more of an emphasis should be placed on NUTRITION, along with the core public health classes. This will benefit the many students who come into the program and are not Registered Dietitians. Those who come in without that credential do not receive a solid enough background in nutrition through the MPH program. More focus on career development. Advisement: I was highly dissatisfied with my program concentration advisement. Beth Dixon became my advisor after one semester (as I changed from Community/International to Public Health...)

Please use the space below to provide additional comments regarding your experience in the MPH program.

| Highly valued the opportunity to interact and build relationships with such a diverse student body and faculty. It was rewarding and challenging to be a part of an academic program that evolved so much over the two years...reaccreditation and shifting to the global institute for public health. I was lucky to be a small part of providing feedback to the program during this reaccreditation process and I am grateful for that. I am also grateful to the faculty who brought enthusiasm and a sincere passion for teaching. Overall, I thought it was a great program with a lot of focus on skills, whi... |  |

Number of daily responses

| Number of responses without dates: 1 |  |

Number of responses without dates: 1
Appendix I: Descriptions of Centers and Institutes Listed on Pages 28-29

**Center for Urban Science Progress**
cusp.nyu.edu/
The Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP) is a public-private research center that uses New York City as its laboratory and classroom to help cities around the world become more productive, livable, equitable, and resilient. CUSP observes, analyzes, and models cities to optimize outcomes, prototype new solutions, formalize new tools and processes, and develop new expertise/experts. These activities will make CUSP the world’s leading authority in the emerging field of “Urban Informatics.” The Center for Urban Science and Progress aims to unite two extraordinarily profound developments in human history in order to improve the lives of citizens around the globe: the digital revolution, 90% of the world’s data has been created in the last two years alone and global urbanization, for the first time in history, more than half of the world’s population lives in urban areas. CUSP will instrument New York City and use existing data from a network of agencies to transform the city into a living laboratory and classroom. It will make sense of the vast amount of data it collects to help cities around the world become more productive, more livable, more equitable, and more resilient. In addition to its research activities, CUSP will sponsor educational programs such as a master’s degree and an advanced certificate.

**Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy**
furmancenter.org/
The Furman Center is a joint research center of the New York University School of Law and the New York University Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. The Center is named in honor of NYU Law alumnus Jay Furman, class of ‘71, who is a member of both the NYU School of Law Foundation Board of Trustees and the NYU Board of Trustees, and an international real estate investor and developer. Over the past 15 years, the Furman Center has been committed to the highest standards of interdisciplinary empirical and legal research about housing, land use, real estate, and urban affairs. The Center is dedicated to the following three missions:

- **Providing objective academic and empirical research** on the legal and public policy issues involving land use, real estate, housing and urban affairs in the United States, with a particular focus on New York City;
- **Promoting frank and productive discussions** among elected and appointed officials, leaders of the real estate industry, leaders of non-profit housing and community

---

1 These descriptions are borrowed from the websites of the various centers and institutes.
development organizations, scholars, faculty and students about critical issues in land use, real estate and urban policy;

- Presenting essential data and analysis about the state of New York City’s housing and neighborhoods to all those involved in land use, real estate development, community economic development, housing, urban economics and urban policy. The Furman Center manages several websites that help disseminate information on New York City’s housing and neighborhoods to the public.

Since its founding in 1995, the Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy has become a leading academic research center devoted to the public policy aspects of land use, real estate development and housing. The Furman Center is directed by Vicki Been, the Boxer Family Professor of Law. Ingrid Gould Ellen, Professor of Public Policy and Urban Planning, is the Co-Director of the Center. More than 15 faculty from the Law School, the Wagner School, and NYU’s Faculty of Arts and Sciences are involved in the Center’s work.

**Guarini Center for Environmental and Land Use law**

[law.nyu.edu/centers/elc/index.htm](http://law.nyu.edu/centers/elc/index.htm)
The Frank J. Guarini Center on Environmental and Land Use Law, named for the Hon. Frank J. Guarini ’50 (L.L.M.’55), a former member of Congress who advanced progressive environmental legislation, works to advance policy-relevant inquiry and writing and develop and implement innovative market and regulatory solutions for environmental, climate and energy issues at the city, state, national, and global level. The Center is the focal point for faculty and student activities in environmental and land use law. It promotes legal research and policy problem-solving through collaborative work by faculty, students, and research fellows. The Center sponsors conferences and publications on cutting-edge topics in environmental law.

**Institute for Education and Social Policy**

[steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/](http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/iesp/)
The Institute for Education and Social Policy (IESP) conducts non-partisan scientific research about U.S. education and related social policy issues to help inform educational institutions and policymakers about the effectiveness of instructional programs, the impact of school reform initiatives and the relationships between academic achievement, school finance and socio-economic and demographic factors such as poverty, ethnicity and immigration status. Faculty, research staff and doctoral students at IESP share an interest and commitment to educational improvement. Current research topics include school finance, education of poor, non-white and immigrant students, small schools, after school programs, school accountability, teacher labor markets, school reform, and relationships among schools, neighborhoods and the health, housing and work patterns of communities. IESP hosts conferences and seminars that explore current issues in educational research or related areas and that help disseminate research findings with immediate policy relevance. IESP specializes in quantitative analyses of large administrative and national databases, evaluations of important education innovations and
interventions, longitudinal studies of changes over time that combine data from disparate sources, and purposeful use of qualitative methods to promote knowledge of important but difficult to measure attributes such as leadership and context. IESP researchers are trained in econometrics, evaluation methodology, qualitative methods, and survey design; they are skilled communicators to both academic and practitioner audiences. IESP, a part of the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education, and Human Development, was founded in 1995 as a partnership between Steinhardt, the Robert F. Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Institute for Policy Integrity
policyintegrity.org/
The Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University’s School of Law was founded in 2008. With a focus on economics and administrative law, it works with organizations to erase bias from the process of judging regulations and pave the way for stronger protections. When done correctly, the numbers often support strong government protections for important issues like the environment, health and safety, and consumer protection. But too often, cost-benefit analysis has been used in a biased fashion, leading to deregulation or watered down rules. This imbalance should be reset to produce unbiased analyses that can show what some have been trying to hide: smart government protections are often cost-benefit justified. Policy Integrity can help groups use economics to reach their advocacy goals. The tension between advocacy and cost-benefit analysis has real world consequences. Advocacy groups can use cost-benefit analysis as a powerful tool to promote their causes. Working with a range of advocacy organizations, the Institute has helped organizations use cost-benefit analysis and economics to address issues like toxic coal ash storage, dirty heating oil in New York City, climate change, and net neutrality protections on the Internet. Through the Institute, it is ensured that the economic discussion is not dominated by one side of the debate.

Institute for Public Knowledge
ipk.nyu.edu/
The Institute for Public Knowledge (IPK) brings theoretically serious scholarship to bear on major public issues. Located at NYU, it nurtures collaboration among social researchers in New York and around the world. It builds bridges between university-based researchers and organizations pursuing practical action. It supports communication between researchers and broader publics. And it examines transformations in the public sphere, social science, and the university as a social institution as these change the conditions for public knowledge. The Institute was established in 2007 by the President and Provost of New York University as an interdisciplinary, University-wide social science research institute. Since September 2012, IPK has been directed by Eric Klinenberg, professor of sociology and author of the acclaimed books Heat Wave, Fighting for Air, and Going Solo. As an example of its activities, IPK began investigating what happened during Superstorm Sandy as the storm waters receded in
November 2012. It established the Superstorm Sandy Research Initiative, including the Superstorm Research Lab, a group of faculty and doctoral students who combed through the city to observe and record the immediate aftermath of the disaster as well as the rebuilding process. IPK also organized the public forum series on Sandy, “Climate Change, and the Future of New York City,” a set of eight events through the winter and spring of 2013 that brought together faculty and members of the public to discuss issues including housing, infrastructure, security, and climate change.

**Marron Institute on Cities and the Urban Environment**
marroninstitute.nyu.edu/

New York University’s Marron Institute on Cities and the Urban Environment is an interdisciplinary and international effort to advance vital new research and teaching on cities and the urban environment. As the world rapidly urbanizes, the urban environment is fundamental to our global future: cities are central to climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts; they are laboratories for new models of governance, planning and innovation; and they represent diverse societies grappling with questions of equity, inclusion and opportunity. Launched in February 2013, the Marron Institute was developed to explore these intersecting issues through an unprecedented University-wide lens—bringing together the social sciences, natural sciences, humanities, and professional schools to sponsor significant interdisciplinary research, develop new curricular initiatives, provide a vibrant academic community for scholars and students, and help cities around the world become more livable, sustainable, and equitable.

**McSilver Institute for Poverty Policy and Research**
mcsilver.org/

The McSilver Institute for Poverty Policy and Research conducts, promotes, and disseminates interdisciplinary applied research with the purpose of better understanding poverty in New York City and developing practices to address root causes of, effects of, and responses to poverty. Drawing on intellectual and scholarly strengths of New York University and located within the Silver School of Social Work, the Institute partners with New York based agencies and communities to develop research projects and policy/advocacy recommendations that have short- and long-term social impact.

**Metro Center on Urban Education**
steinhardt.nyu.edu/metrocenter/

The Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools (Metro Center) is a comprehensive, University-based center that focuses on educational research, policy, and practice. It is a partner and resource at the local and national levels in strengthening and improving access, opportunity, and the quality of education in schools. Its mission is to target issues related to educational equity by providing leadership and support to students,
parents, teachers, administrators, and policy makers. For 35 years, the Metro Center has been a transformational force inspiring positive change in schools, districts, and regions across the country. The Metro Center is powerfully focused on driving equity and access in urban, suburban, and rural school settings - especially when confronting issues of race, gender, and national origin. Its comprehensive programs serve a wide range of constituencies - more than 5,000 classroom staff impacting 125,000 students, as well as 2,800 parents and 61 agencies, schools, and school districts.

**Rudin Center for Transportation Policy**

wagner.nyu.edu/rudincenter/

The Rudin Center for Transportation Policy and Management at NYU’s Wagner Graduate School of Public Service aims to strengthen understanding of all modes of transportation through research, public forums, and educational programs. The Center draws upon faculty, students, and visiting scholars at NYU. Current areas of inquiry include:

- The flow of people, goods and information in and through New York City
- The impact of information technology on transportation systems
- New approaches to financing infrastructure
- Aviation and economic development
- Mobility and the mind

**Urbanization Project**

urbanizationproject.org

The NYU Urbanization Project, in the Stern School of Business consists of several initiatives. The Urban Expansion initiative works with cities to make room for their rapid growth. The initiative is based on evidence that mayors and civic officials can make minimal preparations to shape cities that are vibrant, inclusive, and affordable. The Charter Cities initiative focuses on the potential for startup cities to fast track reform. By building new cities in special zones, countries can leverage the 21st century’s unprecedented scale of urban growth, generating new options for reform-minded leaders and new choices for families in search of better places to live and work. In addition, there are labs that serve to incubate new ideas at the Urbanization Project. New cities and urban expansion are the ways to accommodate billions of new urban residents. Labs explore applied research projects that have the potential trigger new initiatives or generate new insights for urban leaders and residents.
The Center for Urban Science and Progress  
Steven E. Koonin

On April 23, 2012, New York City and New York University announced the inauguration of the Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP). This paper describes the rationale and vision for CUSP, its initial structure and operations, and the issues arising in bringing the organization into being.

I. CUSP rationale and vision

I.1 Cities and data

CUSP is about the intersection of two simple but compelling themes: “cities” and “data”.

The rationale for cities can be stated succinctly – “it’s where the people are.” About half of humanity lives in urban environments today and that number will grow to 80% by the middle of this century; North America is already 80% in cities, rising to 90% by 2050. Cities are thus the loci of resource consumption, of economic activity, and of innovation; they are the cause of our looming sustainability problems but also where those problems must be solved. Cities have to be efficient, they have to be resilient, they have to be sustainable, and must address quality of life issues for their citizens. And any given city must be as good as it can be in the global competition for talent and capital.

The rationale for “data” is similarly compelling. Our ability to collect, transmit, store, and analyze data is growing rapidly (Fig. 2). If properly acquired, integrated, and analyzed, “big data” can take us beyond today’s imperfect and often anecdotal
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1 CUSP Founding Director; Professor of Information, Operations & Management Sciences, NYU Stern School of Business; and Professor of Civil and Urban Engineering, NYU-Poly
understanding of cities to enable better operations, better planning, and better policy. Putting urban data in the hands of citizens can improve governance and participation; in the hands of entrepreneurs and corporations it will lead to new products and services for governments, firms, and consumers. In short, it is now not a fantasy to ask “if you could know anything about a city, what do you want to know” and to ponder what could be done with that information.

**Figure 2:** Exponential growth of network traffic

![Exponential growth of network traffic](image)

To think about the “know anything” question, it is useful to realize that cities deliver services (shelter, safety, security, health, food, water, waste, energy, mobility, ...) to their citizens through infrastructure and through processes. We want to know how those systems operate, how they interact, and how they can be optimized. There are three classes of data to be acquired:

- **The Infrastructure:** We need to know the condition of the infrastructure (e.g., Are the bridge joints corroding?, Where are the leaky pipes?) and the operation of the infrastructure (e.g., How is traffic flowing?, Is the electrical grid balanced?).
- **The Environment:** We need to understand not only the usual meteorological variables but also the pollution and noise that people experience day to day.
- **The People:** Cities are built by and for people and so cannot be understood without studying the people: their location, health, economic activities, how they communicate, their opinions, etc. Privacy and data access are thus very important.
considerations in studying cities.

I.2 Interested parties

Achieving a synthetic data-driven understanding of a city will be of interest to four classes of people:

- **The government:** State and local governments seek to deliver services more efficiently, to set better policies, to better plan infrastructure improvements. The federal government is interested for many of the same reasons, but also to fulfill its obligation to produce accurate national statistics. And citizens are interested in urban data to ensure government transparency and accountability, as well as enhance the government’s opportunities to improve their urban living.

- **The private sector:** Retail, advertising, insurance (to better stratify risk), finance (to guide investments and detect fraud), real estate, entertainment, and political campaigns have all been moving to acquire, aggregate, and analyze large amounts of societal data to improve their performance.

- **The security organizations:** Within the U.S., local and national law enforcement and the Department of Homeland Security strive to understand what’s going on in society, as does the intelligence community abroad. While these organizations are largely interested in identifying individual bad actors rather than broad behavioral trends, the technologies and methodologies are common to other uses.

- **The social scientists:** The data paradigm of social science typically involves well-designed surveys and experiments, both qualitative and quantitative. This involves clean data from comparatively small samples that can be complemented by large volumes of imperfect data, if sampling errors, coverage errors, and biases can be accounted for. Such data can yield new insights into human behavior and social norms, giving a sense of the “pulse of the city.”

A preliminary analysis\(^2\) of New York City taxi data illustrates what can be done. The Taxi and Limousine Commission provided the GPS-derived start and stop times and locations, as well as the fare and tip, for each of the roughly 180 million taxi trips during 2011. The clustering of start and stop locations (left) and the weekly rhythm of activity (right), punctuated by unusual events, gives novel insight into this urban system.

\(^{2}\) L. Lins, F. Chirigati, N. Ferreira, C. Silva and J. Freire - NYU Poly (unpublished)
I.3 Urban data sources

Traditional sources are census data and the administrative records the city uses to do its business (permits, tax records, public health data, land use, etc.) However, operational data such as traffic and transit flows, utility supply and consumption, economic, and communications records also exist, although may be difficult to access and aggregate for proprietary and/or privacy reasons.

New technologies provide new opportunities for sensors to acquire data. Beyond fixed *in situ* sensors to record light, temperature, pollution, etc., personal sensors that record location, activity, and physiology are becoming available. Potential internet data sources include Twitter feeds, social media, blogs, and news articles. Crowd-sourced sensing of the environment and infrastructure via mobile phones is also becoming feasible. And there is a proliferation of video cameras and RFID technology at chokepoints or portals for pedestrians and vehicles, essentially none of which is analyzed for purposes other than forensics or revenue.

Some US sensor statistics

- 300 million mobile phones; 494,151 cell towers
- Approximately 400,000 ATMs record video of all transactions
- 30 million commercial surveillance cameras
- 4,214 red-light cameras; 761 speed-trap cameras
- A third of large police forces equip patrol cars with automatic license plate-readers that can check 1,000 plates per minute


Remote sensing also offers new possibilities. While transient remote sensing from satellites or aircraft is well-known, persistent remote sensing from urban vantage points is an intriguing possibility. Instrumentation on a tall building in an urban center can “see,” modulo shadowing, some 1,000,000 people within a 10 km radius, without the mass, volume, power, or data rate constraints of airborne platforms. Visible, infrared, hyperspectral, and radar imagery are all phenomenologies to be explored for urban scenes, as is Light Detection and Ranging (LIDAR).
Two images suggestive of what might be possible are shown in Fig. 4. On the left is a low-quality (1 Mpixel) ordinary image looking south from the Empire State Building. Several tens of thousands of lights are visible, most of them stationary, whose dynamics carry information about urban systems. The image on the right is of lower Manhattan as seen in the infrared, so that it depicts heat rather than light. The building on the almost far left shows differences in the heat escaping individual suites, either because of thermostat settings or insulation, or both. The peculiar pattern of the building in the middle stems from a data center on the lower floor and its vents on the roof.

