



Self-Study Design

Presented to the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Submitted: November 1, 2014
Revised for Internal Use: December 1, 2014

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Self-Study Design

Table of Contents

Section	Title	Page
I.	Introduction	3
II.	International Education at Columbia	3
III.	University Goals of the Accreditation Review	7
IV.	Organization of the Steering Committee and Working Subcommittees	8
V.	Charges to the Working Subcommittees	10
VI.	Involvement of the Columbia Community	12
VII.	Organization of the Self-Study Report	13
VIII.	Editorial Style of Self Study Report	13
IX.	Assessment and Outcomes	14
X.	Document Review	14
XI.	Timeline	15
XII.	Profile of Visiting Team	16
	Appendix A: Membership of the Subcommittees	17
	Appendix B: Document Review Details	22

I. Introduction

Columbia University was founded in 1754 as King's College by royal charter of King George II of England. It was renamed Columbia College by the New York State Legislature in 1784, and was formally designated a “university” by the Trustees in 1896. It is the oldest institution of higher learning in the state of New York and the fifth oldest in the United States. Columbia comprises 16 schools and colleges and currently employs about 5,000 faculty and enrolls nearly 30,000 students.

Columbia University is scheduled for its next accreditation review in 2015-2016. We have submitted, and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has accepted, our proposal to adopt the “selected topics” model for the evaluation. Our focus will be on the globalization of education at Columbia. This approach offers us the opportunity to address in part the Commission's accreditation standards 1 through 4, 7 through 11, 13, and 14. However, since the self-study will speak to only a portion of our educational programming, it cannot fully demonstrate our adherence to the Commission's standards of accreditation. To confirm our full adherence to the standards, the Commission will also conduct a document review which will occur separately from the preparation of the self-study and prior to a visit by the external examiners. The University proposes that the document review take place in late fall 2015, and that the external review team conduct its site visit in March of 2016. The full schedule for accreditation activities and review is presented in Section XI of this document.

II. International Education at Columbia

As the leading institution of higher education in one of the most cosmopolitan cities in the world, Columbia has had a long history of international involvement. From the admission of international students in the 19th century to the increasing international content in its curricula, Columbia has become a global university in its ambitions and engagement with the rest of the world. As our President, Lee C. Bollinger, has written, “the university is not apart from the activities of the world, but in them and of them. In an era when the economic, environmental, and social challenges we face are truly global in nature, Columbia is building programs and creating the right kind of intellectual and physical infrastructure to deepen our mission of teaching and learning, scholarship and service around the world.” His vision for global education is one that leaps forward, surpassing the more limited concept of “international education” that has typically focused on siloed knowledge of a particular region in isolation. Rather, globalized education embraces a new interconnected vision, one that is interdisciplinary, which allows for comparative study and learning across geographic regions and areas of inquiry, and which is conceptualized and developed in partnership with local/regional collaborators, faculty, alumni, and students. This commitment is evidenced by the many long-standing partnerships of various types between Columbia schools and a host of foreign institutions. These partnerships take the form of two-way faculty exchange programs,

editorial collaborations for major academic journals, and diverse research endeavors. While not designed explicitly for educational purposes, these programs clearly serve as fertile breeding grounds for future educational initiatives.

Columbia's Global Centers

In recognition of this mission, the University has adopted multiple strategies for increasing its international educational engagement in recent years. It has created a network of global centers to serve as bases from which the University's schools and their faculty can create cooperative partnerships with scholars and educators in the regions in which they are located. The University currently operates eight Global Centers in Amman, Beijing, Mumbai, Paris, Istanbul, Nairobi, Santiago, and Rio de Janeiro. According to their mission statement, the Columbia Global Centers "promote and facilitate the collaborative and impactful engagement of the University's faculty, students, and alumni with the world to enhance understanding, address global challenges, and advance knowledge and its exchange." Distinct at every level from "branch campuses," their mission includes promoting educational cooperation with partners throughout the world, contributing to the enrichment of the Columbia education by increasing international content in the classroom; supplementing the curriculum with international study abroad, internship opportunities, and course offerings; providing resources to attract students from abroad; facilitating research opportunities for Columbia students and faculty; and providing a point of continuing engagement for international alumni. The Global Centers are distinguished by robust and dynamic relationships with local and regional stakeholders that foster collaboratively-developed 'project-based scholarship.' Unlike branch campuses, they are comprised neither of separate faculty nor of separate students outside of the larger Columbia University community. Rather, the curricula and projects associated with each location evolve as the needs, interests, and priorities of the region and Columbia faculty and students grow and change.