In both of these images, a single sensor covers a great deal. The synoptic and persistent coverage of such modalities, together with their relatively easy and low-cost operation, may offer a useful complement to *in situ* sensing.

**I.4 How will the data be used?**

Large urban datasets will be used in several different ways. One of the simplest is identification of unusual data or outliers. The distribution of observations of any given variable over a population may reasonably be expected to
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be unimodal, although not necessarily normal. Large statistics, and control of systematic
trends, allows for clear identification of outliers in such a distribution, which can then be
investigated in more detail.

An example is the energy use data from large buildings in NYC, shown in Fig. 5. The weather-normalized energy use intensity (annual kBtu/sq ft) of multifamily residential units is nominally normal, while that for office buildings show a “fat tail” on
the high side, with the most inefficient buildings consuming energy at more than 5 times
the rate of the most efficient. Investigation of the causes of such differences is clearly of
interest (Data errors? Differences in occupancy? In activity? In construction? In building
operation?).

Large datasets will also be used to corroborate and evaluate simulations. As
discussed in Section III.1.c below, an important tool and product of urban informatics
will be high-resolution agent-based simulations integrating mobility, land use, energy,
health, economics, communications, etc. Large datasets will be essential to constructing,
validating, and improving such simulations. It remains to be investigated what
observations these simulations need to reproduce with what fidelity for a given purpose.

The value of any large urban dataset is enhanced through its association with other
data. Observations are linked through location and time, as well as through entity
(person, firm, vehicle, structure). The power of such linkage in producing new
information is significant. For example, knowing an individual’s ZIP code localizes that
data to 1 in 30,000 (the average population of a ZIP code). Linking a ZIP code with a
birthdate reduces the pool to approximately one in 80, while further connecting gender
and year-of-birth are sufficient, on average, to uniquely specify an individual.

In addition to data linkage, correlation analyses will be useful in constructing and
validating behavioral proxies. For example, demonstrating that infrared images are well-
correlated with building energy consumption in a small subset of buildings for which the
latter are known directly (e.g., through utility records) would allow accurate measurement
of energy consumption for a much broader set of buildings through synoptic IR imaging.

I.5 Applications of urban data

There will be many applications of CUSP’s data, analysis, and modeling to improve
the City:

- To optimize operations of those urban systems that can be monitored and
  managed in real time (traffic and transit flows, gas/water/electrical grid, services
delivery such as EMS, …)
- To monitor the condition of infrastructure such as joint corrosion in bridges,
potholes in streets, leaks in pipes, insulation in buildings
- To better plan new infrastructure such as zoning, public transit routes, and utility
distribution systems
- To improve regulatory compliance by targeting “nudges” and more efficiently

---

3 D. Hsu and C. Kontokosta, NYC Local Law 84 Benchmarking Report, 2012
allocating scarce enforcement resources
• To monitor public health, including nutrition, the spread of infectious diseases, and the health impacts of environmental conditions
• To manage abnormal conditions, including hazard detection, emergency preparations, and emergency response
• To monitor/predict the effects of natural and deliberate policy experiments
• To better inform the citizenry of the need for, and delivery of, city services

II. About CUSP

CUSP is part of the Applied Sciences NYC initiative. In December 2010, Mayor Bloomberg announced a competition to bring more science and engineering activity to the city. The first winner of that competition was Cornell-Technion, who won the right to build a campus on Roosevelt Island. CUSP was the second winner, announced April, 2012 (Figure 6.)

II.1 The CUSP partnership

CUSP will draw its research strength from an extraordinary consortium — leading institutions of higher learning, leaders in the tech industry, and leaders in public service — that individually rank among the most prominent in their sectors, but together form an unsurpassed whole.

The academic partners are:
• Carnegie Mellon University
• University of Toronto
• University of Warwick, UK
• City University of New York
• Indian Institute of Technology, Bombay
The major industrial partners are:
- IBM
- Microsoft
- Xerox

with participation also from:
- Consolidated Edison
- National Grid
- Lutron
- Siemens

and lesser participation from:
- Arup
- IDEO
- AECOM

The participation of four of the Department of Energy’s National Laboratories brings a unique set of capabilities:
- Lawrence Livermore
- Los Alamos
- Sandia
- Brookhaven

CUSP’s government partners are thirteen of the agencies in City government together with the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the Port Authority:
- Department of Transportation
- Department of Buildings
- Department of Sanitation
- Department of Citywide Administrative Services
- Department of Design and Construction
- Department of City Planning
- Department of Health and Mental Hygiene
- Department of Environmental Protection
- Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications
- Department of Parks and Recreation
- Police Department of NYC
- NYC Fire Department

CUSP’s diverse partners bring to the enterprise, in varying proportions, hardware and software capabilities, faculty and staff, students, data, and financial resources.

II.2 The CUSP vision

CUSP’s vision statement is as follows:

*The Center for Urban Science and Progress (CUSP) is a unique public-private research center that uses New York City as its laboratory and classroom to help cities around the world become more productive, livable, equitable, and resilient. CUSP observes, analyzes, and models cities to optimize outcomes, prototype new solutions, formalize new tools and processes, and develop new expertise/experts.*
These activities will make CUSP the world’s leading authority in the emerging field of “Urban Informatics.”

Thus, CUSP is not only about research and education, but also about real demonstrations of new tools and new solutions.

CUSP’s focus on data, as opposed to more physical forms of engineering, is motivated by several considerations:

• **“Data” underpins the solutions to urban problems:** It is impossible to judge the efficacy of steps to improve a city without well-defined metrics and baselines. Further, the needs and specifications for physical innovation must be informed by data.

• **“Data” is unifying across domains and disciplines:** Data is the common language through which CUSP can convene diverse expertise. It joins stovepipes, particularly connecting the social sciences to engineering and the physical sciences.

• **Informatics is among the most rapidly moving of technical areas:** Few other technologies show the exponential (Moore’s Law) progress that informatics continues to enjoy.

• **“Data” offers ample white space:** There are many candidates for pioneering basic research and applications of data to urban challenges.

• **The “informatics overlay” has the greatest potential short and mid-term impact:** While the physical infrastructure of a city can take decades to change materially, the overlay of the Sense-Model-Intervene paradigm on the operations of the existing infrastructure can produce efficiencies much more rapidly.

• **“Data” research is more cost-effective than physical research:** Data-only research is far less capital-intensive than physical activities, which require expensive specialized laboratories. Better understanding of urban systems and needs will undoubtedly inform new lines of physical research (e.g., materials, structures), which can be pursued by CUSP’s partner institutions.

**II.3 CUSP’s scale**

CUSP is being built from scratch. At the end of March, 2013, there were 20 people in the organization, of whom 5 were faculty. The Center is expected to grow rapidly in the coming decade to some 50 full-time senior researchers on site (roughly 30 faculty and 20 industrial staff), 30 post-docs, 430 masters students, and 100 PhD students.

CUSP’s headquarters are in downtown Brooklyn. In February, 2013, the Center moved into 26,000 square feet of leased space on the 19th floor of One MetroTech (Fig. 7). Additional leased space will be occupied as CUSP grows over the next five years, whereupon it will move across the street into 150,000 square feet of a newly renovated 370 Jay Street (the old subway headquarters building).

At full strength, CUSP’s annual budget is projected to be some $70 million, derived
from a combination of federal, state, and City agency funding, corporate partner support, philanthropic donations, tuition, and other NYU funds.

Figure 7: Plan of the initial CUSP space in 1 MetroTech in Brooklyn.

III. CUSP’s activities

Success in CUSP’s research, demonstration, and education programs requires careful thought as to how to best marshal the resources of NYU and its partners. The number, nature, and coordination of its senior researchers; the core capabilities that need to be nurtured; and the physical or intellectual infrastructures that need to be created are all important considerations. Figure 8 illustrates how to think about these matters.

CUSP will have a set of senior researchers (faculty or staff and the students and postdocs who work for them) who span the core disciplines of urban informatics. These include the acquisition of data (whether through organic data flows, web and new media feeds, mobile phones, or new sensors), the curation and integration of diverse data sets (including Geographical Information Systems technologies and data visualization), and various forms of data mining and modeling. Motivated by CUSP applications, these researchers will extend the frontiers of these disciplines and educate/mentor students and postdocs in them. A second set of researchers will be those who know the urban systems, including transportation, health, utilities, buildings, etc.

Projects will draw upon both disciplinary and domain researchers to address particular urban challenges. Some of these will be large, strongly managed activities with defined scope/schedule/budget executed with the participation of multiple corporate partners and the City. At the other extreme may be a student-initiated project involving one or two people creating a consumer app drawing upon particular datasets.
Interactions with the community and with the social and behavioral sciences are other important dimensions of CUSP activities, as detailed in the following section.

![CUSP research program structure](image)

**Figure 8: Structure of the CUSP research program.**

### III.1 CUSP core capabilities and facilities

To be more than a job shop, CUSP must house, sustain, and nurture a set of core capabilities and facilities in urban informatics. Some of these will be physical, others will be software, and some will be intellectual.

#### III.1.a Data capabilities

The skills to acquire, organize, and integrate large heterogenous datasets will be central to CUSP’s function. CUSP itself will not develop new physical sensors, but can provide testbeds for those developed by others. Datasets must be well-characterized and interoperable with clearly documented provenance and registered in space/time. This latter requires a 3-dimensional urban GIS capability. The ability to visualize large, complex datasets will also be crucial.

With respect to the data itself, many NYC datasets are posted on the City’s open data website, [https://nycopendata.socrata.com/](https://nycopendata.socrata.com/). However, the roughly 1,000 datasets listed show great variability in their data quality, currency, and completeness. CUSP intends to clean the most important of these datasets, making them interoperable and available to the general public. This will build an important part of CUSP’s infrastructure while also helping the City get its own house better in order.
III.1.b Urban Observatory

CUSP will create a platform for the demonstration and exploitation of various synoptic sensing technologies in urban settings. The accessibility of diverse urban scenes and activities, together with various “ground truths,” will allow an exploration of the phenomenology and utility of various sensor modalities, particularly when intercorrelated and/or combined with correlative data. Among the likely uses for observatory data are to improve building energy efficiency, to detect releases of hazardous material, to track pollution plumes, and to aid post-blackout restoration of electrical power.

CUSP’s Urban Observatory

- An urban vantage point (top of a large building) offering unrestricted views of diverse urban scenes (e.g., simultaneously lower Manhattan and residential Brooklyn), personnel access, stable mechanical support, protection from the elements, electrical power, and a high-speed data connection
- A number of proven or experimental sensors, including:
  - Photometric and colorimetric optical imaging
  - Broad-band IR imaging (SWIR, MWIR, and thermal)
  - Hyperspectral imaging (trace gases)
  - LIDAR (building motions, pollution)
  - Radar (building and street vibrations, building motion, traffic flow)
- Correlative data on the urban scenes
  - Meteorology (temperature, winds, visibility), both at the observatory and in situ
  - Detailed description of the scene geometry (distances, directions, and identities of structures and streets visible)
  - Parcel and land use data, building characteristics and type (size, age, number of stories, etc.), building utility consumptions, and real estate valuation data
  - Location and nature of major stationary pollution sources and in situ pollution data
  - In situ vehicle and pedestrian traffic information for the streets visible
  - Demographic and economic data
- Software for archiving, processing, and analyzing data acquired
  - Image processing chains
  - Data warehouse, GIS, Visualization tools
  - Software and procedures to enhance privacy protection
- Personnel and funding to create and operate the above

III.1.c Modeling and simulation

The understanding derived from CUSP’s data activities will be embodied in part through modeling of urban systems. Such modeling, if predictive, can aid in real-time systems management, in planning infrastructure improvements, and in exploring the impacts of policies. While reduced models will no doubt be developed (and be useful) for many applications, ideally modeling will be integrated, high-resolution, validated, and high-fidelity.
Physical systems are traditionally modeled through ordinary or partial differential equations whose form and parameters are determined semi-empirically. But the behavioral aspects of urban systems are likely better described by different models such as statistical and agent-based models. Such models have long found application in traffic simulations, and have been extended to include the much slower dynamics of land use. They have also found application in correlating real time meteorological data, such as air quality, with health incidents. A truly integrated model would augment traffic and land use with communications economics, energy, environment, health, etc.

“Atomic resolution” simulations of the 20 million people in the NYC metropolitan area are well within modern high-performance computing capabilities. Determining the decision rules in such simulations and knowing what constitutes “validation” in such a multi-dimensional system is a familiar, and fundamental, challenge in computational science. CUSP’s large datasets should be helpful here.

III.1.d Citizen Science

The new technologies that enable the CUSP vision also enable broad citizen participation in CUSP activities. Indeed, the study of the urban environment is particularly attractive to those who experience it daily. Citizens can participate actively in data acquisition through personal sensors and crowd sourcing, or in data analysis through donation of computational cycles, or crowd-sourced pattern recognition.

Citizen science can be an important (or even sole) component of many CUSP projects. For that reason, CUSP must cultivate core citizen science capabilities, including citizen engagement and enrollment, app creation, and crowd-sourced data management. CUSP will also seek to entrain the vibrant NYC hacker and maker communities.

III.1.e Quantified Community

CUSP is exploring the full instrumentation of a section of the city. Notionally, this “quantified community” of some 10,000 people might involve a new development or a 20-block radius around CUSP headquarters in downtown Brooklyn. Important questions are “What data would be acquired by what means?”, “What benefits would accrue to the researchers and to the community?”, and “How can the community be engaged to ensure that privacy and ‘opt out’ can be guaranteed even as useful data is acquired and analyzed?”

III.1.f Connection with the Social and Behavioral Sciences

CUSP is focused on the study of urban informatics – the collection, integration, and analysis to improve urban systems. The social and behavioral sciences are an important informant for CUSP activities - people are the customers and operators of urban systems, so that understanding them and their behavior is essential to the CUSP mission. Conversely, CUSP’s large, multi-modal data sets could revolutionize the social and behavioral sciences. Indeed, at this fertile intersection, the greatest challenge is to formulate the correct questions.

Close interaction between the urban informatics and social and behavioral science
disciplines will be a CUSP hallmark. This collaboration will be able to build on the emerging activity in computational social sciences and digital humanities. CUSP will actively engage economists, sociologists, demographers, anthropologists, political scientists, historians, linguists, and philosophers in formulating the important questions and in the development of the data and models to inform those questions. These researchers will be among the primary users of CUSP data and analyses.

The notion of data “users” is not unfamiliar in the physical sciences (such as astronomy). A caricature for CUSP would be that social scientists would bring their questions, CUSP researchers would figure out how to acquire the data, and the social scientists would analyze (perhaps with CUSP help) and interpret. Social scientists may also be project team members as appropriate, drawn from NYU and Partner faculty and staff.

III.1.g Technology Transfer

CUSP is expected, through its research and educational programs, to devise and demonstrate new technologies for improving cities. To be impactful, these technologies need to be commercialized and diffused by the private sector. That diffusion will happen both through CUSP’s large corporate partners and through entrepreneurial startups that CUSP may spawn.

It is important that CUSP have the culture and mechanisms to foster the commercialization of the technologies it produces. The organization for doing so may be organic or reside in the broader NYU.

III.1.h Relationship with government agencies

The CUSP vision requires that the Center’s work be not only relevant to urban problems, but also impactful. This latter means that beyond demonstration of technologies for acquiring, integrating and analyzing data, CUSP must understand how to best promote the adoption by city agencies, particularly those in New York City. A working knowledge of those agencies, finance, regulation, and policy formulation is therefore also important to CUSP’s mission.

CUSP has been created with a special relationship to many government agencies responsible for New York City. That relationship should facilitate moving CUSP’s work from relevant toward impactful. Within CUSP and its partners, it will also be important to have people knowledgeable and experienced in promoting technical change in government agencies.

III.2 CUSP projects

CUSP is expected to execute a diverse set of projects of many different scales. Of particular importance will be the initial set of a few large projects executed in partnership with the City and/or the industrial partners. Direct impact on the City government and/or its citizens on a few-year timescale is highly desirable to demonstrate that CUSP can achieve something and to build support for the organization. For that reason, much
attention is being devoted to defining and choosing that initial set. After a canvass of the government and industrial partners, several projects are being further defined in the early months of 2013. Among these are:

- **Noise** is one of the more vexing aspects of urban life, with likely health impacts as well; the largest fraction of NYC 311 calls are noise-related. Surprisingly, little has been done to measure noise (e.g., defining ambient as a function of space/time), characterize noise (traffic vs. HVAC vs. construction vs. wind) or use that information to mitigate noise impacts. A mix of 311 call analysis and stationary and mobile *in situ* sensing would enable data acquisition for subsequent analysis. Results will be of interest to the real estate, public health, and law enforcement communities.

- **Building efficiency** offers numerous opportunities for economic and sustainability gains. A combination of self-reporting, synoptic sensing, and comparative analysis using correlative data should help identify and quantify particular opportunities of interest to the real estate, utility, financial, and environmental communities.

- Oil-fired heating of buildings is a major contributor to **particulate pollution**. Synoptic and advanced *in situ* sensing may allow real-time tracking and public display of the resultant building plumes, which would be a major impetus to their reduction.

- Data relevant to **public health** can be sensed in novel ways, including environmental microbial and small-molecule analyses, as well as the permissive monitoring of activity and nutrition.

- There have been some demonstrations of **improving city resource allocation** through multi-data correlations. Many more opportunities exist.