The Global Centers function as a network, encouraging educational and research programs that require working across disciplinary boundaries, having a presence in multiple regions, and engaging non-Columbia experts and scholars from those regions. They enable cross-regional discussion and comparison, allowing for events and outcomes that occur in one part of the world to be recognized and usefully applied in another. While some of the Centers' programs and research initiatives are country- or regions-specific, an increasing number are multi-regional, and even global. They leverage the University's diverse intellectual capacities from across the undergraduate, graduate and professional schools, and pursue a set of university-wide core activities that evolves over time based on the active engagement of faculty and students. For example, through the efforts of the Istanbul center and Columbia's Center for Democracy, Toleration and Religion, professors from the Arts & Sciences and the School of International and Public Affairs have established an ongoing conversation with the Turkish Economic and Social Studies Foundation and Bogazici University on issues related to

democratization in Turkey. They plan to expand this discussion into a regional, comparative context with institutions in Egypt and Tunisia. In another example, Columbia undergraduates have the opportunity to gain first-hand research experience, in collaboration with Columbia faculty, in subjects of transnational importance from a comparative perspective across several locations through the Columbia University Global Scholars Program Summer Research Workshop. The Workshop is a three-year pilot program initiated by the Weatherhead East Asian Institute, in collaboration with Columbia Global Centers, the Office of Global Programs, and the Institute of Latin American Studies. Finally, the Global Centers facilitated a project-based effort to develop sustainable youth centers in Russeifeh, Jordan, emerging from collaboration between the Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation and Jordan's Ministry of Social Development. All three examples demonstrate the wide-ranging, problem-based, interdisciplinary, outward-looking education and scholarship that can develop at an international research university.

Global Educational Partnerships

Many of the University's schools have developed joint degree programs with educational institutions in other countries. Through these collaborative programs, they have expanded the educational opportunities available to their students while attracting additional international students from their partner institutions. The schools have also established other types of relationships with universities throughout the world that give their students the opportunity to integrate international study into their educational programs. Undergraduates interested in studying abroad can choose to spend a semester or a full year in more than 150 separate programs in many different countries. The University's graduate schools have similarly promoted international partnerships to allow and encourage their students to complete a portion of their studies overseas. They also offer a wide range of international internships and clerkships through which their students can put the knowledge and skills they have gained at Columbia to use on behalf of NGOs, governmental bodies, international agencies and for-profit corporations.

The table below provides summary data on the numbers of students who have pursued study abroad or global internships or education-related travel from selected schools throughout the University. Note that these numbers are higher than those reported annually to the Middle States Commission, because these numbers represent all student travel, and not just those students who study abroad at locations where Columbia directly controls the faculty and/or curriculum (as required by the annual institutional profile instructions).

Number of Students who have Studied or Traveled Abroad as Part of their Columbia Education:

	Number of students who have studied/traveled abroad by category during the 2013-2014 academic year:			
School	Study Abroad <i>(defined as one semester or longer)</i>	Global Internship	Other Education-Related Travel	Total
Architecture Planning and Preservation	32		789	821
Business	9	53	823	885
Columbia College, General Studies and Engineering (Undergraduate)	384	80		464
Continuing Education			20	20
Dental			50	50
Engineering (Graduate)		2	25	27
Graduate School of Arts & Sciences			22	22
Journalism			24	24
Law	50			50
Nursing		9	2	11
Physicians & Surgeons (includes Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy)		4	89	93
Public Health		110	12	122
School of International and Public Affairs		298		298
Social Work	3	5		8
TOTALS:	478	561	1856	2895

While most of these collaborative relationships have been initiated and developed by the individual schools, the University as a whole has also formed a transatlantic partnership with three of France’s premier educational institutions: École Polytechnique, Institut d’Études Politiques de Paris (Sciences Po), and Université Paris I-Panthéon-Sorbonne. Known as the Paris Alliance, the partnership fosters collaborative educational programming across the full range of disciplines and degrees at the four member institutions.

All of the University’s schools are committed to making international content an integral part of their curricula. Some have developed global tracks in selected programs for students interested in international careers. The undergraduate schools have added an international component to their liberal arts requirements. Other schools have developed clusters of courses designed to give students an understanding of the increasingly global nature of the disciplines they cover. Individual faculty weave international content into many of their courses, even when those courses do not have an explicitly global focus. Our students tell us that they see enriched international content in their studies due to their exposure to international faculty and students from outside the United States, both of which contribute to transformation of classroom dialogue and the overall classroom atmosphere.

Columbia's commitment to being a global university is also apparent in the growing presence of students from countries throughout the world. Over the past decade, international enrollments have been increasing at more than 4.5 percent per year. Today, Columbia's students are among the most international among the country's universities and colleges, both in absolute numbers and percentage of total enrollment. The growing number of international students enriches the intellectual life at Columbia, but their presence also requires that we pay greater attention to the cultural and experiential diversity that they bring to our community, which we can and should leverage to improve educational outcomes for both domestic and international students.