Because diverse projects will rely on common CUSP infrastructure and perhaps common personnel, CUSP will build, during its initial years, a body of data, knowledge, and practice that will gradually lead to an integrated view of urban systems, as illustrated below.
Toward an integrated view of the city

III.3 CUSP educational programs

CUSP has defined and secured NYU and New York State approvals for a one-year MS program in Applied Urban Science and Informatics. A less-extensive certificate option is also available. These programs are being advertised (see http://cusp.nyu.edu) and a class of some 50 students is expected to begin instruction August 2013.

Following the structure portrayed in Figure 8, the CUSP curriculum combines instruction in the informatics disciplines with that in urban domains; “softer skills” in governance, organizational change, finance, leadership, and entrepreneurship are also covered. This structured work is combined with a strong project component, which may be team membership in a large project or small-group work on an entrepreneurial idea based upon urban informatics. The following years are expected to see the introduction of a PhD program in urban systems, various executive education programs, and joint degrees. Distance learning technologies figure prominently in CUSP thinking.
CUSP expects to train people who are either now in, or who will come to know, the government agencies and know how to apply informatics techniques to urban problems. We expect that they will find employment urban government, both in New York City and elsewhere around the world, in the corporations who support those governments, and in startups and NGOs who deal with urban issues, with data, or both.

IV. Issues arising

IV.1 Organizational design choices

CUSP is a complex and ambitious undertaking in a nascent field, Urban Informatics. To maximize the probability of success, careful thought is being given to the scope, structure, and character of the organization, both in its initial form and likely subsequent evolution. Balances need to be struck in several different dimensions:

- There are diverse stakeholders with diverse interests. The academic stakeholders are primarily motivated to advance research and education, the industrial partners are primarily interested in producing commercially-relevant products and people, and the City would like to see economic impact and tangible impact on government or citizens. Even within the Academy, there is a need to strike a four-way balance: basic sciences vs engineering and technology vs social sciences vs leadership and entrepreneurial skills.
• Within the research program, a balance needs to be struck between domains vs. disciplines, and between Research and Development vs. Demonstrations (i.e., Projects). Choices between long-term and short-term work also need to be made.

• Even CUSP’s scope needs to be determined: the balance between NYC proper versus the region (e.g., beyond the obvious interdependencies of the City with its suburbs, the City’s water supply extends several hundred miles upstate), the balance of focus on NYC vs other US cities vs international cities, and the focus on the retrofit of existing cities vs the design of new-build cities.

• The location of activity at CUSP proper vs at Partner institutions.

The responses to all of these choices cannot be black and white and will undoubtedly change as the organization matures. But the need to instill a mission-driven culture combining multiple disciplines (“sensors to sociologists”) and to tangibly demonstrate impact on CUSP’s principal sponsor suggests an initial concentration on and in NYC, with initial activities tilting toward the shorter-term.

IV.2 Data access and privacy

CUSP’s aspiration to “know everything” about a city naturally raises concerns about data access generally and about personal privacy in particular. Reasons for restricting data access include the proprietary nature of certain datasets and/or algorithms. The need to protect data on critical infrastructure and its operation is also a concern. And finally, perhaps most problematically, are issues associated with personal privacy.

Privacy is a structural issue for CUSP – cities are built by and for their inhabitants and so cannot be studied without studying people at some level. CUSP therefore squarely comes up against many of the “big data + privacy” issues that are much discussed with respect to government and private-sector activities. Fortunately, there are a number of mitigating factors and steps that can be taken to manage the tension between personal privacy and urban informatics.

CUSP will take simple organizational and procedural steps to ensure appropriate data access. Most important has been the appointment of a Chief Data Officer, reporting directly to the Director, with the responsibility of providing a knowledgeable perspective on data access issues. There will also be an independent data access advisory committee with academic and community representation. Education in data ethics is planned for all CUSP students and researchers. Access restriction and monitoring through authorization criteria and procedures, as well as automatic activity logging, are also planned.

There are also technical measures that can be taken to enhance privacy. Degradation of resolution or granularity, synthetic data, and multi-level access controls are among the tools that can be explored here. It is also important to realize that privacy norms and expectations are changing with generations and that some people are willing to provide their data if they can see a personal or societal benefit, as exemplified by social networks, credit card fraud detection services, and smart phone location services.

Finally, we don’t really know yet what the optimal level of privacy is for studies of interest. For example, as the resolution moves from the individual home to a building to
a block to a neighborhood, the anonymity clearly increases, yet the ability to stratify the data decreases. It may be that, for many purposes, resolution at the neighborhood level is sufficient.

Modern technologies enable the collection, integration, and analysis of personally relevant data and such activities are being undertaken in both the government and the private sector. These activities bring significant benefit, but also carry the potential for abuse. CUSP aspires to lead an informed and balanced conversation in this area and to be a leader in the development and practice of data privacy measures.

**IV.3 Measures of success**

In defining a new center, it is important to have some sense of what success would look like in 5 – 10 years. For CUSP, those goals would include:

- **Define and elaborate “Urban Science.”** The field is nascent and quite amorphous at present. What are its subjects of study? Its goals? Are there principles (or at least best practices) that can be found in dealing with Urban Informatics? Are there new modes of sensing, of integrating data, of mining, modeling and simulation that can be developed? How effective can Urban Informatics be as a tool to improve a particular city? To compare different cities?

- **Establish a vibrant world-class center.** Through its research, researchers, and educational programs, CUSP should become the world center for urban informatics. Measures of that success will include the quality and stature of its senior personnel, scholarly publications, patents, technologies commercialized, conferences, and the ability to secure private and government funding. Response to hiring ads and the competitiveness of the admissions process are also indicators, as well as requests for institutional partnerships.

- **Train several hundred people in this new field.** The achievements, satisfaction, and placement of CUSP’s students will be measures of its educational success.

- **“Quick win” projects impacting the city and its citizens.** CUSP should have accomplished more than a few quick-win projects that demonstrate the power of Urban Informatics to measurably improve the quality of City government, its services, or the lives of its citizens.

- **Commercialization of CUSP technologies.** CUSP should develop and demonstrate technologies and methodologies that will see commercialization, either through startups or its large industrial partners.

- **Bring new tools to the social sciences.** CUSP should have fostered a dialogue about, and exemplified, the use of “big data” in the social sciences, offering tools that will advance economics, sociology, etc.
Appendix K: Focus Group Questions for Students

1. Why did you choose your area of concentration or major?

2. Does the curriculum offer you the chance to explore issues related to cities and the urban environment from different disciplinary perspectives? Is any particular discipline dominant?

3. What do you see as the university’s existing strengths in the area of cities and the urban environment?

4. What challenges or barriers do you see to the continuation or expansion of teaching related to cities and the urban environment at NYU?

5. How involved are you or your fellow students in faculty research related to cities and the urban environment?

6. What recommendations would you make to the university for improvement?
   a. Should the university launch a new undergraduate major in cities and the urban environment? Should it offer a minor that could be combined with other disciplinary concentrations?
   b. What might the university offer for graduate students?
   c. What more could be done to encourage faculty-student interaction related to urban issues?

7. Are there particular areas related to cities and the urban environment on which you believe the university should focus?
Appendix L: Provost’s Task Force on the Future of the Humanities at NYU

The NYU Humanities Initiative
Sparked by a request in 2004 from the American Council of Learned Societies, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the American Association of Universities, over the past year universities across the country have been holding roundtables, town meetings, and discussions to talk about “the state of the humanities” on university campuses. Here at NYU under the leadership of Edward Sullivan and Jane Tylus, various groups of humanities scholars and teachers have come together to discuss the humanities at NYU. These groups included faculty and administrators from FAS, Steinhardt, Gallatin, Tisch, GSP, Stern, and the Bobst Library. A smaller working group has emerged from these various meetings, which has met frequently this spring to identify common concerns and frustrations (easy to do) as well as proposed tentative “solutions” (less easy to do). Above all, we’ve learned a great deal from one another as to the differing forms that the “humanities” take at NYU. And we’ve pondered what it might mean should NYU decide to actively promote the humanities on campus by committing to a vision of humanities collaboration and education that we have spent this year articulating.

The untold story, we believe, and a story that is worth telling in the most compelling way possible, is that there is tremendous potential in the humanities at NYU which the university has yet to take advantage of in any systematic way. We boast a cutting-edge and highly-motivated faculty that has grown considerably in the last few years thanks to Partners and exciting new hires in schools such as Steinhardt. Over new 100 faculty in humanities programs and departments have joined NYU since 2002, many of them mid-career and senior faculty. Top programs and departments in the humanities at NYU range from philosophy and comparative literature to ethnomusicology and culture and communications, from the seminars in great books taught in General Studies to the innovative seminars of the Gallatin School of Individualized Studies and the John W. Draper Interdisciplinary Master’s Program in Humanities and Social Thought. Faculty in humanities regularly are the recipients of national awards such as Guggenheims, ACLS and NEH fellowships, and Fulbrights, and participate in humanities centers and courses across the country at Cornell, Stanford, UNC, the Folger and Newberry Libraries, and the New York Public Library. Our graduate students regularly take top jobs in their fields – this year’s Ph.D.s in humanities are heading to Harvard, Duke, and Berkeley, just to name a few – and like our faculty, win national awards for their research.

The excellence of NYU’s humanities faculty, students, and departments has yet to be recognized, or indeed, exploited at a university-wide level. For while we have many strengths as individual scholars, we have limited opportunities to collaborate in our teaching and research, as well as to share the results of our teaching and research. For this is a faculty keenly interested in pursuing creative teaching options, such as team-teaching with colleagues and graduate students, and designing ways to strengthen the connections between what we do in the classroom and what we do in archives, studies, libraries, museums, and archaeological digs. We are interested in improving infrastructure and communication on campus, as well as in reaching out beyond NYU to the broader NYC community. We are well aware that a number of small centers and institutes exist to which many of us have no real access, given the specialized foci of most of these institutes. And we would do far more in the way of conferences, outreach, and other organized events were the money – and some staff – available to us.
Throughout the year, we have begun to settle on one particular kind of vision as to what a space for NYU humanists might look like – one that would take full advantage of our location in the city and of the many varied humanities programs featured at NYU. It would also take full advantage of the many leading scholars at NYU who have made their own focus the nature of humanistic inquiry. At the same time, we don't want to duplicate anything currently at NYU or, for that matter, in New York City, which boasts CUNY’s highly visible Center for Humanities, Columbia’s Heyman Center, and the NY Council for the Humanities.

Our unique niche at NYU, we believe, is to provide a space for scholars and for students, both physical and virtual, in which we can have ongoing conversations as to the role and purpose of the humanities themselves. What role do they play vis-a-vis the university, the city, K-12 education, the sciences, the professions, society more generally? What visibility should they have nationally and internationally? Historically how have the humanities evolved and how has their relationship within and outside of institutions changed?

At the May joint meeting of the ACLS and AAU, two presidents and two provosts emphasized that without the support of top-level university administrators for humanities initiatives, the disciplines that are so crucial to our students’ education as they confront an increasingly complex world will continue to lose ground on a national level. These four university leaders, from Cornell, Michigan, Case Western Reserve, and Georgetown, were, respectively, an engineer, an economist, a psychiatrist, and a medieval historian: three of them representatives, thus, of areas not considered “humanities” but ones that they argued depend vitally on humanist inquiry and training. In the spirit of their recommendation, we would like to propose that the president and provost of NYU commit substantial funding to the current Humanities Council so that the Council may be reborn as the NYU Humanities Initiative, and become a space, both virtual and physical, in which these critical questions might be formulated, debated, and perhaps even – dare we say – answered.

Such a call to university-wide support for humanities “centers” is hardly new. In the last fifteen years, such centers have sprung up around the country and provided crucial support for individual scholars in a time of eroding national funding as well as connections between universities and their communities. Arguably, NYU itself was at the vanguard of such a movement: in 1976, at the time of the closing of the Washington Heights Campus, a group of faculty applied for, and received, a substantial endowment from the Mellon Foundation to establish a Humanities Council whose principal role was to put in place an innovative undergraduate curriculum in the humanities. In many ways, our current roster of courses in CAS – freshman and sophomore honors seminars, for example – as well as Gallatin’s curriculum owe something to this thirty-year-old idea. In 2000, the Council changed direction by putting into place a series of workshops that bring together faculty and graduate students in related areas to engage in seminars, conferences, and classes. It has also been faced with increasing requests for grants-in-aid from individuals and programs seeking money for book subventions, translation and permission costs, and conference funding.
Despite the change in focus, the Council’s budget has not changed since 1977: it consists of only the interest from the Mellon endowment, roughly $160,000-180,000 a year. Half of this budget is dedicated to staff. This has left us with less than $90,000 to run annual Humanities Council Workshops and provide much-needed grants-in-aid. Such a budget falls far short of the commitments found at other major universities (see Appendix 1), and will not be adequate to fund the programs we propose below – programs which, we believe, will create and enhance community, further faculty research, spearhead exciting new innovations in undergraduate education, and bring NYU the national attention it deserves as a leader in humanities endeavors. We believe that with your support we can begin to take full advantage of our locational endowment while addressing some of the obstacles that New York City, and a university as large as NYU, present. Our sprawling bureaucratic structure can make it hard to coordinate – and fund – cross-school projects. The fact that the humanities are taught in so many schools makes it imperative that we arrive at better solutions to combat isolation and lack of communication. As detailed below, with the inauguration of a Humanities Initiative, humanities faculty and graduate students at NYU will be able to make a series of important contributions to the university, to New York City, to our overseas campuses, and to national discussions on the role of the humanities and higher education.

**Proposal**

1. As of 2007-8, the Humanities Council will become NYU Humanities Initiative: a program involved both in consolidating the humanities community at NYU and connecting it to the community outside NYU. The Initiative will sponsor annual themes with a focus on an issue specific to the practice and will define a specific annual focus. Suggestions for the first several years and beyond include:
   – humanities and the city
   – humanities and the sciences
   – the evolution of the humanities
   – humanities, “globalization,” and language-learning
   – humanities and public policy
   – humanities and K-12 education
   – humanities and the arts
   – the humanities and the growth of the American university

Each year, the Advisory Board for the Humanities Initiative (9 members chosen from the NYU humanities community) will select a combination of faculty and graduate student fellows who will apply for a semester’s or year’s grant so they can pursue their current work and contribute to the community in significant ways. Fellows will have one of two roles. “Humanities scholars” will participate in weekly meetings, give talks in NYU departments and schools other than his/her own and coordinate a workshop. “Teaching fellows” would work together with other applicants to develop team-taught courses for development which would hinge on questions about humanities research and the way the humanities engage – and engage with – other disciplines. The Initiative will thus be engaging with the NYU community in two important ways: facilitating conversation and exchange across disciplines and departments; and participating in a university-wide project to enhance and energize undergraduate education. We will also continue our highly successful humanities workshops, targeting one or two of them to cover the year’s theme on a more individualized scale.
Far from restricting the kinds of applications for such programs, a focus on the dialogues that our work creates with others would open up enormous possibilities for individual scholars and their intellectual enterprises. A number of scholars at NYU, in fact, have already written about the specific place of the humanities (and, for that matter, of the university) in contemporary society. Their work might be used as a springboard for initial discussions in which we define the “center” for our activities.

2. Along with colleagues who work with WebComm, we will create and manage a virtual archive for humanists interested in exploring ideas about teaching, educational policy, and other issues vital to our fields. Such a vehicle will allow us to engage in discussions about the role of the humanities in our national culture.

3. In September, 2006, we also will apply for an NEH Grant in Faculty Humanities Workshops which if successful would give us funding for three years (2007-10) to host seminars on the humanities with area high school teachers. Such seminars will not only serve to bring city teachers and NYU faculty together to discuss the role of humanities in NYC schools. They will also serve as spurs to one of the projects that is at the heart of the Humanities Initiative, rethinking undergraduate education and envisioning ways to bring our research and teaching more closely together.

4. Continue to provide grants-in-aid for conferences and individual proposals for subventions, etc., while working with national organizations to address the need for radical changes in publishing, copyright practices, etc.

As suggested in our timeline below, we propose that in 2006-7 we launch a series of workshops and a major one-day symposium to address how that center will take shape and what its agenda will be for the coming years. Other, more bureaucratic questions still have to be addressed: the relationship be between this space and other centers and institutes; the role of our current humanities workshops; the ideal number of staff; how best we can coordinate with the NY Institute for Humanities and with other local organizations; what kinds of services the Initiative should be designed to provide (a clearing-house for translation efforts? For coordinating all humanities events on campus?). We are confident, however, that such issues can be easily resolved, and offer this in the spirit in which it was generated: with great enthusiasm and confidence in the future of the humanities at NYU.

**Recommendations for the NYU Humanities Initiative**

**2006-2007**


2. Two or three workshops in the fall and spring to bring in faculty from NYU and other universities involved in cross-disciplinary programs and conversations to aid us in setting our agenda for the next few years regarding the role of the humanities: in society, K-12 education; in relation to the sciences, the arts, federal policy, the professions; historically, theoretically, etc.
3. Launch of new website for humanities by end of fall, 2006, that will act as virtual space for humanities conversations, courses, research; a publication will follow.

4. A 3-day “retreat”/planning meeting at Villa La Pietra over January break for the advisory council in the humanities to discuss and plan our agenda for the next few years.

5. Ongoing: our 5 new (already approved) workshops in the Humanities; small grants-in-aid; monthly newsletter on humanities events

6. Apply for NEH and other supplemental funding for 2007-8 and beyond.

7. Serious efforts to obtain space beginning in 2007-8. Bobst Library may serve as temporary home, but another campus site, perhaps where other institutes will eventually be housed, should be designated as a future home. Space needs would include a seminar room, staff offices for Director and Associate director, work-study space, and shared offices for fellows.

8. At end of spring, 2007, announcement of NYU Humanities Initiative and fellows chosen for 2007-8 academic year.

9. Discussion with program directors and individual school deans as to feasibility of locating several small humanities centers/programs under the umbrella of the Initiative in an effort to provide more consolidated support and visibility

2007-2008
1. Creation of “humanities scholars” program: one semester fellowships for 8 faculty and graduate students who will meet regularly and who will give a series of talks in departments on campus not traditionally linked to their discipline.
2. Creation of team-teaching pairs: one course off for 3 faculty pairs to design a team-taught course, to be implemented following semester; they will meet regularly with visiting scholars

3. If NEH funding is approved, launch of seminars for high school teachers with NYU faculty on range of issues regarding the teaching of humanities and relationship of humanities to other disciplines

4. Series of high-profile lectures/workshops linked to this year’s theme

5. Beginning of term of faculty director and of additional staff (grant-writer; outreach director) for the HC

2008-2011: continuation of programs, with 5-year evaluation of Initiative in 2011

Budget
Currently, the interest from the Mellon Endowment provides funding for personnel (.5 FTE and work-study students), grants-in-aid up to $5000, and Humanities Council Workshops. Once personnel funding is removed from the endowment’s interest, roughly $90,000 remains to fund
the annual grants and workshops. As requests for grants mount, this amount of funding has become precariously slim, and at the end of this particular academic year, requests are being turned down and budgets for 2006-7 workshops are being cut dramatically because of shortages (Appendix 2).

Clearly the future of our current grants process will need to be discussed by the provost and by deans. While grant-funding for conferences and needs unrelated to the future center should be encouraged by NYU, it is by no means obvious that the HC should continue to serve as the only clearing house for such grants. At the same time, the Humanities Initiative will request that an ongoing portion of funding to be dedicated to individual grants-in-aid for book subventions, publication, and translation. It will also be active in working with organizations such as the Humanities Alliance, the MLA, etc., to advocate for far-reaching changes in the processes of book publishing, copyrights permission, etc.

We request the following funding from NYU. We will also, of course, work actively with grants agencies to pursue supplemental funding. We believe that characterizing the NYU Humanities Initiative as we have done will enable us to position ourselves in a strong light vis-a-vis funding sources. No other “Center for the Humanities” in the United States currently takes the humanities themselves as a specific, annual focus. At the same time, it is crucial that NYU invest in the center beyond the current Mellon endowment, and that it invest for a period of time substantial enough to ensure the success of the NYU Humanities Initiative.

2006-7: $60,000 of next year’s HC budget is already committed to next year’s workshops; over $20,000 is already committed to grants-in-aid. Thus beyond the interest from the endowment for next year (($30,000 of which remains for grants-in-aid) we request:

- $60,000 for the one-day symposium and 2 new workshops on the Humanities;
- $25,000 for the three-day retreat in January at La Pietra (15 faculty; travel; rooms)
- $30,000 for ITS to begin development of NYU Humanities Initiative’s website, per discussion and price agreement in May, 2006;
- $30,000 for part-time web-manager/consultant for the web project: total of additional $145,000.

As of 2007-8, we expect an annual budget of $400,000, not including current staff. Thus in addition to the endowment’s current interest, we are requesting an additional $300,000 in annual funding. This funding would permit the following breakdown and ensure, we believe, the Initiative’s success within the NYU and NYC community:

- Humanities Fellows Budget: 8 fellows yearly, with buy-out of $15,000/semester per faculty member (6) and stipends of $20,000/semester for graduate student (2) = $130,000
- Team-teaching Budget: 4 faculty yearly, with buy-out of $60,000 (4 courses) for course releases
- Workshop, conference, and publications budget: $100,000
- Grants-in-aid: $60,000
- Publications and website maintenance budget – part-time personnel and costs: $50,000
Respectfully Submitted
Members of the Ad Hoc Humanities Task Force
Rene Arcilla, Chair, Humanities and the Social Sciences, Steinhardt
Uli Baer, German, FAS
Nancy Barton, Chair, Art, Steinhardt
Michael Beckerman, Chair, Music, FAS
Ruth Ben-Ghiat, Italian Studies, FAS
Asya Berger, Director, Humanities Council
Suzanne Cusick, Music, FAS; Member, Advisory Board, Humanities Council
Georgina D’Opico-Black, Spanish, Director of Medieval and Renaissance Center, FAS
Walter Johnson, History, FAS
Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Peformance Studies, Tisch; Member, Advisory Board, Humanities Council
Brad Lewis, Gallatin School of Individualized Study
Fred Schwartzbach, Dean of General Studies Program, SCPS/FAS
Michael Stoller, Director, Collection and Research Services, NYU Libraries; Member, Advisory Board, Humanities Council
Edward Sullivan, Dean of Humanities, Fine Arts, FAS; Chair, Humanities Council
Jane Tylus, Italian Studies, FAS; Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Appendix M: What Villa La Pietra Can Offer in the Humanities

What Villa La Pietra Can Offer in the Humanities That You Can’t Find in Manhattan

Most of our remarks should center on the villa as place: a residential college that will deepen students’ experience not only of Florence but of a unique villa culture that can both project them into the past and familiarize themselves with a host of contemporary issues and activities (making olive oil and the “slow food” movement, the role of Italy in the EU, etc.). To this end, we will distinguish the attributes of this “place” that can be effectively described and publicized in the US; a roster of courses, some already being taught, some not, that speak directly to the villa experience; and innovative teaching strategies that are not possible in NY. Above all, we want to make the case that the Villa is a powerful argument for the ongoing importance of the humanities: it is an archive, a garden, a 15th-century building, a library, a stage; and it is easily accessible to great libraries, archives, museums, churches, theatres, opera houses, ruins, etc. And it’s a great place to work with primary sources. Finally, as a villa - a space apart - it offers a space for reflection on what we are and where we have come from: American students can learn far more about America in Florence than at home.

As a residential college, the Villa should invite VLP faculty to be “resident advisors”; it should integrate villa activities into coursework; it should form a community that students will care about and want to regularly get involved with. Thus student services (Marc Wais) should be directly involved in such planning, along with faculty at VLP.

Additionally, we should address ourselves in these broader remarks to the place of Florence in the NYU Global Network and what makes it distinctive; to the ongoing smorgasbord of courses that should continue to attract non-humanities folks; to the need to involve both Villa and Washington Square faculty in a future curriculum. Perhaps these initial observations should end with the point that at the moment, there is little obvious synergy between courses and no obvious “map” as to which courses might be best suited to students coming in with particular interests.

Some of those “synergies” might thus be:

Given that increasing numbers of students now go as sophomores, rather than juniors: might an “alternate” MAP curriculum at the Villa be considered? What better place to do a ConWest course on antiquity and the Middle Ages or the renaissance?

Since lower number of LSP students will be attending as freshmen, would this make it possible for CAS students to stay at villa? Might a “Villa La Pietra” mini-minor be considered, focusing on courses emphasizing villa life (art, food, the archive, history, the garden, travel writing, etc.)? The courses we came up with as a core curriculum in “humanities” or “Villa Studies” include Italy and colonialism; the history of unification; Italian immigration to the US and elsewhere; Italian-American literature and culture; urban studies and city planning; Mediterranean identity; ethnographies and local histories of Florentines; great books about Italy; travel writing (and creative writing); history of science and medicine (“the science of art”), the history of banking; music and patronage; food studies; theatre and commedia dell’arte; an archival course on Americans abroad; Villa life from the Romans through the Actons; some of these courses would explore useful meeting points between “non-humanities” majors and humanities courses: i.e., a course on the psychology of Michelangelo; a course on botany and gardens; on Leonardo as the
great scientist, engineer and artist? (This would be a way to bring Poly students to Florence!)

Would a suitable endpoint to this mini-minor be a thesis, to be continued in NY? Finally, the villa can only flourish if it also has Italians around - not only faculty, but students. How can we develop mandatory language exchanges with Italians, or have film series that would lure Italian liceo and university students to VLP?

Other comments will be ancillary to this main body of suggestions:
1. La Pietra and Washington Square: faculty on both campuses should be involved in every step of planning
2. How can departments and DUGS be involved more formally in promoting study abroad? Course lists should be distributed to each department well in advance for publicity and advising purposes; DUGS should meet with Global staff each semester. Annual meeting of DUGS with Global, possibly at the Casa.
3. How can advertising be done more effectively: having a LP “open house” at the Casa each semester; posters and brochures need to be distributed targeting Florence
4. Stern model: can study abroad become a requirement for departments? Can departments (or MAP) be encouraged to accept more courses taught at Villa for requirements?
5. How to coordinate faculty visits? - both as researchers and as professors? Our faculty can be the best advertisers for our programs at LP. How can their teaching at the villa be facilitated? Why can’t they be housed in the apartments on campus?
6. Have a conference ON the villa, perhaps in commemoration of an anniversary
7. Might we explore linking courses between NY and VLP - possibly through teleconferencing?
8. How can we structure conversations between departments and VLP so as to identify courses that don’t (and perhaps can’t) exist in Washington Square - but do and can in Florence?

II. Publicity and the Website:
1. Needs to be found more easily and needs to be overhauled
2. Very static, opening with brief, nondescriptive letter by director
3. Dry list of courses: liven them up!
4. No indication of the stature of the instructors
5. Timing: spring courses were put up very late this year: at end of November, still had courses from spring 2008 online
6. How to change: have sections on student activities at the villa (participating in the harvest, access to the gardens, study spaces on the terrace); weekend trips available to students such as to the Cinque Terre; Italian immersion program and housing possibilities downtown as well as family stays
7. Enlist students to publicize!

III. The Faculty Community at LP
Faculty seemed energetic and enthusiastic but without any real sense of community: some of the professors were meeting each other for what seemed like the first time. How to create a sense of community both among themselves and in NY?
1. Encourage them to attend the VLP Seminars as well as to create monthly work-in-
progress series, which would offer a catered dinner at Sassetti
2. Explore possibility of inviting some to NY for either short visits or exchanges
   (Washington Square faculty to teach their course at LP and vice versa)
3. Enable students to “take a professor to dinner” - and faculty to become assigned to
   residential sites downtown and at LP, similar to what we do in NY
4. Have small grants available so that faculty can develop new courses and/or develop
   research programs over the summer
5. Explore possibility of using curricular challenge grants for Villa faculty

IV. Role of Graduate Students and Studies at LP:
1. Explore possibilities of their teaching intro courses - writing, Italian – as well as serving
   as Tas in possible expansion of the MAP to Florence, or art history or history survey
   courses. Could also be a fellowship award in concert with GSAS or MARC to create a
   course to be taught especially in Florence.
2. Explore possibilities of targeted grants to graduate students - one focusing on archives,
   another on collection, a third on villa life, etc. Perhaps the grants could be awarded to a
   faculty member who would then come with a graduate student
3. Host a graduate symposium at the Villa with GSAS
4. Involve ISAW and Center for Med. Studies in ongoing research/graduate efforts

VI. The Reputation of VLP: Does it Need Overhauling?
1. Efforts ongoing with Ellyn at VLP salutory: attempting to give LP an intellectual
   dimension and developing ties with community: talks must be in Italian, otherwise
   Florentine audience won’t come and will be limited to Americans/English abroad. To
   what Ellyn currently doing, would suggest exploring publication series, annual
   conference on aspect of the Villa, etc.
2. Promote community service more than we have and develop internships in concert with
   departments – i.e., with journalism, have students working for Florence websites and
   newspapers
3. Greater collaboration with institutions in Florence: U. Firenze, EUI

VII. Going Forward
1. What will be role of Abu-Dhabi be in Villa’s future, particularly regarding research
   possibilities and a modular teaching system? (7 weeks in AD, 7 weeks in Florence?) How
   should we look at other sites in Europe - Prague, Paris, Madrid - as “destinations” for our
   students on their weekend trips and possible exchanges of faculty and students during the
   semester?
2. Look carefully at other programs currently in Florence – Syracuse, Middlebury – to see
   how they advertise and what they foster in terms of their special approach to Florence
3. Identify most popular courses, identify why other courses are low. Work with DUGS to
   identify required courses for the major that could be taught in Florence.
4. Identify - as we began to do with our “introductions” - the remarkable talents and
   strengths of the Florentine faculty: Eric Nicholson created an acting group, the “La Pietra
   players” which folded for lack of funds and support; Giovanna Calvino (Italo’s daughter)
   could offer wonderful courses on futurism; Grazia Gobbi-Sica has contacts in the “villa”
   world in Florence and knows all about Florentine cemeteries; Silvia Catitti has special
connections to the Laurentian Library; several art history faculty have been instrumental in recent exhibitions; Matteo Sansone is a major critic of Italian opera; etc. How can we take advantage of these special talents and contacts in a way that will anchor our students more effectively in the Florentine community - and that community at the villa?

5. Identify NYU faculty who will be key teachers and players in the Florence program - and develop a process whereby they can be selected to teach either in the academic year or the summer. Also identify collaborations with research institutes – perhaps the HI? – for fellowships to Florence that will result in new course proposals at the site or in Washington Square.
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Executive Summary

Data Science—using automated methods to analyze massive amounts of data and to extract knowledge from them—is a set of methods that will become core to many areas of business, science, and government. With the Initiative in Data Science and Statistics, NYU is on a path to establish the leading data science training and research facilities in the country. NYU’s initiative has many advantages, compared to our peers: we are early, our location places us at the center of a vibrant and growing industry in data analytics, and some of our schools and faculty are established in the field. To maintain our advantage, we must establish a Center for Data Science (CDS) by fall 2012. Faculty recruitment should begin in the fall of 2012, and an MS program should start admitting student for the fall of 2013. Our objective will be for the Center for Data Science to become the premier U.S. research and teaching institution in data science.

To build up the CDS, we considered several scenarios from conservative to aggressive, with a detailed financial analysis over a seven-year planning period. In steady state, the CDS will have 15 core tenure-track faculty, 6 of whom are already at NYU and 9 of whom are to be hired. The new two-year MS program in Data Science (MSDS) would admit 60 new students each year, and the new PhD in Data Science would admit 12 students each year. The CDS will host 8 postdocs, research scientists, and visiting scholars.

The financial plan calls for $3M of investment over 3 years. The initiative would roughly break even the 4th year, and will generate about $1.5M of positive cash flow thereafter. The plan requires 20,000 square feet of additional office and lab space, beyond the roughly 10,000 square feet already occupied by core CDS faculty currently at NYU. The space must be in the Washington Square Campus area, as most of the scientific interaction will be with affiliated CDS faculty located in WSQ: relatively few such faculty at are NYU Poly and Langone. The financial model estimates the incremental cash flows to New York University relative to the status quo, defined as the continuation of support of 6 core faculty members. The next steps to move the program forward are to:

1. Approve the Center for Data Science (CDS) at the New York University level and associate it with the Courant Institute. The center will start its activities in fall 2012.
2. Submit accreditation requests for an MS and PhD program to New York State in the fall of 2012, with the aim of receiving approval in time to admit students in fall 2013. Similarly to the CUSP and Public Health programs, the DS programs will be “university wide” and will follow the same internal approval procedure as CUSP.
3. Start advertising for MS students once New York State has accredited the program. (Advertising cannot start before such approval.)
4. Approve a year 0 startup budget to cover expenses starting in the summer of 2012 up to the fall of 2013 ($860K).
5. Provide $4 million in funding over two years starting in the fall of 2013, primarily for new
faculty lines and staff. The $4 million includes the projected cash losses of $3 million and an extra $1 million as a cushion that could be used, for example, as part of the costs of fitting out new space.

6. Start interviewing new faculty candidates in the 2012-2013 season.

7. Begin fund raising with potential corporate sponsors.

8. Initiate a search for space in the Washington Square campus area to host the Center for Data Science core faculty, research scientists, visitors, and PhD students. The total required space is around 30,000 square feet. 10,000 square feet would be freed when current core faculty move to the new space.
Introduction

*Data Science in the Age of the Exabyte*

We live in the "Age Of The Petabyte", soon to become "The Age Of The Exabyte". Our networked world is generating a deluge of data that no human, or group of humans, can process fast enough. The deluge of data is transforming the way business, government, science and health care are carried out. An increasing amount of new knowledge is being derived by automatically analyzing massive amounts of data.

A new discipline has emerged whose object is to provide the underlying theory and methods of the data revolution. This new discipline overlaps multiple traditional disciplines that include Mathematics (Pure and Applied), Statistics, Computer Science, and an increasingly large number of application domains.

This emergent discipline is known by several names: We will call it "Data Science."

A detailed rationale can be found in appendix E.

The emergence of Data Science is a golden opportunity for NYU.