III. University Goals for the Accreditation Review

Columbia's global initiatives have already exercised a strong influence over the shape of the educational programs the University offers. That influence is likely to grow in the future. Therefore, Columbia faces a future that will require it to define even more clearly what it means to be a global university and what sort of education it should offer. We are taking steps to better articulate that vision. As proof of this commitment, Columbia University President Lee Bollinger has organized a committee of more than twenty faculty from across the University to lead a University-wide discussion on what is a global university; and more specifically, what is a global Columbia. This group, the President's Global Forum, will coordinate University events touching on such critical issues as the future direction of scholarship needed for the world ahead, the subjects and experiences we should be teaching and providing for our students, and the ways in which we must be organized in order to meet our responsibilities and remain consistent with our own values. Happily, one of the Co-chairs of the President's Global Forum, Ken Prewitt, also serves as a member of our Accreditation Steering Committee, ensuring that the accreditation process is well integrated with the President's Global Forum.

The University views the accreditation review as another opportunity to contribute to what will be an on-going institutional effort to make sure that its students are intellectually equipped to live in an increasingly interconnected world. The Steering Committee will closely follow the seminars and resulting discussions to inform key questions raised during the accreditation review.

The Accreditation Steering Committee has identified several overarching questions to guide the preparation of the University's self-study. These include:

- What are the hallmarks of a globalized education? How do we define a "globalized" education (and global thinking) at both the undergraduate and graduate levels at Columbia University?

- What are the expected outcomes and long-term benefits to our students of engaging in a globalized education? What are the benefits to society? (These aspects may well inform questions above about how to motivate schools to take on the challenge of building/improving global education.)
- What are the specific methods and approaches that we should use in order to instill a global perspective in students across all of our educational programs, regardless of discipline? What is the evidence for claiming that our approaches represent "best practices," or that they are, at the very least, proven effective in terms of student learning and instilling the ability to engage in global thinking?
- How should the University utilize partnerships with institutions in other countries to enhance the global content of the education our students receive? What form should those partnerships take? How should the University take advantage of the Global Centers to promote those partnerships and otherwise promote the internationalization of its educational programming?
- How will we know if we've succeeded in attaining our educational aims? Measurement is a particular challenge in this realm. Assessing whether or not a student has a "global perspective" or the ability to "think globally" is, like interdisciplinarity, a lofty goal that can be extraordinarily difficult to measure. What metrics can we employ to demonstrate our teaching effectiveness and student proficiency? How do we provide convincing evidence that we have the capacity to both deliver a globalized education and measure our effectiveness?

To address the questions above, we have formed 4 working subcommittees in addition to the Accreditation Steering Committee, as described in the next section.

IV. Organization of the Steering Committee and Working Subcommittees

The preparation for the full review will be guided by the Provost of the University, John Coatsworth, with the assistance of a ten-member Accreditation Steering Committee that he will chair. The full Steering Committee membership includes:

- Melissa Begg, Vice Provost for Educational Programs and Professor of Biostatistics at Columbia University Medical Center
- Andrew Davidson, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Professor of Population and Family Health
- Wafaa El-Sadr, University Professor of Epidemiology and Medicine and Director of the International Center for AIDS Care and Treatment Programs (ICAP)
- Jim Glover, Associate Provost for Educational Programs

- Merit Janow, Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs and Professor of Professional Practice
- Holger Klein, Professor and Chair of the Department of Art History and Archaeology (Chair, Working Subcommittee #2)
- Safwan Masri, Executive Vice President for Global Centers and Global Development
- Letty Moss-Salentijn, Edward V. Zegarelli Professor of Dental Medicine, Vice Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Dental Medicine, and Co-chair, Education Committee for the University Senate
- Stephen Nicholas, Professor of Pediatrics, Associate Dean for Admissions for the College of Physicians & Surgeons, and Director of the Columbia University International Family AIDS Program (Chair, Working Subcommittee #3)
- Justin Pearlman, Chief of Staff, Provost's Office
- Ken Prewitt, Carnegie Professor of Public Affairs, Special Advisor to the President, and Co-chair of the University Forum on Global Columbia (Chair, Working Subcommittee #1)
- James Valentini, Dean of Columbia College, Henry L. and Lucy G. Moses Professor, and Vice President for Undergraduate Education
- Katja Vogt, Professor of Philosophy, Chair of Columbia's Interdepartmental Classical Studies Graduate Program (Chair, Working Subcommittee #4)

The primary responsibilities of the Steering Committee will be to direct the preparation of the self-study document on the globalization of the Columbia education, and the organization of the site visit of the external team of visitors. In addition, it will serve as the forum in which issues arising from the document review are addressed with members of the Provost's staff organizing the actual collection and indexing of materials for that review.

In addition to Provost Coatsworth, two members of his office will play key roles in preparing for the University's re-accreditation. Melissa Begg, the recently appointed Vice Provost for Educational Programs, will work closely with the new Associate Provost for Educational Programs, Jim Glover, to coordinate the work of the Steering Committee and its subcommittees. Their office will also manage the collection and presentation of materials of the document review, with assistance from others in the Provost's Office, in the schools, and in the relevant administrative offices of the University.