- There is a groundswell of interest in “Big Data” from industry and government. The White House recently announced a multi-agency initiative in “Big Data”, which was followed by announcements from MIT, Berkeley, Columbia, and others.
- A particularly large number of companies in the Greater New York City area are driven by Data Science, including IBM, AT&T, Google, Facebook, Microsoft, EMC, Thompson-Reuters, pharmaceutical, financial, and insurance industries, and Web companies such as Foursquare, bit.ly, Etsy, and Twitter. This puts NYU in a particularly favorable position.
- By acting quickly enough, NYU will be one of the first universities to have an integrated approach to Data Science, as well as major research and teaching activities that bring together pure and applied mathematics, statistics, computer science, and application areas.
- There is a large, growing, and largely unfulfilled demand for data scientists from industry, which creates an opportunity for a very successful Master’s program, and provides a source of funding for a major research and education center.
- Data Science is slated to have a major impact in a number of areas of intellectual endeavors in which NYU is already strong, such as social science.
- The emergence of Data Science is a golden opportunity for the Courant Institute. The questions associated with data representation have become a major source of interesting problems in pure and applied mathematics (compressive sensing, sparsity, very large-scale linear algebra, non-convex optimization, intractable inference with
variational methods, Monte-Carlo methods etc). Data Science is also becoming a major opportunity to continue and strengthen a unique and celebrated tradition at Courant: new mathematics that has a direct impact on the world.

The emergence of Data Science is also a threat: Data Science has become or is fast becoming an important facet of many fields of intellectual endeavor, including biology, physics, the social sciences, medicine, and urban sciences. If it didn't seize the opportunity, NYU would diminish its chances to maintain or increase its leadership in a number of important fields that are increasingly dependent on Data Science, notably biology, genomics, astronomy, and the social sciences.

A notable trend is the shift of interest of many mathematicians towards issues related to Data Science. Missing this trend would put the Courant Institute at risk of losing its leading position in applied mathematics.

The Center for Data Science (CDS)

The centerpiece of the Initiative is the NYU Center for Data Science, which will regroup faculty, scientists, and graduate students whose primary research and teaching activities revolve around Data Science.

The CDS is created as part of a university-wide initiative, and hence is not part of any particular school, similarly to CUSP and the global program in public health. However, the CDS is likely to have strong relationships with Courant and Stern, as the core faculty’s primary affiliations are likely to be within these two units.

Organization, Resources

The proposal calls for the CDS to regroup 15 core tenure or tenure-track faculty members (6 faculty already at NYU, and 9 new faculty), plus research faculty, visitors, postdocs, PhD students, technical staff, administrative staff, lab space, and computing facilities. The CDS will also have an additional 20 affiliated faculty from all over the university.

The working group is unanimous in its recommendation to allocate space for the CDS in or near the Washington Square campus, preferably in close proximity to both the campus and Silicon Alley/Union Square. Common space and proximity to affiliated faculty is key to attracting faculty, corporate sponsors, government grants, and top PhD students. More importantly, it is also key to enabling interdisciplinary work through cross-fertilization of ideas and methods. Common space for core faculty and their PhD students and postdocs is crucial to the success of the entire initiative.

While space in Brooklyn is more easily available, the proximity to Washington Square is
paramount: while there will be CDS-affiliated faculty at Poly and Langone, the majority of core and affiliated faculty will be from Courant, FAS, Stern, Steinhardt, and Wagner. It would be very difficult to attract a significant audience to seminars and other events unless they were held near Washington Square.

Furthermore, the availability of quality space and facilities will be an important tool for recruiting top faculty and students. High quality space signals the university’s intentions to excel in this area.

Space
The CDS facility will host the primary offices of core faculty, research faculty, research scientists, postdocs, visiting scholars, industry partner in residence, PhD students, software engineers, administrative staff, lab space, seminar room, meeting rooms, and computing facility room.

CDS will collaborate with many departments within NYU that are located at WSQ, including computer science, mathematics, information systems (Stern), physics, biology, sociology, linguistics, anthropology, economics, politics, law, and public health. Many students from these WSQ-based programs are expected to enroll in CDS classes and to be involved in research of interest to CDS core faculty. There will also be interaction with CUSP students and faculty who will be in Brooklyn, as well as faculty from Poly and Langone (mainly from medical informatics and biostatistics). The preponderance of interactions with WSQ campus programs requires that the CDS space be within walking distance of WSQ.

The minimum space required is evaluated at 30,000 sq.ft. (15 core faculty, 2,000 square feet per faculty member).

As a reference points, the University of Utah’s Scientific Computing and Imaging Institute (sci.utah.edu) has 15 faculty and uses 3,000 square feet per faculty member. The NYU Genomics Center uses 2,860 square feet per faculty member.

Computing Facilities
For obvious reasons, Data Science research has very high (and ever growing) needs in computing power and data storage space.

For example, current research activity in Data Science involving Yann LeCun and Rob Fergus (2 faculty, 5 postdocs and scientists, 10 PhD students) use dedicated compute servers with 230 CPU cores, 36 GPU cards and 60-70 TB of storage. However, this dedicated system is significantly below present needs: This group is also a major user of NYU’s High Performance Computing cluster facility: Cardiac (1200 cores), Union Square (600 cores), and Bowery (2500 cores).
One role of the CDS will be to host a repository of large datasets either collected by CDS, obtained from from public sources, or provided by industry partners. This will require a multi-petabyte data storage facility.

In addition, “big data” courses, machine learning courses, capstone projects, and programming assignments will require student access to a cluster (with GPUs and Hadoop infrastructure) separate from the research facilities. The estimated size is around 20 nodes, 160 cores, 20 GPUs, and 50TB.

We hope to procure some of this equipment through in-kind donations from industry partners. Our conservative budget calls for $1.1M investment in equipment over 5 years.

**People**

**Core Faculty**

Our “realistic” planning scenario assumes that in the 7th academic year of the initiative, there are a total of 15 core tenure-track faculty, defined as those who have their primary allegiance to CDS and their primary (or only) office in CDS space. Six of these faculty members are currently at NYU in Courant and Stern, 9 are new hires. In addition, the MS program would require an additional 3 equivalent full-time adjunct faculty.

Core faculty would be hired with expertise and research interests aligned with the emerging taxonomy in data science. At this writing, these interests are primarily in mathematical statistics, computational statistics and machine learning, optimization and large-scale computation, system design for large-scale data science, and several application areas, such as artificial intelligence, computational biology, computational economics, or quantitative methods in social science.

**Administrative and Technical Staff**

The financial model assumes a total of 4 full-time-equivalent administrative staff and 4 technical staff, assuming that other such resources needed could be leveraged from Courant. However, exactly what is needed should be revisited as the initiative unfolds and its support requirements become known.

The technical staff includes 4 full-time equivalents, two of whom are system administrators, and two are software engineers. These roles would maintain the CDS computing and data storage infrastructure, as well as maintain and support open-source software developed at CDS and large-scale data sets hosted by CDS.

**Scientific Advisory Board**

A Scientific Advisory Board would be recruited to provide guidance on research topics and
curriculum and faculty. A non-exhaustive list of names was proposed for members of the advisory board:

- **Bernhard Scholkopf**: co-founder, Max Planck Institute for Intelligent Systems, Director MPI Department for Empirical Inference
- **Dan Huttenlocher**: Dean of Computing and Information Science, Cornell. Future director of the Cornell campus in NYC.
- **Tom Mitchell**: Chair, Machine Learning Department, CMU.
- **Leon Bottou**: Research Director at INRIA. Formerly scientist at Microsoft Research and the Microsoft ad division, NEC Labs, AT&T Labs, and Bell Labs.
- **Data Scientists from industry research labs in the NYC area, such as Chris Volinsky (AT&T Labs-Research), John Langford (Microsoft Research NY), Jason Weston (Google Research NY), Rick Lawrence (IBM Research), etc.**

### Industrial Advisory Board

An Industrial Advisory Board would be recruited to help assure that MS students were meeting the needs of industry. We would recruit from local companies with a business interest in data science.

Examples of candidates include Rick Lawrence (IBM Research), Claudia Perlich (M6D), Hilary Mason (bit.ly), etc.

### Research Themes

#### Data Science is Becoming Pervasive

A recent article in Wired Magazine was entitled: "The End of Theory: The Data Deluge Makes the Scientific Method Obsolete". While this is certainly a journalistic exaggeration, Data Science is on the cusp of revolutionizing all areas of intellectual endeavor. Data Science is becoming a necessary tool to answer some of the big scientific questions and technological challenges of our times: how does the brain work? how can we build intelligent machines? what is the structure of the universe? how does life work? how do we find cures for diseases? how can we understand social structures and predict human behavior?

Our networked world is generating a deluge of data that only machines can process fast enough. Some of that data is readily interpretable by machines, but much of it consists of unstructured data captured from the real world using a variety of sources: sensors from scientific experiments, pictures and videos from the Web, Web usage data, location data from smartphones, link data from social networks, customer data from e-commerce websites, transaction data from financial companies, text from news agencies, blogs, and collaborative filtering websites, usage data from credit card companies and utilities, the list goes on.

The deluge of data is transforming the way science and medicine are carried out. New
knowledge is being derived by automatically analyzing massive amounts of data. New fields of Science are emerging that are built around the automated analysis of massive datasets. This includes new branches of genomics, biochemistry, astronomy and cosmology, high-energy physics, and neuroscience (particularly brain imaging). Several areas of social science and the humanities are already starting to be influenced by automated data analysis, including law, economics, sociology, political science, and history. The trend is only going to accelerate in the coming years.

We will see an increasingly large number of traditional discipline spawning new sub-disciplines with the adjective "computational" or "quantitative" in front of them. We already know about computational physics, computational neuroscience and computational biology. We will soon see the emergence of computational economics, computational history, computational psychology, and many others.

Data Science overlaps multiple traditional disciplines including Statistics, Computer Science, Applied Mathematics, and many application domains. The tight interaction between these normally separate fields is key to the success of the present initiative.

An concrete example will help illustrate the importance of the interaction: massive amounts of data are being collected by astronomical instruments such as radio-telescope arrays, optical telescope, and space-based telescopes. Deblurring the optical images to find exoplanets requires new ways to represent images. One of the most efficient methods comes from recent advances in applied mathematics on sparse representations of high-dimensional data. But efficiently computing these sparse representations requires new optimization methods to minimize particular types of non-smooth functions. The models involve statistical inference in
complex Bayesian models that exploit the regularities in the data. This set of methods is also useful in computational photography and medical imaging. This simple example illustrates the necessary interaction between such fields as mathematical statistics, optimization, scientific computing, machine learning, Bayesian statistics, signal processing, astronomy, and medical imaging.

NYU already has a strong presence in data science methodology, and in a number of application areas of data science.

The Methods of Data Science

Data Science was born from a desire to answer one of the most important scientific questions of our times: what is intelligence, and how does the brain work? The methods of Data Science, and the reason it attracts so many bright students is that, beyond the applications to business and science, its goal is to produce intelligent machines. Data Science is the new AI. Its methods come not only from statistics and applied mathematics, but also from theoretical and computational neuroscience. Some classes of models, such as artificial neural networks, sparse modeling, non-negative matrix factorization, convolutional networks, and others have their roots in neuroscience and cognitive science. The connection between AI, machine learning, computer vision, and robotics on one hand, and computational neuroscience and cognitive science on the other hand has proved very fruitful in both directions. This also happens to be one of the hottest topics in machine learning at the moment.

The methods of Data Science draw on statistics for Bayesian methods, parameter estimation, generalization bounds, theoretical guarantees, and inference methods such as Monte-Carlo, MCMC, and variational methods.

It draws on computer science for machine learning, kernel methods, parallel processing, database systems, and application areas such computer vision, robotics, and AI in general. Areas of pure mathematics are poised to have a large impact on the “big data” problem, particularly geometry and analysis on the problem of representing data in high-dimensional spaces.

The research of the CDS core faculty will be focused on producing new methods for Data Science: new algorithms, new theories and analysis, and new efficient implementations of the methods. However, new methods are rarely developed in isolation: a tight interaction with mathematics and and a tight interaction with application areas are necessary to make progress.

The Mathematics of Data Science

Data Science is quickly becoming a major source of inspiration for new problems in pure and
applied mathematics. Some of the most celebrated breakthroughs in mathematics in recent years have been motivated by problems of data representation, e.g. compressive sensing, the structure of point clouds in high-dimensional spaces, and the exploitation of sparsity. An increasingly large number of pure and applied mathematicians are working on problems that are motivated by the problem of representing natural data.

Some of the major questions in Data Science are how to discover regularities, hidden structure, and dependencies in data, and how to represent the data in such a way that these regularities are made explicit. This opens up a large spectrum of new problems in pure and applied mathematics. For example, natural images occupy a tiny, low-dimensional surface within the gigantic space of all possible combinations of pixel values. How can we use image collections to discover and parameterize this low-dimensional surface? How can we embed the raw data into a space in which the set of natural images is easily separated from the rest? How can we embed the data in a space in which all images of people are easily separated from all images of cars? by analyzing the properties of point clouds and surfaces in high-dimensional spaces, branches of mathematics such as geometry, harmonic analysis, and probability can contribute to finding answers to these questions.

Data Science is naturally connected with several branches of applied mathematics and mathematical statistics, including very large-scale linear algebra (linear systems, SVD, eigen problems), as well as convex and non-convex optimization, approximate integration using variational methods and Markov-Chain Monte-Carlo methods, finding the ground states of complex networks of interacting nodes, and a host of other problems.

Margaret Wright and Yann LeCun have been serving on a National Academy of Sciences committee named "Mathematical Sciences in 2025". The committee has been interviewing a number of leading figures in the mathematical sciences, as well as in fields that are heavy users of mathematics. When asked about the next challenge for mathematical sciences, virtually every interviewees put "large datasets" and “representing high-dimensional data” on top of their list. This answer came not only from statisticians, but also from prominent pure mathematicians, applied mathematicians, and from the leaders of almost all the professional societies, national laboratories, and major industry research labs.

Application Areas

NYU already has a strong presence in many important application areas of Data Science, including astronomy, high-energy physics, AI and computer perception, genomics, business analytics, medical informatics, and quantitative methods in social science.

Seminar Series

The CDS will run a weekly Data Science Colloquium series. Speakers will be prominent
researchers in all areas of data science, and relevant application domains.

**Funding, Partnerships, Sponsorships**

Data Science is a very hot topic among government funding agencies, as well as within industry.

The CDS is expected to raise significant amounts of funding from federal funding agencies (NSF, NIH, DARPA, IARPA, ONR, AFOSR, etc), many of which already fund Data-Science related projects at NYU, notably in Computer Science. For example, the Computational and Biological Learning Lab lead by Yann LeCun and Rob Fergus has raised over of $5.5M in Data Science-related grants between fall 2008 and spring 2012.

A Data Science-centric IGERT grant application is in progress at this writing.

In steady state the CDS can be expected to raise a total of at least $4.5M per year in loaded grant money. This corresponds to about $300K per year and per faculty.

The CDS is also expected to raise significant funds from industrial partners. Given the dearth of Data Science graduates on the job market today, companies need access to students to evaluate and attract them when they approach graduation, industry partners also need access to faculty with particular expertise, as well as to updates about the latest progress in the field.

**Industry Partner Program**

Any company may
- participate in the coop program: companies receive resumes of top students, and can choose to sponsor their studies. Students in the coop program commit to summer internships with the sponsor entity.
- endow or fund a faculty chair, a postdoctoral fellowship, or a student fellowship.
- contribute datasets to the CDS dataset repository.
- sponsor research projects
- make unrestricted gifts
- have a link to their website from the Center for Data Science sponsor page
- making in-kind contributions
- donate equipment
- donate space
- contribute staff as student mentors and researchers

In addition, four (4) levels of yearly corporate membership are offered:

- **Bronze Level:** $100K/year for a minimum of 3 years (if pre-funded, or otherwise irrevocably guaranteed or collateralized in the first year) OR $175K/year if on an annual basis for 3 years. Companies in this program will get:
- Invitations to semiannual open houses in which research projects and new advances in data science are presented
- Early access to graduating student database and résumé books
- Access to lists of students seeking summer internships
- Consultant matchmaking service, to identify and introduce faculty, research staff, and other data science experts to partners in need of data science expertise
- Invitations to technical talks and seminars

- Silver Level: $200K/year for a minimum of 5 years (pre-funded, guaranteed, or collateralized in the first year) OR $325K/year on an annual basis for 5 years. Includes the Bronze-level items plus the following:
  - Ability to send one employee as scientist in residence at the CDS
  - Ability to supervise student capstone projects, in collaboration with CDS faculty
  - Ability to give guest lectures and seminars on projects of interest to the company
  - Ability to propose real-life data science problems and solution to become case studies in the program
  - Ability to have two employees audit courses in the program at no cost
  - Participation in the annual Corporate Partner Workshop. After corporate members present current issues encountered in their business, corporate members and C4DS researchers meet in topical break-out sessions to discuss relevant methods and possible solutions

- Gold Level: $300K/year for a minimum of 5 years (pre-funded, guaranteed, or collateralized in the first year) OR $425K/year on an annual basis for 5 years. (The Gold and Platinum levels would include rights to participate in licensing opportunities and Advisory Board seats that were tied to fulfillment of funding obligations.) Includes the Silver-level benefits plus the following:
  - Ability to send two employees as scientists in residence at the CDS
  - Pro-rata right to purchase warrant participation in CDS licensing portfolio (terms ‘to be determined’ TBD)
  - Limited access to participate in prescribed development and commercialization rights for specified CDS technology licenses (at market terms TBD)

- Platinum Level: $425K/year for a minimum of 7 years (pre-funded, guaranteed, or collateralized in the first year) OR $525K/year on an annual basis for 7 years. Includes the Gold-level benefits plus the following:
  - One-day annual workshop on specific topics of interest to the corporate partner with selected CDS faculty and researchers
  - Right of first refusal for preferential access to participate in prescribed development and commercialization rights for specified CDS technology licenses (at market terms TBD)
  - Naming rights for one (or more) designated facilities within the center (terms TBD)
  - One representative seat on the CDS Industrial Advisory Board
Potential corporate sponsors include:

- Financial services
  - Wall Street, Banking, Insurance:
    - JPMorgan Chase
    - Morgan Stanley
    - Goldman Sachs
    - Blackstone
    - Blackrock
    - Renaissance
    - Capital One
    - AIG
    - Swiss Re
    - Zurich Re

- Telecom
  - AT&T (Florham Park)
  - Verizon

- Technology, Data Analytics
  - IBM (Yorktown Heights)
  - Alcatel-Lucent (Murray Hill)
  - NEC (Princeton)
  - SRI (Princeton)
  - EMC
  - SRI (Princeton)

- Web
  - Google
  - Microsoft
  - Yahoo
  - Bit.ly
  - FourSquare
  - Tumblr
  - Twitter
  - Facebook

- Health
  - Johnson and Johnson
  - Pfizer
  - Glaxo Smithkline
  - Merck
  - Sanofi-Aventis
  - Blue Cross Blue Shield
Bi-annual Open House
The Center for Data Science would hold an open house twice yearly. This would be a mixer with a keynote speaker for people from the New York City area with an interest in data science.

Industry Workshop Day
At the annual industry workshop day, we would present student and faculty projects of potential interest to industry.

Educational and Training programs in Data Science

Scientific Computing MS with a Concentration in Data Science
We have submitted an application to New York State to approve changes in the existing MS in Scientific Computing program. The changes would replace the current master's thesis with a capstone project course, organize the program into two concentrations (one in modeling and simulation, one in data science), and fine-tune the required and elective courses.

These changes were submitted to New York State at the beginning of the summer. We are told that the timing for approval is several months.

New MS in Data Science
The CDS would offer a MS in Data Science consisting of 36 credit hours, normally taking two years (four semesters).

Six courses would be required. Details are in an appendix. These courses and their timing within the curriculum are:

- DS-GA-XX01 Intro to Data Science (fall, year 1): New course covering basic algorithms, software tools, dealing with data, representing data, methodology. Topics:
  - philosophy: prediction/falsification, causation/correlation, memorization/generalization, the limits of induction
  - framework(s) for thinking about problems from a data science perspective
• intro to software tool(s): Torch, libSVM
• basic methods: linear regression, logistic regression, SVM, k-means, some sort of tree/rule induction (superficially, so they can be used, but also because they illustrate fundamental principles of data science)
• dealing with data: visualization, dimensionality reduction, missing data, data cleanup
• representing data: normalization, feature engineering, distance metrics, basis function expansion
• methodology: training/validation/test, regularization, model selection/hyperparameters, model averaging/ensemble methods

• DS-GA-XX02 Statistical and Mathematical Methods for Data Science (fall, year 1): A revision of Mark Tygert’s MATH-GA 2962.001 Mathematical Statistics course adding linear systems solving, non-linear optimization methods, and retaining descriptive statistics, classical statistical tests. Topics:
  • refresher on linear system solving, SVD, eigenvalue problems, gradient, Hessian
  • non-linear optimization, gradient methods, SGD, CG, BFGS/L-BFGS, constrained optimization, QP
  • descriptive statistics, binomial, Poisson, exponential, normal, chi-square, t, and F distributions,
  • hypothesis testing, confidence intervals, point estimation (maximum-likelihood methods, consistency, efficiency, sufficiency, etc.)
  • regression, correlation, analysis of variance, Bayesian inference, nonparametric methods,
  • sequential tests, loss, risk, and decision theory.
  • information and entropy

• DS-GA-XX03 Machine Learning (spring, year 1): A revision of Yann LeCun’s machine learning course CSCI-GA-2565, removing material already taught in the two fall courses and including additional topics. Topics:
  • intro to learning theory, VC dimension, structural risk minimization, regularization
  • supervised methods: kernel methods/SVM, neural nets, adaboost, trees, metric learning
  • unsupervised methods: basis function expansions, PCA, clustering, mixture models/EM, K-PCA, NMF, sparse modeling, manifold learning
  • loss functions for classification, ranking, embedding, etc
  • ensemble methods: bagging, boosting, Bayesian averaging
  • applications: time-series analysis, text analysis, image analysis, audio analysis, information retrieval.
  • architectures, modular models
  • feature learning, energy-based models

• DS-GA-XX04 Big Data (spring, year 1): New course covering tools, databases, large-scale methods, visualization. Topics include:
  • Tools: OpenMP, MapReduce, Hadoop
  • databases, parallel databases
large-scale ML methods: feature hashing, on-line learning, exploiting sparsity
- applications with large datasets: natural language processing, video, social networks,
- representation of high-dimensional data
- visualization

- DS-GA-XX05: Inference and Representation (fall, year 2): New course covering roughly a portion of the material in David Sontag’s CSCI-GA 3033.006 Graphical Models course and also covering causal inference in statistics, and advanced topics in statistical machine learning. Topics:
  - Associational vs. causal inference models, structural equation models, counterfactual conditionals
  - graphical models, factor graphs, conditional random fields
  - exact inference, LP relaxation, variational inference, Monte-Carlo methods
  - training graphical models, structured prediction.
  - Semi-supervised learning, active learning, on-line learning
  - Deep Learning
  - non-parametric Bayesian methods
  - learning with sequences, graphs, and structured objects
  - intro to reinforcement learning

- DS-GA-XX06 Capstone Project in Data Science (fall, year 2): New course offered in the fall instead of the spring so that students may continue their projects via an elective course in the spring, when that is appropriate. Prerequisite: completion of first-year required courses in the Data Science MS. The purpose of the capstone project is to make the theoretical knowledge acquired by the students operational in realistic settings. During the project, students see through the entire process of solving a real-world problem: from collecting and processing real-world data, to designing the best method to solve the problem, and implementing a solution. The problems and datasets come from real-world settings identical to what the student would encounter in industry, academia, or government.

We envision creating nine new courses, the four listed above and these:
- DS-GA-XX07 Information Visualization: cross-listed course with Claudio Silva’s InfoViz course at Poly.
- DS-GA-XX08 Graphical Models: advanced topics in probabilistic inference and estimation. A modified, more advanced version of David Sontag’s Graphical Models course, minus the topics in DS-GA-XX05.
- DS-GA-XX11 Information Retrieval: search, precision/recall, text representation, TF/IDF,
multimedia search, semantic hashing for fast search.

- DS-GA-XX12 Statistical Natural Language Processing: statistical language models, statistical methods for parsing, named entity recognition, language translation, sentiment analysis, and related topics.
- DS-GA-XX13 Signals, Speech, and Audio Analysis: audio feature extraction, signal representation, signal denoising and restoration, optimal filtering, classification and retrieval of speech, music, sonar, etc.
- DS-GA-XX14 Optimization methods for Data Science: stochastic optimization, second order methods, parallel methods.
- DS-GA-XX15 Experimental Design, Mechanism Design, Causal Inference: designing experiments to identify causal relationships and identify complex systems.

For electives, any course offered at Courant at the MS or PhD level would be approved. In addition a list of pre-approved courses in other programs would be published. Courses not in these two lists would require approval of the program director.

**New PhD in Data Science**

A PhD in Data Science would be offered.

The required courses would be the same as for the MS in Data Science, with the additional requirement that a student in receive at least an A- in each course. The existing algorithms course would become an elective.

There would be no breadth requirements as in the PhD for Computer Science, as these would be replaced by the six required courses.

There would be a depth qualifying exam modelled on the DQE for the PhD in Computer Science.

A thesis proposal and presentation followed by preparation of a thesis and a thesis defense would be required as for the PhD in Computer Science.

**CDS Fellows Program**

The CDS will have two postdoctoral research positions called “CDS fellows”. CDS fellows will be selected among applicants by an ad-hoc committee. The existence of a continuous postdoctoral fellow program, not linked to a particular faculty or grant, will cause top candidates to apply, and will be associated with high prestige. The program can be thought of as similar to the Beckman Fellow program of the Beckman Institute at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

**Other Educational Opportunities**
Once the CDS is established, NYU can consider other educational opportunities.

One such possibility is to offer all or most courses on-line for general consumption without receiving NYU course credit. This is an emerging opportunity and threat that must be addressed. CDS would be consistent with NYU’s emergent strategy in this area.

Another educational opportunity will be around executive education in data science. CDS could offer an executive MS in Data Science, modeled after the Stern Executive MBA, and executive education, modeled after the Stern Open Enrollment Programs and the Stern Custom Programs. These programs are potentially a major source of funding.

**Funding and Timing**

**Funding**

In steady state, the CDS will fund itself through the educational programs, grants, gifts, sponsorships and partnerships. Funding from NYU is needed for an initial period of up to 3 to 4 years to support new faculty hiring, a small number of research scientists and postdocs, administrative staff, space, and equipment.

Our financial model (prepared with the assistance of Irene Robling and Michael Sohn, both on the Courant administrative staff) shows that about $3.0 million plus the cost of fitting out newly-acquired space is needed to seed the initiative. The initiative is expected to be cash generating in AY 17.

**Timeline**

The initiative would build up quickly.

- In AY13, NYU would commit the initial funding and the planning and approval work would begin. The key milestones are
  - obtain New York State accreditation of the MS and PhD programs, then
    - advertise the program to prospective MS and PhD students
    - select the initial student body: admit 30 MS students and 8 PhD students
  - hire two tenure-track faculty
  - hire one equivalent full-time adjunct faculty
  - locate the required space, start refurbishing it
  - reach out to potential corporate sponsors

- In AY14, students would be admitted and development of the initiative would continue. Key milestones are
  - offer required first-year MS courses
  - hire two tenure track faculty
○ advertise for and admit 40 MS students and 9 PhD students
○ move into the new space

- In AY15, development would continue with these key milestones:
  ○ offer the required second-year MS courses
  ○ offer a few of the elective MS courses
  ○ hire two tenure track faculty members
  ○ advertise for and admit 50 MS students and 10 PhD students
  ○ complete the fit-out of the new space

- In AY16, development would continue with these key milestones:
  ○ offer most of the remaining elective courses
  ○ hire two tenure track faculty member
  ○ hire one adjust faculty member
  ○ advertise for and admit 60 MS students and 12 PhD students

- In AY17, development would continue with these key milestones:
  ○ offer all of the elective courses
  ○ hire one tenure track faculty member
  ○ advertise for and admit 60 MS students and 12 PhD students

The CDS Organization

This section describes the organization structure of CDS, omitting the faculty positions. Position descriptions for senior position are outlined.

The chart below describes the top-level structure of the CDS organization at full implementation. Rectangles in the organization chart indicate roles, not people, so that a single person could fill more than one role at least initially and more people could be added when and if the organization scaled up because of increased student enrollment. (These roles and descriptions are aligned with those planned for the CUSP program.)
The Assistant Director for Academic Services and Registration is responsible for all matters pertaining to student registration, course scheduling and grading, and student advising. This position coordinates IT services related to registration and course management; acts as a liaison to other relevant educational administrative personnel; manages tuition and cost-sharing across NYU; manages degree certification; works with the Managing Director and other staff to develop and implement internal and external web sites; coordinates faculty instructional matters, faculty teaching evaluation, and teaching loads and schedules.

The Assistant Director for Student Affairs is responsible for all matters pertaining to student affairs: loan, financial aid and work-study applications; housing; health insurance and other student services; scholarships and internships; and career advisement and placement. The Assistant Director will lead the development of student activities to plan and implement new and innovative services, events, and activities for a diverse student population. The assistant director will be responsible for the oversight of the full range of student activities, as well as planning, coordinating and implementing CDS program orientation and convocation and production and maintenance of student data bases and resume books used by recruiters. The position works closely with CDS Corporate Partners to implement cross-partner student engagement and coordination.

The Assistant Director for Admissions coordinates members of the admissions staff in the overall effort to attract and secure a large and diverse pool of the best and the brightest students into CDS programs. Help develop a strategic marketing plan that promotes CUSP’s distinct and compelling brand and several new initiatives in collaboration with the associate director for external affairs and other relevant offices. Develops admissions materials and helps to coordinate the admissions selection committee. The Assistant Director for Admissions works closely with CDS Corporate Sponsors to secure new students and coordinate student enrollment in joint/shared programs.

Program Coordinators are faculty who advise the Director on overall policies, program planning, admissions, and pedagogical matters. They are responsible for coordinating and supervising the curriculum for capstone projects and courses, and for monitoring grading procedures in consultation with the faculty. Program coordinators also coordinate with other programs in NYU, and meet with and advise faculty and students. They may have other general administrative duties and will teach one or more CDS courses. They use their executive assistants for administrative support.

The Assistant Director for Outside Board Support provide support for the Director in managing the Scientific Advisory Board and Industrial Advisory Board. They work at the direction of the chairs of these boards, coordinating with the Director and Managing Director.

The Assistant Director for Executive Education is responsible for all matters pertaining to
executive education; designing and implement a strategy for executive education; coordinating with corporations that use the CDS executive education program; developing and implementing branding for the program; monitoring the success of students enrolled in the program.

The Assistant Director for Computing Services is responsible for all matters pertaining to computing services supporting CDS; helping to develop strategies for administrative support systems (student in-take processing, enrollment, academic administration, and post-graduate tracking); coordinating with faculty the strategy and implementation of facilities support student courses and research including all aspects of the technology stack; developing effective relationships with vendors and partners supporting deployment of computing services; coordinating development and support of open source software supported by CDS; administering data repositories, some with open access, some with rightly-managed rights; design and operation of the computing infrastructure. This role will have several direct reports.
A. Data Science at NYU Today

NYU Faculty involved in Data Science Today

● Courant
  ○ Gerard Ben Arous benarous@cims.nyu.edu: probability, statistics (Courant)
  ○ Chris Bregler: computer vision, machine learning
  ○ Sourav Chatterjee sourav@cims.nyu.edu: theoretical statistics (Math)
  ○ Rob Fergus: computer vision, machine learning
  ○ Leslie Greengard greengard@cims.nyu.edu: computational sciences (Math)
  ○ Yann LeCun yann@cs.nyu.edu: machine learning & AI (CS)
  ○ David Mordecai mordecai@cims.nyu.edu: computational economics (Courant)
  ○ Dennis Shasha: bioinformatics, databases
  ○ David Sontag dsontag@cs.nyu.edu: machine learning, AI (Courant/CS)
  ○ Mark Tygert: statistics, large-scale linear algebra
  ○ Margaret Wright mhw@cs.nyu.edu: optimization (Courant/CS)
  ○ Adi Rangan rangan@cims.nyu.edu: computational neuroscience, numerical analysis
  ○ Esteban Tabak tabak@cims.nyu.edu: applied mathematics, data mining

● FAS
  ○ Michael Blanton blanton@nyu.edu: astrophysics and cosmology, Sloan Digital Sky Surveys I, II, III, BigBOSS
  ○ Richard Bonneau bonneau@nyu.edu: computational biology (Biology & CS)
  ○ Jane Carlton <jane.carlton@nyu.edu >: genomics (Biology)
  ○ Dalton Conley daltonconley@gmail.com: sociology (Sociology + Wagner)
  ○ Gloria Coruzzi gc2@nyu.edu: plant systems biology (Biology)
  ○ Kyle Cranmer kyle.cranmer@nyu.edu: particle physics (Physics), Large Hadron Collider Atlas Experiment
  ○ Nathaniel Daw daw@cns.nyu.edu: Computational neuroscience of learning and decision making (Neural Science)
  ○ Paul Glimcher paulg@nyu.edu: Neuroeconomics and decision making (Neural Science)
  ○ David Greenberg: sociology
  ○ Kris Gunsalus kcg1@nyu.edu: genomics and systems biology (Biology)
  ○ David Heeger david.heeger@nyu.edu: cognitive and computational neuroscience, vision, fMRI (Neural Science & Psychology)
  ○ David W. Hogg david.hogg@nyu.edu: exoplanets and cosmology (Physics), Sloan Digital Sky Survey III
  ○ Guillermina Jasso: sociology
  ○ Jennifer Jennings: sociology
  ○ Edo Kussell edo.kussell@nyu.edu: computational biology (Biology)
- John Leahy john.leahy@nyu.edu: economics
- Dohoon Lee: sociology
- Bijan Pesaran Bijan@nyu.edu: Neuronal dynamics and decision making.
- Michael Purugganan mp132@nyu.edu: genomics (Biology)
- Tom Sargent thomas.sargent@nyu.edu: economics
- Patrick Sharkey pts1@nyu.edu: sociology (Sociology + Wagner)
- Mark Siegal mark.siegel@nyu.edu: genomics and systems biology (Biology)
- Eero Simoncelli eero.simoncelli@nyu.edu: computational neuroscience, vision (Neural Science)
- Christine Vogel cvogel@nyu.edu: proteomics (Biology)

- Law
  - Ryan Bubb ryan.bubb@nyu.edu: empirical legal studies

- NYU Langone Medical Center
  - Alexander Alekseyenko: microbiomics, sequencing informatics, statistics, bioinformatics
  - Constantin Aliferis Constantin.Aliferis@nyumc.org: bioinformatics (Medical informatics, computational causal discovery and variable selection, building predictive models from high-dimensional biomedical data)
  - Yidalon Aphinyanaphongs: information retrieval and scientometrics
  - Stewart Brown: sequencing informatics, bioinformatics
  - David Fenyo: proteomics informatics, bioinformatics
  - Lawrence Fu: information retrieval and scientometrics
  - Judith Goldberg JD.Goldberg@nyumc.org: biostatistics (Biostatistics)
  - Mengling Liu mengling.liu@nyumc.org: biostatistics (Medical Center)
  - Alexander Statnikov Alexander.Statnikov@med.nyu.edu: computational causal discovery and variable selection, building predictive models from high-dimensional biomedical data

- Poly
  - Claudio Silva csilva@poly.edu: visualization/data analysis (CSE)
  - Juliana Freire: data management (CSE)

- Steinhardt
  - Jack Buckley jack.buckley@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Nicole Carnegie nicole.carnegie@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Ying Lu ying.lu@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Joel Middleton joel.middleton@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Jennifer Hill jennifer.hill@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Marc Scott marc.scott@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Sharon Weinberg sharon.weinberg@nyu.edu: applied statistics (PRIISM)
  - Mary Farbood mfarbood@nyu.edu: neuromusicology, data analysis (MARL)
  - Juan Bello jpbello@nyu.edu: music informatics (MARL)

- SCPS
- Silver School of Social Work
  - James Jaccard jjaccard@nyu.edu: psychometrics and statistical methods
B. Similar Entities at Other Institutions

Several universities and research institutions across the globe have significant research and teaching activities in Data Science. But there is no model to follow that directly pertain to NYU's unique situation. Most university have not had the luxury to start an initiative from scratch, relying instead on existing Statistics departments and choosing to facilitate rapprochements between statistics, computer science, and applied mathematics through joint appointments (UC Berkeley is a good example of that approach). In reality, many schools have sensed the importance of the
“big data” and are scrambling to organize their activities in statistics, machine learning/AI, and information science. Good examples include Cornell (driven by the new dean of engineering Dan Huttenlocher), Princeton, Duke, Columbia, and Stanford.