The Steering Committee has decided to create four working subcommittees which will focus on the following topic areas:

- Mission and organization of international education at Columbia
- Globalizing the undergraduate education
- Globalizing the graduate education
- The role of the Global Centers in the University's educational programs.

Each of the working subcommittees will be chaired by a member of the faculty (who may also be a member of the Steering Committee) and will include other faculty and senior administrative officers as members. Members of the Provost's Office and the Office of the Executive Vice President for Global Centers will staff the working subcommittees. Membership of the working subcommittees is included in Appendix A.

V. Charges to the Working Subcommittees

Subcommittee #1: Mission Committee

The subcommittee on the **mission and organization of international education** will focus on the broad issues of the University's goals for internationalizing its education, and the organizational structures and resources needed to pursue them. Among the questions it will be asked to consider are these:

- How is the mission of global education consistent with the university's overall mission and goals?
- Does Columbia need to develop a University-wide set of goals and strategies for promoting the internationalization of its educational programs or should that be left to the individual schools?
- In what ways does the organization and leadership structure of the university support or impede global education? Does the University need to develop additional organizational structures to support the growth of a globalized education?
- What types of central utilities are required to support international education? How effective are those that currently exist? Are additional ones needed? How will we gauge their effectiveness?

Subcommittee #2: Undergraduate Education Committee

The subcommittee on **globalizing the undergraduate education** will conduct a more detailed evaluation of how the University can strengthen the international dimensions of the education it offers to its bachelor's students. The subcommittee will be asked to consider the following questions:

- What are the knowledge and skills that every Columbia undergraduate student should acquire to reflect global awareness and the ability to function in and contribute to a global environment?
- How effectively do the international experiences available to undergraduates, such as study abroad, joint-degree programs, internships and study tours, support the University's goal of globalizing the education it offers them?
- How can the undergraduate schools use the Global Centers to enrich the international content of their programs?
- How should the University measure whether its efforts to globalize the undergraduate curriculum are successful?
- How do the university's admission and recruitment policies enhance our ability to meet our goal of global education at the undergraduate level? In what ways could admissions efforts be enhanced to better support the goal of a global education? How can the presence of a growing number of international undergraduates be used to promote the University's goal of developing educational programming with a stronger international orientation and greater international content?

Subcommittee #3: Graduate Education Committee

The subcommittee on **globalizing the graduate education** will conduct a similar evaluation of the University's post-baccalaureate curricula in both our graduate and professional schools:

- What are the knowledge and skills that every Columbia graduate student should acquire to reflect global awareness and the ability to function in and contribute to a global environment?
- How effectively do the international experiences available to graduate students, such as study abroad, joint-degree programs, internships and collaborative research agreements, support the University's goal of globalizing the education it offers them?
- How can the graduate schools use the Global Centers to enrich the international content of their programs?
- How should the University measure whether its efforts to globalize the graduate curricula are successful?
- How do the university's admission and recruitment policies enhance our ability to meet our goal of global education at the graduate level? In what ways could admissions

efforts be enhanced to better support the goal of a global education? What is the optimal size of the international graduate student population? How can their presence be used to promote the University's goal of developing educational programming with a stronger international orientation and greater international content?

Subcommittee #4: Global Centers Committee

The network of Global Centers is one of the central elements in Columbia's strategy for becoming a truly global university. Each of the other subcommittees will need to take into account the significance of the Centers for the portion of the analysis they will be assigned. The subcommittee on the **role of the Global Centers** will conduct a more comprehensive review of their role in the future development of Columbia's educational programming by considering the following questions:

- How can the Columbia Global Centers contribute to the development of stronger international programming on the New York campuses?
- How can the Global Centers be used to promote opportunities abroad that will strengthen the global perspectives and global thinking among the University's students?
- How can the Global Centers help to identify and recruit students from international locations?
- How do the Global Centers be used to enhance our ability to recruit outstanding faculty worldwide?
- What are the most significant barriers to utilization of the Global Centers by NY-based faculty and students? How can the central administration encourage individual faculty and students, as well as schools, to access the connections and resources available to them through the Global Centers?
- How should the University measure whether the schools are effectively utilizing the Global Centers to enhance the international dimensions of their programs?

VI. Involvement of the Columbia Community

Students, staff, faculty, trustees, and alumni will be involved from the very beginning and throughout the self-study process until its conclusion. Committees will have membership including faculty and administrators from across the University. In addition, we will convene a student advisory group to provide input and perspectives on the self-study and resulting

recommendations. The University Trustees have already begun to engage in the self-study process, and will be provided with quarterly reports and multiple opportunities to provide feedback on our self-study. We will establish a website to foster community engagement, which will provide publicly available data, summaries, and interim reports. In addition to using email to gather input, we are also exploring the use of an online comment form to facilitate collection of community insights and opinions.