Perhaps the boldest experiment was the creation of a Machine Learning Department at Carnegie-Mellon University a few years ago. The process started 15 years ago with the creation of the Center for Automatic Learning and Discovery under the leadership of Tom Mitchell, which eventually became a full-fashioned department. The department has 23 core faculty. Strangely, they do not offer a professional masters program, only a secondary masters accessible only to PhD students in other areas.

Columbia has had a unique, but only partially successful approach. In 2003, Columbia create the Center for Computational Learning and Systems, a research center initiated with a $2.4M startup fund, and funded by soft money thereafter. More recently, Columbia reorganized its statistics department, hired an external chair (David Madigan from Rutgers), and created a hugely successful professional Masters program (with over 170 students in 2010) that entirely funds their PhD program. To foster interactions between various data science efforts, Columbia created the Applied Statistics Center. However, there seems to be little interaction between the statistics program (which remains somewhat traditional, with too little emphasis on computational aspects), the CCLS, and the small number of machine learning faculty in CS.

UC Irvine created the Center for Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems, under the leadership of Pierre Baldi, with 8 primary faculty, and 22 additional affiliated faculty. The research activities have a large component in bioinformatics.

The Max Planck Society in Tübingen recently created a new Max Planck Institute for Autonomous systems, with a Department of Empirical Inference under the leadership of Bernhard Schölkopf, whose main scientific mission is very similar to our vision for a center for data science at NYU. The department has a mixture of activities on methods and theory, together with research in a number of application areas, particularly biology, neuroscience, and astronomy. The Institute covers all aspects of intelligent and autonomous systems, artificial and natural, neurons and silicon, robots and animals.

Several universities have not tried to unify data science under a single umbrella, preferring to beef up their activities in machine learning within their CS department, or to hire computationally-inclined researchers in their statistics departments. The result is that many schools have considerably stronger machine learning and AI activities within their CS department than NYU (a list is given in Appendix C).

For example, Stanford has a very strong statistics department which includes “practical” statisticians who see little boundary between their brand of statistics and machine learning (e.g. David Donoho, Trevor Hastie, Rob Tibshirani, Jerome Friedman), as well as a very strong CS department with a large activity in AI (Machine Learning, Robotics, Computer Vision, Natural Language Processing), and strong applied mathematics (with the Computational and
Mathematical Engineering program). However, there seems to be little interaction (if not a rivalry) between these various groups.

Berkeley has chosen to foster interactions between CS and Statistics by making a large number of joint appointments between the two departments, hiring computationally-inclined statisticians or statistically-inclined machine learners (e.g. Michael Jordan, Bin Yu, Martin Wainwright and several others).

Several schools have created critical mass by regrouping all of AI under a single banner (ML, natural language processing, vision, robotics, and sometimes computational biology) because almost everyone in these fields is heavily involved in ML as a direct contributor or as a user. MIT is a good example: the AI activity very strong and diverse (the department is called “Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab”) with a large effort in robotics. The Brain and Cognitive Science department also has a strong presence in machine learning with connections to neuroscience.

Some universities have struggled to develop meaningful ML/AI efforts within their CS departments, including Chicago, Harvard, Yale, and to a lesser extent Princeton. Chicago has found a creative way to solve the problem however, by hosting the Toyota Technological Institute on campus (endowed by the Toyoda family), in which many of the faculty members work on ML/AI. Princeton is rumored to be working on an initiative similar to ours. Harvard and Yale have a relatively small presence in machine learning, but are traditionally strong in statistics and applied mathematics.

Statistics on DS-Related Centers at Other Institutions

- **CMU: Machine Learning Department**
  - 15 core faculty, 4 research faculty, 3 adjuncts
  - 35 affiliated faculty
  - 7 postdocs, 3 visiting faculty
  - 4 admins
  - 3 software engineers
  - 54 affiliated PhD students (not all are advised by core faculty)

- **University of Utah: SCI (Scientific Computing and Imaging Institute)**
  - 15 core faculty, 5 research faculty, 2 adjuncts
  - 19 research scientists and postdocs
  - 14 software engineers + 4 media development
  - 9 admins, 6 sysadmins.

- **UC Irvine: Center for Machine Learning and Intelligent Systems**
  - 8 core faculty,
  - 22 affiliated faculty
  - 2 research staff
  - sponsors: Yahoo!, Experian, Microsoft, IBM, Google
C. MSDS Program

New courses are described in the body of the document. Here we depict the timing and sequencing of the courses.

Many courses presently offered at Courant, Stern, and other programs would be pre-approved as electives. Other courses may be taken as electives with the approval of the program director.

Program Schedule

YEAR 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURSE TITLE</td>
<td>CREDITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-GA-XX01 Intro to Data Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-GA-XX02 Statistical and Mathematical Methods for Data Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Science Elective 1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CREDITS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

YEAR 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FALL</th>
<th>SPRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COURSE TITLE</td>
<td>CREDITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-GA-XX05 Inference and Representation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-GA-XX06 Capstone Project in Data Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Science Elective 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CREDITS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Financials

The financial model is in a Google document that can be accessed by contacting Yann LeCun, Roy Lowrance, Irene Robling, Gérard Ben Arous.

URL for financial model (authorization required)

The financial model analyzes the cost to NYU beyond the status quo, which includes the costs and revenues associated with the 6 faculty members already at NYU who will become core CDS faculty. All costs and revenues that would be generated by these six faculty members are included in the base case and hence excluded from the incremental analysis. These costs and revenues include: the costs of about 10,000 square feet of space used for offices, doctoral students, visitors, seminar rooms, and labs; costs of supporting their current doctoral students; revenues from their current grants; revenues from MS students taking courses they currently teach.

The incremental financial forecast projects the need for three years of cash investment before the initiative would become cash generating. The total cash investment needed is about $3.0 million over the first three years plus any costs for leasehold improvements on the incremental space acquired. The fourth year is projected to be roughly break-even from a cash perspective. Starting in the fifth year, the initiative would generate roughly $1.5 million in positive cash flow each year.

The costs in these forecasts are more certain than the revenues. Costs are based on Courant’s unit costs multiplied by the appropriate size numbers and inflated at the inflation rate assumed by Courant. Incremental space is assumed to cost $100 per square foot initially. Estimates for fitting out the space would vary widely based on the exact nature of the space acquired and are omitted from these estimates.

In order to attract a very good applicant pool for the first group of MS students admitted, we have assumed that each of them would be granted a complete fellowship for the two year MS program.

The revenue assumptions are primarily around MS enrollment and the resulting tuition credits, overhead on grants derived by the incremental faculty added, and funding from corporate sponsors.

MS admissions in the first academic year is assumed to be 30 students and to grow to 60 by the 4th academic year. Given the great demand for data scientists, we expect to be able to admit only high potential students and meet these enrollment objectives. Additionally, the model
assumes very small enrollments in DS courses from CUSP students (rising to only 15 full-time equivalents in the 4th academic year), a conservative assumption given that much of the science in CUSP will depend on Data Science and the large enrollments planned for CUSP. (We continue to work with the CUSP planners to firm up that projection.) We assume that 40 non-data science, non-CUSP full-time equivalent students will also enroll in the Data Science courses in the 4th academic year of the initiative. Grants from the incremental faculty are assumed to grow to $200,000 by the 4th academic year of the program, an amount that is equal to the average of the entire Computer Science faculty. We expect to exceed this number, given the importance of data science to many funding sources. We plan an aggressive campaign to raise funds from corporate sponsors but assume that only $200,000 a year is raised from this program.
E. Rationale for the Center for Data Science

*The Age of the Exabyte*

We live in the "Age Of The Petabyte", soon to become "The Age Of The Exabyte". Our networked world is generating a deluge of data that no human, or group of humans, can process fast enough. Some of that data is readily interpretable by machines, but much of it consists of unstructured data captured from the real world using a variety of sources: sensors from scientific experiments, pictures and videos from the Web, Web usage data, location data from smartphones, link data from social networks, customer data from e-commerce websites, transaction data from financial companies, text from news agencies, blogs, and collaborative filtering websites, usage data from credit card companies and utilities, the list goes on.

The deluge of data is transforming the way science and medicine are carried out. New knowledge is being derived by automatically analyzing massive amounts of data. New fields of Science are emerging that are built around the automated analysis of massive datasets. This includes new branches of genomics, biochemistry, astronomy and cosmology, high-energy physics, and neuroscience (particularly brain imaging). Several areas of social science and the humanities are already starting to be influenced by automated data analysis, including law, economics, sociology, political science, and history. The trend is only going to accelerate in the coming years.

We will see an increasingly large number of traditional discipline spawning new sub-disciplines with the adjective "computational" in front of them. We already know about computational physics, computational neuroscience and computational biology. We will soon see the emergence of computational economics, computational history, computational psychology, and many others.

The common thread of these new domains will be their reliance on automated methods to analyze massive amounts of data and to extract knowledge from them. While each application domain has its own set of specific techniques, a new discipline has emerged whose object is to provide the underlying methods of the data revolution. This new discipline overlaps multiple traditional disciplines including Statistics, Computer Science, Applied Mathematics, and application domains. This emergent discipline is known by several names: computational statistics, machine learning, or even "modern" Artificial Intelligence.

*We will call it "Data Science".*

The phrase Data Science has gained acceptance because its methods emerge at the intersection (or the union) of several existing disciplines (mainly statistics, machine learning, AI,
applied mathematics, and databases), without being entirely contained in any one of them.

**The Data-Centered World**

We are at the cusp of what Joe Hellerstein of Berkeley has called "The Industrial Revolution of Data" [1], in which information (and perhaps "knowledge") is primarily produced by machines, not people.

Data Science has already revolutionized the commercial world. Without the tools of Data Science, companies such as Google, Amazon, Facebook, Linkedin would not be the successes that they are. Even brick-and-mortar companies such as Walmart owe their success partly to Data Science: tracking and predicting customer and supplier behavior allows them to optimized stocks and prices. More broadly, all modern enterprises rely on so-called "business analytics" which is the business world's name for their application of data science. Business analytics is an increasingly strategic segment: business analytic startups are being bought by large consulting and services companies such as IBM and SAP.

There is a huge, and largely unmet, need for data science specialists on the job market today. Established Companies such as Google, IBM, AT&T, Microsoft, and Amazon hire large numbers of graduates with computer science, mathematics, statistics, or engineering backgrounds to turn them into data scientists, but they are not the only ones. Practically every Wall Street company now use computational methods to predict financial data, analyze business news, and automate trading. They recruit in financial mathematics program, but also in statistics and machine learning. Every company with an e-commerce website (even brick-and-mortar stores) rely on data analytics to manage customers and control prices, sales, and stocks. Many mobile app companies collect usage and location data from users. Services companies such as banks and telecom companies collect data on customer behavior for credit assessment, churn prediction, and fraud detection. Biotech and pharmaceutical companies hire data scientists to analyze biological data and drug testing results.

Data Science is so important that the CTOs and Chief Scientists of a large proportion of successful web companies have backgrounds in AI, Machine Learning or Computational Statistics (e.g. Google, bit.ly, Microsoft's on-line advertising and search divisions, Yahoo! labs).

Data scientists may be the most sought-after graduates of the next few years. The New York Times ran an article in August 2009 entitled "For Today's Graduate, Just One Word: Statistics" which included the following quote [2]:

"I keep saying that the sexy job in the next 10 years will be statisticians, and I'm not kidding."

Hal Varian, Chief Economist at Google
Another quote from the same article [2] is from Erik Brynjolfsson, director of the MIT Center for Digital Business:

"...But the big problem is going to be the ability of humans to use, analyze and make sense of the data."

Data Science will also revolutionize medicine, education, and other areas that are slated to become "evidence-based". Here is a quote from Peter Orszag [3], former director of the White House Office of Management and Budget:

"Robust, unbiased data are the first step toward addressing our long-term economic needs and key policy priorities. [...] I noted two particular areas where more and better data would be useful: health care and education."

A Gaping Educational Void

Despite the huge growing demand for data scientists, not a single university in the US proposes a degree in Data Science today. There is a huge and gaping void to fill, and a huge opportunity for the first universities to fill it.

Existing programs in statistics, computer science, applied mathematics, information science and business management include courses related to data science, but they don't quite fit the bill. Many computer science departments offer courses in machine learning, many statistics departments offer courses in data analytics, many business schools and schools of information science have programs in data mining, and some applied mathematics programs offer courses
in data analysis, visualization and optimization. But very few graduates of these programs have the breadth of skills required to call themselves Data Scientists.

The problem is well expressed by Drew Conway, an NYU graduate student in Politics who is a major contributor to the Data Science blog "The Dataist". Drew published the Data Science Venn Diagram [4]: CS programs don't have enough mathematics, substantive expertise in an application area, and exposure to large datasets; statistics and mathematics programs don't have enough programming, algorithmics, substantive expertise, and exposure to large datasets; and business and information science programs don't have enough mathematics, programming and algorithmics. None provides nearly enough exposure to large, real-world datasets. Machine Learning is at the intersection of computer science and math/stats, traditional research is at the intersection of math/stats and topical expertise, and data science it at the intersection of all three sets: CS, math/stats, and topical expertise.

Data Science requires skills in continuous mathematics that are currently only required from students majoring in physics, mathematics, and some engineering fields. The mathematical pre-requisites for Data Scientists include such topics as multivariate calculus, linear algebra, optimization and probability. Data Science also requires programming skills that are only offered to CS majors (C/C++ programming, scientific computing, database systems, machine learning and AI). Data Science also clearly requires solid training in statistics. In addition, Data Science can profit from skills in a number of application areas, such as signal and image processing, bioinformatics, natural language processing, etc.

There is a stupendously large educational gap to fill, and huge opportunity for educational institutions that will fill it first.

Here is another quote from Hal Varian (Google's chief economist) from a 2009 McKinsey Quarterly article [5]:

"I keep saying the sexy job in the next ten years will be statisticians. People think I'm joking, but who would've guessed that computer engineers would've been the sexy job of the 1990s? The ability to take data—to be able to understand it, to process it, to extract value from it, to visualize it, to communicate it—that's going to be a hugely important skill in the next decades, not only at the professional level but even at the educational level for elementary school kids, for high school kids, for college kids. Because now we really do have essentially free and ubiquitous data. So the complimentary scarce factor is the ability to understand that data and extract value from it."

However, Mike Driscoll in his 2009 Dataspora.com article entitled “The Three Sexy Skills of the Data Geeks” [6] echos Drew Conway's point when he writes:

"I believe that the folks to whom Hal Varian is referring are not statisticians in the narrow sense, but rather people who possess skills in three key, yet independent areas:
Nathan Yau in his 2009 Flowingdata.com article entitled “Rise of the Data Scientist” [7] reinforces this important point:

"We're seeing data scientists - people who can do it all - emerge from the rest of the pack. [...] Statisticians should know APIs, databases, and how to scrape data; designers should learn to do things programmatically; and computer scientists should know how to analyze and find meaning in data."

Many comments from readers of these articles are from employers asking "where can I find data scientists?". The sad answer is "nowhere". Because of this unmet demand, an MSc and PhD program in Data Science is almost guaranteed to be an instant success. The Courant Institute is particularly well positioned to seize the opportunity by putting together and hosting such a program.