VII. Organization of the Self-Study Report

The self-study will be organized thematically, following the structure of the subcommittees. The self-study sections will include:

- Executive summary
- Mission and organization of international education at Columbia
- Globalizing the undergraduate education
- Globalizing the graduate education
- The role of the Global Centers in the University's educational programs
- Cross cutting themes across all four dimensions
- Recommendations based on findings, analysis of those findings, and benchmarks for implementing the recommendations
- The path forward

VIII. Editorial Style of Self Study Report

The following standard editorial style will apply to the final report as well as all interim drafts and subcommittee reports. All reports are to be constructed in WORD.

- **Font:** Calibri 12 point font.
- **Institutional Acronyms:** Write out in full upon first usage, indicating the acronym in parentheses. Thereafter use the acronym.
- **Margins:** 1 inch top, bottom, left and right
- **Page Numbers:** Bottom center
- **Section Headings:** Primary headings within documents will be bold 14 point font; secondary headings will be italic 12 point font
- **Spacing:** Single
- **Statistics and Tables:** Data will be analyzed via Excel and STATA, and imported into

tables in Word.

- **Subcommittee reports:** Will typically be 10-20 pages in length, and will incorporate the following sections:
 - Summary of the group's charge
 - Analytical discussion of the questions undertaken and outcomes, including strengths and challenges
 - Explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions relate to the Commission's standards
 - Discussion of the connection of the group's topic with those of other groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place
 - Primary recommendations and suggested benchmarks for tracking progress over the coming 5 years
 - Appendices may be used to present data and tables used by the committee during their discussions
- **Submission:** All documents will be saved to a mutually accessible and secure shared drive.

IX. Assessment and Outcomes

As a final step in the self-study process, the Steering Committee will review and evaluate all subcommittee recommendations and community feedback. They will select the goals most appropriate to our institution at this point in its history, and develop a set of specific objectives and benchmarks for us to use to monitor our progress towards achieving our goals over the coming 5 years. Whenever appropriate, we will utilize a "logic model" approach, focusing on ultimate/long-term goals, and the sequential, intermediate steps required to reach those objectives. At the end of this process, the Steering Committee will determine how our progress is to be assessed based on the input of the subcommittees and University community. All decisions will be informed by supporting data, and careful analysis (not regurgitation) of relevant information and statistics.

We look forward to the self-study process as a unique opportunity to reflect thoughtfully on our mission as a global research university, and the steps we need to take to reach that outcome. Far beyond meeting the needs of the Middle States Commission, the re-accreditation process affords us the chance to develop guidelines and goals that will inform new directions for the institution, strategic planning initiatives, and decisions on resource allocation and future priorities. The Columbia community is already actively wrestling with how we will define ourselves as a global university, and this review will enable us to carefully examine and align our aspirations with the resources and infrastructure needed to achieve them.

X. Document Review

The preparations for the document review will be conducted separately from the drafting of the self-study by members of the Provost's Office under the supervision of Vice Provost Begg and with the advice of the Steering Committee. One of the members of the Office will be designated as having the primary responsibility for the document review.

The Provost's Office has already collected a significant number of documents from the websites of the University's schools and administrative offices. The Provost's Office will ask the schools and administrative officers to review those documents, select those that are most current and relevant to the Commission's evaluation of the University's compliance with its standards of accreditation, and provide any additional documents they consider important. They will be asked to complete those tasks by the spring of 2015.

In the summer of 2015, the Provost's Office will review the collected documents and select the ones that will be provided to the external reviewers. The selected documents will be organized in an electronic system so that they can be searched by standard and topic. Also in the summer of 2015, the Provost's Office will prepare a "roadmap" for the external reviewers to help them navigate through the documents that they will be given. The roadmap will elaborate on the description included as Appendix B, which describes the types of documents that we will use to provide evidence that Columbia meets the Commission's 14 standards of excellence, and which will also aid in the compliance review.

Columbia is a large, diverse, and decentralized university. Academic activity is organized through 16 Schools, 19 Faculties, 79 departments of instruction and more than 200 institutes, centers, and interdisciplinary programs. There are approximately 5,300 faculty members, of whom about 71% hold full-time appointments. The University currently offers more than 560 programs at the Baccalaureate, Master's, and doctoral levels, and another 70 or more leading to certificates. In fall 2013, it enrolled 27,082 full-time and part-time students seeking degrees or certificates; and it awarded 11,623 degrees and certificates during the 2013-14 academic year.