**The New Data-Centered Science**

While data analytics has revolutionized business practices, it is also revolutionizing the way science is carried out.

A recent Wired Magazine article quoted famous statistician George Box's well-known quip: "All models are wrong, but some are useful." The title of the article was: "The End of Theory: The Data Deluge Makes the Scientific Method Obsolete" [8]. While this is certainly a journalistic exaggeration, the article points to a clear trend: more and more branches of science are relying on the automatic analysis of massive datasets to extract new knowledge. Some of the best examples can be found at NYU: genomics and proteomics, astronomy, high-energy physics, brain imaging and neuroscience, economics, social network analysis, text mining in law, history, and political science, etc.

Science Magazine ran a special issue in February 2011 entitled “Dealing with Data”. Even the popular science press is echoing the trend: the November 2011 issue of Popular Science is a special issue entitled “Data is Power, how information is driving the future”, with articles such as “The Glory of Big Data”, “The Rise of the Machines”, and “The Data-Centric Universe”.

A good evidence that a new field is emerging is the migration of researchers from previously unrelated fields to data-centered science. Perhaps the best example is genomics. A number of prominent researchers in genomics and computational biology have backgrounds outside of biology. A famous representative of this trend is Prof. David Haussler from UCSC who, from a machine learning theorist in the early 90’s went on to develop some of the first statistical methods for biological sequence analysis, and played a key role in the public effort to sequence...
the human genome. He now sees himself as a biologist who uses data analysis to explore the evolution of the human genome. Another one is Eric Lander, founding director of the MIT Whitehead Institute, and a major contributor to the human genome sequencing project, and whose PhD is in mathematics.

**The Science behind Data Science**

Data Science is helping the sciences, but it was born from a desire to answer one of the most important scientific questions of our times: what is intelligence, and how does the brain work? The methods of Data Science, and reason it attracts so many bright students is that, beyond the applications to business and science, its goal is to produce intelligent machines. Data Science is the new AI. Its methods come not only from statistics and applied mathematics, but also from theoretical and computational neuroscience. Some classes of models, such as artificial neural networks, sparse modeling, non-negative matrix factorization, convolutional networks, and others have their roots in neuroscience and cognitive science. The connection between AI, machine learning, computer vision, and robotics on one hand, and computational neuroscience and cognitive science on the other hand has proved very fruitful in both directions.

The methods of Data Science draw on statistics for Bayesian methods, parameter estimation, generalization bounds, theoretical guarantees, and inference methods such as Monte-Carlo, MCMC, and variational methods. It draws on applied mathematics for large-scale numerical methods, large-scale SVD and eigen-problems, convex optimization, non-convex optimization, and harmonic analysis. It draws on computer science for machine learning, kernel methods, parallel processing, database systems, and application areas such computer vision, robotics, and AI in general. Areas of pure mathematics are poised to have a large impact on the “big data” problem, particularly geometry and analysis.

**Data Science: an Opportunity and a Threat for NYU and the Courant Institute**

As we all know, Courant is ranked number one in the nation for Applied Mathematics. What has made Courant so successful is a tradition of developing new mathematics and new computational methods with an eye towards real-world applications. If Courant is to maintain its leading position, it must continue that tradition and lead the next wave in Applied Mathematics.

In the "Age of the Exabyte", the next wave in applied mathematics is undoubtedly the analysis of large datasets. With its almost seamless boundary between CS and Mathematics, and its strong link with the Sciences, Courant is uniquely positioned to lead that wave.

In fact, if Courant doesn't lead the data revolution, it would almost certainly lose its dominance in
Margaret Wright and Yann LeCun have been serving on a National Academy of Sciences committee named "Mathematical Sciences in 2025", which is studying future important directions in the field. The committee has been interviewing a number of leading figures in the mathematical sciences, as well as in fields that are heavy users of mathematics. When asked about the next challenge for mathematical sciences, virtually every interviewee put "large datasets" on top of their list. This answer came not only from statisticians and biologists, but also from prominent pure mathematicians, applied mathematicians, and the leaders of almost all the professional societies, national laboratories, and major industry research labs.

Perhaps the best evidence that Applied Mathematics is on a collision source with Data Science is the research direction adopted by many leading applied mathematicians over the last few years, including Vladimir Rokhlin (Yale), Ronald Coifman (Yale), Stan Osher (UCLA), Emmanuel Candes (Stanford), David Donoho (Stanford), Guillermo Sapiro (Minnesota). All are actively involved in the development of intelligent data analysis methods. In the interviews for MathSci-2025, David Donoho (Statistician at Stanford) said "mathematics doesn't give enough credit to the empirical sciences [...] we should encourage people to be mathematical phenomenologists". Ronald Coifman (Applied Mathematician at Yale) said that the biggest challenge for the coming years is "the underlying mathematics of approximating high-dimensional functions", "the mathematics behind high-dimensional data representations", and "the need to invent new mathematical tools to deal with high-dimensional data".

Data Science indeed poses interesting questions for pure mathematics and probability theory: what is the structure of data in high-dimensional spaces? many branches of pure mathematics and probability theory could make major contributions to our understanding of data, particularly geometry. Some of the new mathematics of the 21st century will undoubtedly be inspired by the "big data" question.

**The Role of Courant in a University-Wide Initiative in Data Science.**

With Courant's reputation in applied mathematics, the uniquely tight relationship between mathematics and computer science, and the strength of the faculty in theoretical statistics, probability, machine learning, AI, computer vision, optimization, computational mathematics, and mathematical finance, Courant has a unique mix of talents in the basic methods of data science. However, the NYU expertise in data science goes well beyond Courant. Other groups within NYU have considerable strengths in data science and its applications. This includes a number of departments in FAS, notably biology, physics, neuroscience, and economics, which have strong activities in data science for such things as genomics, astronomy, high-energy physics, brain imaging, neural signal analysis, and economic prediction. Stern has a strong presence in machine learning and predictive modeling in its information science department and programs. Steinhardt has two programs that are strongly connected with data science: quantitative
methods in social sciences, and music information retrieval in the music technology program. Poly has expertise in data visualization, signal processing, and robotics. The medical school has a large bioinformatics group with considerable strength in machine learning and statistical modeling.

While NYU at large and Courant in particular have clear strengths in applied math, machine learning, theoretical statistics and probability and a large number of application areas, other universities have relied on the strength of their statistics departments, establishing links with computer science and applied mathematics to build effort in data science. While the absence of a computationally-oriented statistics department at NYU could be seen as a handicap, it can also be turned into an advantage: it makes it possible to design a 21st century computational statistics and data science program from the ground up, and to leapfrog other institutions without being hampered too much by the weight of legacy.

By creating a program in data science, Courant would not replace existing programs within the university, but would strengthen them: students in these programs would be able to take classes on fundamental methods from the data science program. Conversely, students from the data science program would be able to take courses in a wide range of application areas.

In many fields (such as CS and biology) where research relies heavily on graduate students and postdocs, the quality of the graduate students has a considerable influence on the quality of the research, which in turn influences the ability to publish in top venue, to attract funding, and to attract top faculty. A strong PhD program in data science would help Courant and NYU at large to attract top students, funding, and faculty. The ideal data science PhD candidate has a strong mathematical background (with an undergraduate major in mathematics, statistics, physics, EE, or math-heavy CS degree), but many lack enough familiarity with computer science and programming. Conversely, many candidates with a pure CS background have too little background in continuous mathematics (some very prominent machine learning researchers admit to never take North-American CS majors as PhD students for that reason). Unfortunately, many non-CS students are often scared away by the course requirements of CS PhD programs (e.g. in systems), while non-Math students are scared away by Mathematics PhD requirements (e.g. in complex variables). A Data Science program would attract more top PhD candidates with a strong mathematical background and good computer science skills, and would offer them an appropriate range of courses.

The topics of Data science, Machine Learning and AI are extremely popular among the best PhD applicants in Computer Science: during the fall 2009 PhD admission process, the Computer Science Department pre-selected roughly 120 top applications, of which approximately 35% were in ML, computer vision, or robotics, despite the fact that the NYU CS department does not not have a specific program in ML/statistics, and had only two faculty whose primary interest is ML, and three in computer vision. Furthermore, ML and computer vision attract a considerable proportion of the federal and private funding into the CS department. There is a huge demand from prospective students and from funding agencies in this area, which cannot currently be met
because of lack of space and faculty members.

**Demand from Industry in the NYC Area and Beyond**

There is a huge demand for data scientists from a quickly increasing number of companies, and data scientists are nowhere to be found (see an example of a job post for a data scientist at Facebook in Appendix D). The occurrence of the term “data scientist” in job offers has exploded in recent years [9].

*Job postings that mentions “big data” from indeed.com*

*(after "Building data science teams", DJ Patil, 2011)*

A large number of web-oriented startup companies in New York City are entirely built around data analytics, and many have significant R&D activities in machine learning, data mining, and data science in general. The pace of recruitment in these areas has been accelerating in the last few years. The most prominent companies include Google (Manhattan), Yahoo (Manhattan), NEC Labs (Princeton), IBM (Yorktown Heights), AT&T (Florham Park), Lucent/Bell Labs (Murray Hill), Telcordia (Piscataway), SRI (Princeton). Many Wall Street companies such as Standards and Poor, as well as hedge fund, such as D. E. Shaw and Renaissance, actively recruit graduates with a machine learning background. A large number of web-oriented startups in and around NYC are also recruiting in this area (bit.ly, foursquare, etc).

The annual Strata Conference (held in New York City in September 2011) covers the latest and best tools and technologies for data science, from gathering, cleaning, analyzing, and storing data to communicating data intelligence effectively.

A NYC-based "meetup" on Machine Learning was formed a few years ago. This informal monthly gathering brings together people from various background around an invited speaker. Participants typically number in the hundreds.
Appendix O: Quantitative Metrics Project

Overview
In 2012, the Provost’s Council on Science and Technology was charged with creating an integrated quantitative metrics database for the bench sciences. The resultant Departmental Metrics Dashboard compiles various indicators for selected departments. To accommodate NYU’s complex structure, the Dashboard organizes data by school, department and subunit. Data on faculty, staff, students, proposals, and grant expenditures are inputted from University systems: HRIS (faculty and staff), SIS (students), Cayuse (proposals), and fame (grant expenditures), and dashboard data are refreshed nightly. Metrics provided by departments are updated once a year in the fall. These include faculty honors and awards, post doc count, funding and placement, and PhD student funding and placement. Departments also have the opportunity to review and correct erroneous data. External rankings are updated once a year as new data become available. The system is used by senior University leadership, deans, and department chairs for decision-making. Plans are to expand the scope of the Dashboard beyond the original departments.

Content
The Departmental Metrics Dashboard compiles for selected departments the indicators identified by the Provost’s Council on Science and Technology as "Principal Markers of Success: Priority Academic Metrics for Assessing Science and Engineering at New York University." The academic units included are the Arts and Sciences science departments, the Courant Institute, Dentistry, Nursing and within the Steinhardt School Applied Psychology and the Public Health and Nutrition programs in the Department of Food Studies, Nutrition and Public Health. Two institutes closely associated with those departments are included: the Institute for Human Development and Social Change and the Institute for Education and Social Policy. The Center for Data Science, Center for Urban Science and Progress, and Global Institute of Public Health are also included though because they are new their data are sparse. NYU Polytechnic and the School of Medicine are among the Nine Points of Science, but they are not included in the dashboard because their data are not integrated.

Reporting Units
To accommodate NYU’s complex structure the Departmental Metrics Dashboard organizes data by School, Department and Subunit. The filters at the top of each page permit the selection of the schools, departments or sub-units to which the user has access. User with access to multiple units may select a single unit or a group of units.

School is the highest organizational level within the dashboard, and may actually be a school or an institute.

Department is generally an academic department overseen by a chair, generally corresponding to an Org in financial data, an HR Department in Human Resources, and an Academic Organization in student data. Selected institutes are also included as “Departments.”

Subunit is required to report on the research success of faculty groups with distinct research programs within a department. An example is that in Steinhardt’s Department of Food, Nutrition and Public Health reporting for Nutrition and Public Health are segregated when appropriate.
Reporting Years
The dashboard shows the current and three prior years. For consistency with financial reporting the selection of years is updated when a fiscal-year's financial books are closed, generally in mid-October. For example, the dashboard showed data for 09-10 through 12-13 until the financial close, at which time it was updated to 10-11 through 13-14.
All the metrics are reported on a September 1-August 31 year. Academic and fiscal metrics are labeled differently to avoid the potential confusion arising from the conventions of identifying academic years by the starting calendar year and fiscal years by the ending calendar year. For example, for the period September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013 academic metrics are labeled 12-13 and fiscal metrics FY13.

Data Sources and Update Frequency
Data on faculty, staff, students, proposals, and grant expenditures are from university systems: HRIS (faculty and staff), SIS (students), Cayuse (proposals), and fame (grant expenditures). These data are refreshed nightly, as indicated by the date/time stamp in the upper left corner of each dashboard page.
Metrics provided by departments are updated once a year, in the fall. These include faculty honors and awards; post doc count, funding and placement; and PhD student funding and placement. External rankings are updated once a year as new data become available.

Security
The Departmental Metrics Dashboard has its own security structure because it synthesizes data from multiple sources into the configuration required to meet reporting needs. Access is controlled at the Departmental Metrics Department level. Anyone with access to a Subunit within a Department has access to data on all the Subunits. Consistent with University data management policy there is no access limitation on student data. Anyone with access to the Dashboard has access to all the student data included.
# Departmental Metrics Dashboard and Principal Markers of Success

## Size and Quality of the Full-Time Tenure-Track Faculty

### 1. Percentage of "Research Active" and Non-"Research Active" Tenure Track Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a1. Total number of faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a2. Total number of research-active faculty</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a3. By rank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical faculty by rank</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE (full-time equivalent positions)</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty by gender and ethnicity</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Faculty Recruitment and Retention

### 2a. Number of offers to junior, mid-career, and senior offers of appointment as well as acceptance rates by rank

### 2b. Retention success rate for junior, mid-career and senior, controlling for counter-offers

### New hires by rank and tenure/non-tenure appointment type

## National and International Awards, Honors, and Leadership Positions

### 3a. Truly significant awards (Nobel Prize, Fields Medal, Turing Award etc.)

### 3b. Truly significant, high impact results (Note: requested; none reported)

### 3c. Truly significant leadership positions in academe and government

## Impact of the Faculty’s Published Results

### 4a. Number of articles in refereed journals, in high-impact journals, proceedings, books

### 4b. Citation rates, indices (e.g. h index), external reviewers’ estimates of depth of impact

## External Funding

### 5a. Number of individual research grants and large-scale multi-disciplinary grants

### 5b. Annual federal and foundation grant expenditures for the unit and per tenure/tenure track faculty

### 5c1. Number of proposal submissions and number of proposals funded broken out by Federal funder

### 5c2. Compared to national application-based success rate

### 5d. Advanced training supported by external funding: Average number of doctoral students/post docs that are supported.

### Grants by purpose (research or other)

### Expenditure from new and continuing grants

### Direct and indirect expense

### Personnel, OTPS and equipment expense

### Grant expenditures for research staff

---

**Dashboard Page**

**Work in progress**

---

Preliminary vendor review complete summer 2013

---
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### 6. Quality of the PhD Student Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of PhD students</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6a. GRE and GPA scores for accepted/registered students</td>
<td>FY14 UDW+ Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b. Number of PhD students supported by prestigious doctoral fellowships</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c. Time-to-degree (compared to national rates for field)</td>
<td>FY14 UDW+ Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d. Placement statistics and positions</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhDs awarded. PhD students by new and continuing, domestic/international, gender and ethnicity</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Size and Quality of Post Doc Appointees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of post docs</th>
<th>Post Docs &amp; Research Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7a. Number, size and description of special post doctoral fellowships (HHMI, Burroughs-Welcome, etc.)</td>
<td>Post Docs &amp; Research Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b. Placement statistics and positions</td>
<td>Post Docs &amp; Research Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Undergraduate Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate enrollment profile: number and percent of offers, acceptances and registered, with comparison to goals</th>
<th>FY14 UDW+ Admissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a1. Undergraduate enrollment profile: number and percent of offers, acceptances and registered, with comparison to goals</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a2. Distribution by race, ethnicity, gender, geography and income (Dashboard provides counts of majors and their distribution by race/ethnicity and gender. Geography and income not yet included.)</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program enrollment by new and continuing, domestic/ international, primary/secondary major</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b1. Student quality at entry: SAT, ACT, GPA scores for applicants/acceptances/registered</td>
<td>FY14 UDW+ Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b2. Benchmark data for top 10 competitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c. Placement, six months after graduation. Number and percent of students credentialed/licensed and with &quot;above the bar&quot; GRE/GMAT/LSAT scores in field of study, with jobs, or in graduate and/or professional programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. National and International Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National rankings of grant expenditures</th>
<th>External Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9a. National rankings of grant expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. Academic Rankings of World Universities: ARWU (the 'Shanghai Rankings') - 'objective' rankings</td>
<td>External Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c. U.S. News &amp; World Report - peer assessments</td>
<td>External Rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9d. National Research Council</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Additions Beyond the Original Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction: Students (who does the department teach?)</th>
<th>FY14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction: Faculty (who teaches department courses?)</td>
<td>FY14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Away</td>
<td>FY14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>