In light of the University's size, diversity and complexity, the assembled documents will be chosen as representative of the types of available materials rather than exhaustive in scope. The documents, as noted above and in Appendix B, will include policy statements, bulletins, handbooks, administrative guides, budget documents, the reports of committees, and web descriptions. Some will be publicly available documents; others will be ones with a restricted distribution. They will include materials written for a variety of audiences, such as students, faculty, administrative officers, Trustees, alumni, external regulatory agencies and the general public.

XI. Timeline

- January 2014 Self-study proposal submitted to the Commission and approved
- Spring 2014 Steering Committee established
Collection of materials for the document review begins
- Summer 2014: Submission of self-study design
- Fall 2014 Visit by the University's liaison officer
Selection of the members of the working subcommittees
Working subcommittees begin their work
- May 2015 Reports of the working subcommittees due
Collection of the materials for the document review completed
- Summer 2015 Self-study drafted
Road map for the document review drafted
- Fall 2015 Review of the draft self-study by members of the University community
- Late fall 2015 Document review takes place
- December 2015 Draft of self-study submitted to the Commission for comment
- January 2016 Self-study completed and distributed to the external visiting committee
- March 2016 Visit by the external evaluation committee

XII. Profile of Visiting Team

We appreciate the opportunity to help describe the characteristics of an ideal visiting team. We would welcome a team of visitors that emerge from institutions with:

- A strong research enterprise
- Large undergraduate, graduate, and professional school student populations, similar to Columbia in size and scope

- A large global footprint on multiple dimensions including student base, faculty recruitment and retention, community engagement, and scholarly research

Site visitors might be drawn from peer institutions, including: Harvard University, the University of Chicago, Princeton University, Yale University, and Stanford University. The ideal site visitors would have significant experience in administrative leadership positions at a large research university, as well as interest and expertise in global education and research.

Appendix A Membership of the Working Subcommittees

Subcommittee #1: Mission Committee

Faculty Name	Title
Ken Prewitt (chair)	Carnegie Professor of Public Affairs
Elaine Abrams	Professor of Pediatrics and Epidemiology
Richard Deckelbaum	Robert R. Williams Professor of Nutrition (in Pediatrics) and Professor of Epidemiology; Director, Institute of Human Nutrition
Thomas DiPrete	Giddings Professor of Sociology
John Donaldson	Mario J. Gabelli Professor of Finance
Joseph Graziano	Professor of Environmental Health Sciences and Pharmacology
Kathleen Hickey	Assistant Professor of Nursing
Shunichi (Nick) Homma	Margaret Milliken Hatch Professor of Medicine (in Biomedical Engineering)
Jean Howard	George Delacorte Professor in the Humanities; Chair, Department of English and Comparative Literature
Bruce Kogut	Sanford C Bernstein & Co. Professor of Leadership and Ethics
Jose Antonio Ocampo	Professor of Professional Practice in the Faculty of International and Public Affairs
Richard Pena	Professor of Professional Practice in the School of the Arts
Mabel Wilson	Associate Professor of Architecture, Planning and Preservation

Subcommittee #2: Undergraduate Education Committee

Faculty Name	Title
Holger Klein (chair)	Professor of Art History and Archaeology and Department Chair
Charles Armstrong	The Korea Foundation Professor of Korean Studies in Social Sciences
Pat Grieve	Nancy and Jeffrey Marcus Professor of the Humanities
Barclay Morrison	Associate Professor of Biomedical Engineering, Vice Dean of Undergraduate Programs, Fu Foundation School of Engineering and Applied Sciences
Anne Paxton	Associate Professor of Epidemiology and Population and Family Health at the Columbia University Medical Center
Michael Pippenger	Dean of Undergraduate Global Programs/Assistant VP for International Education
Victoria Rosner	Senior Associate Dean for the Postbaccalaureate Program & Academic Affairs, Adjunct Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature
Gayatri Spivak	University Professor
Kathryn Yatrakis	Dean of Academic Affairs and Senior Associate Vice President for Arts and Sciences

Subcommittee #3: Graduate Education Committee

Faculty Name	Title
Stephen Nicholas (chair)	Professor of Pediatrics and Population and Family Health at the Columbia University Medical Center
David Albert	Associate Professor of Dental Medicine (Community Health) (in Health Policy and Management)
Akeel Bilgrami	Sidney Morgenbesser Professor of Philosophy
Lori Damrosch	Hamilton Fish Professor of International Law and Diplomacy
Neeraj Kaushal	Associate Professor of Social Work
Art Langer	Senior Lecturer in Technology Management in the Faculty of Continuing Education
Reinhold Martin	Professor of Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Saskia Sassen	Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology
Debra Wolgemuth	Professor of Genetics and Development and Obstetrics and Gynecology

Subcommittee #4: Global Centers Committee

Faculty Name	Title
Katja Vogt (chair)	Professor of Philosophy, Chair of the Classical Studies Program
Anu Bradford	Henry L. Moses Professor of Law & International Organization
Vishakha Desai	Special Advisor for Global Affairs; Professor of Professional Practice in the Faculty of International and Public Affairs
Shan Lal	Associate Professor of Dental Medicine (Pediatric Dentistry) at the Columbia University Medical Center
Rachel Moresky	Assistant Professor of Population and Family Health and Medicine at the Columbia University Medical Center
Shahid Naeem	Professor of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology
Ben Orlove	Professor of International and Public Affairs
Neil Schluger	Professor of Medicine, Environmental Health Sciences and Epidemiology at the Columbia University Medical Center
Bruce Shapiro	Senior Executive Director of Professional Programs; Executive Director of the Dart Center for Journalism and Trauma

Student Advisory Committee

Student	School
Juan Azares	Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Christina Ciocca	Graduate School of Arts & Sciences
Jennifer Ginestra	Physicians and Surgeons
Chris Godshall	Columbia College
Mark Hendricks	Graduate School of Arts & Sciences
June Hu	Law
Britt Johnson	Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Alexandra Kamler	Public Health
Gillian Kupakuwana	Physicians and Surgeons
Jason Mann	General Studies
Gatsby Miller	Law
Ming Jack Po	Physicians and Surgeons
Alejandro Stein	Architecture, Planning and Preservation
Abigail Thacher	Columbia College
Elburg van Boetzelaer	Public Health
Jonah Weinstein	Columbia College
Brennan Rhodes-Bratton	Public Health
Fahad Al-Witri	Graduate School of Arts & Sciences

Appendix B

Self-Study Proposal: Document Review Details

The University will provide the Commission with a substantial range of printed materials and web documents as part of the compliance review. The exact documents will be collected and a road map to them prepared by the summer of 2015. They are likely to include those listed below by each of the Commission's 14 standards and undoubtedly will be supplemented by others as well.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

The University, its 16 schools, its 79 departments and more than 600 degree and certificate programs have written statements that define their missions and goals.

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

Columbia is a decentralized institution offering educational programming in a wide range of academic and professional disciplines. Assessment, planning and resource allocation in these circumstances take place on multiple levels and in different forms. A substantial portion of academic and financial planning occurs at the school level due to a decision-making and budgetary process that places major responsibility for programmatic and financial decisions in the hands of the faculty and deans. The schools have written descriptions of the various ways in which they conduct their internal planning. The Provost's Office has developed similar mechanisms to conduct strategic academic reviews of the schools.

At the University level, the budget process is used to review and modify the plans of the University as a whole as well as those of the individual schools. While its primary purpose is to develop the operating budget for the next year, it is also used to create multi-year plans for the individual schools and the University. The University's budget, multi-year financial plans and the process by which they are created are described in multiple documents, including its annual operating budget, capital budget, consolidated financial report, audited financial statements, IPEDS submission and institutional profile. In addition to the budget submissions, various central University offices produce more detailed reports on their operations. These include, for example, the offices responsible for granting funding, income from patents and licenses, gifts and endowments, student and administrative services, information resources and computing infrastructure and services.

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

Columbia is a large, complex institution with an operating budget that currently exceeds \$3.7 billion. The University has many different types of assets and multiple strategies for managing them in a manner that promotes its academic goals. The annual budget documents

listed above under Standard 2 describe the policies and processes it follows for making decisions on the allocation of its financial resources and for monitoring how those resources are used. Separate documents describe in greater depth the University's endowment payout rules, adopted by the Trustees to maintain the long-term purchasing power of the endowment while meeting the operating needs of the current fiscal year, its process for the management of its physical assets, and its efforts at obtaining external sponsored awards to support its educational programming and research.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

The University's current Charter which was first enacted in 1787 and last amended in 1810 by the New York State Legislature is the legal instrument under which it operates. The Charter defines how the University Trustees are selected and vests in them the final responsibility for its governance. The Trustees have by-laws that describe their internal committee structure. The University Statutes which are approved by the Trustees define the University's academic organization and the responsibilities of the various bodies and individuals who participate in its governance. They also define the organization and powers of the University Senate which has its own by-laws describing its operations and responsibilities. Each year, the Senate adopts multiple resolutions that become University policy. These are available on its web site. Each School has Stated Rules and each Department has By-Laws that define how it operates. The *Faculty Handbook* provides a description of the academic organization of the University. Each of the major academic and administrative offices of the University has a web site that describes its mission, organization and responsibilities.

Standard 5: Administration

By an act of the New York State Legislature, Columbia's 24 Trustees have overall responsibility for the University. The Trustees select the President and the deans and senior administrative officers of the University on the recommendation of the President. Further information on those officers and other senior administrative positions is available on their respective web sites.

In addition to being one of the country's leading institutions of higher education, Columbia is a large corporation with an administrative staff consisting of over 6,000 officers and more than another 3,200 support personnel as well as faculty and other academic officers. The administrative staff includes professionals skilled in many different areas from lawyers, accountants, information technologists, research compliance specialists, government relations experts and engineers to dental assistants, billing clerks, instrument makers, HVAC mechanics, security officers and chefs. Each of the major administrative officers of the University maintains a web page with information on its functions and personnel. Each also has internal documents that describe its internal organization, operations and plans. Further information is also available in the documents they submit as part of the University process for developing its annual budget.

Standard 6: Integrity

Columbia has multiple mechanisms for ensuring that its educational programs, research and administrative operations meet its own high ethical standards as well as the legal and regulatory requirements of the external agencies with which it interacts.

The methods used to ensure the integrity of its academic activities are documented in many different sources. The *Faculty Handbook* describes the policies and procedures governing academic appointments. Additional documents relating to recruitment, research, compensation and discipline of faculty are available in the Provost's Office, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, the Office of Sponsored Research Administration, the Office of Research Compliance and Training and the University Senate among others.

The *Faculty Handbook* also describes the University policies regarding the obligations of the faculty with respect to their students. The schools have the own written descriptions of the policies affecting students ranging from the requirements of their degree programs and grading policies to standards and procedures for student disciplinary and grievance procedures students can use to lodge complaints about the misuse of faculty authority.

The University has established a compliance program to coordinate its numerous efforts to comply with governmental requirements affecting its business practices. The program is coordinated by the Office of University Compliance which collects and disseminates, both in print and on the web, the sources of information about compliance. The Office of Internal Audit evaluates the effectiveness of the University's internal controls in meeting its compliance obligations and minimizing risk in its financial and administrative operations.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

Institutional Assessment is closely tied to planning at Columbia. Therefore, the documents described under Standard 2 also provide a description of how assessment is conducted at the University and how the results are used to improve the quality of its academic programming and its business operations.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

Each of the University's schools includes on its web site a full description of its admissions policies and procedures, its financial aid policies and procedures, and its academic programs. The web sites also contain the schools' transfer of credit policies. Similar materials are also included in the extensive promotional materials the schools use for recruiting purposes. Each school regularly assesses and prepares statistical reports on student retention and the time their students take to complete their degrees.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

There are many offices throughout Columbia that provide student support services. Some, such as the University Libraries, Undergraduate Housing and Dining, Student Health, Office of the Registrar and the Office of Student Financial Services, are part of the University's central administration; others are situated in the individual schools. Regardless of location within the organizational structure, they all are staffed by individuals who are trained in the services they provide and offer a wide array of support to the University's students. Each publishes, both in print and electronically, descriptions of its services and actively reaches out to students in other ways.

Standard 10: Faculty

The University's faculty have the primary responsibility for developing and directing its educational programs. The faculty consist of more than 3,700 who are full-time and more than another 1,600 who are part-time. These include many of the finest minds in their respective disciplines.

The programs list their contributing faculty on their web sites. Information on faculty qualifications is available in the form of web bios posted by the faculty, their *curricula vita*, the reports generated through the University's systems for assessing the quality of its academic units and other documents. The policies governing their appointments and evaluation for promotion and salary increases are described in the *Faculty Handbook* and in policy statements that have been prepared by both the schools and the Provost's Office. The University Statutes define the policies governing faculty discipline and grievances. Administrative documents prepared by the schools, the Provost's Office and the University Senate elaborate on those policies and describe the procedures by which they are implemented. The web site and publications of the Office of Work Life provide information on University services that assist faculty in meeting personal and family needs such as housing, moving, schooling for their children and the challenges of two-career families in the New York region.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

Columbia consists of 16 schools that offer over 400 separate programs at the bachelor's master's and doctoral levels in a wide range of liberal arts and professional disciplines. It also has over 70 programs leading to a certificate and more than 100 dual degree programs in which students may work toward two degrees. Each of these is described on the program's web site and in the bulletin of the school in which it is offered. Each has been developed and is delivered by the University's large, intellectual diverse faculty and is supported by information resources of unusual depth and breadth. Each has developed a learning outcomes plan that defines its goals, measures its effectiveness in achieving them and describes how it uses the resulting information to improve its quality.

Standard 12: General Education

The Core Curriculum is the distinguishing characteristic of an undergraduate education at Columbia. It consists of a series of common courses required of all undergraduates, regardless of major, which provide students with an understanding of the ideas, intellectual trends, artistic achievements, historical forces, scientific reasoning and cultural diversity that shape the world in which they live. It is also designed to teach students to read carefully, think critically and communicate clearly.

The Core is described in the bulletins of the University's three undergraduate schools and on the University's web site. It is subject to regular review and change to reflect the type of education the Columbia faculty believe their students need to be well-informed, contributing members of society once they graduate. The process for conducting those reviews and the results are described in internal documents of the Committee on the Core, the faculty body that oversees undergraduate general education at Columbia and in the reports of special committees that are periodically convened to assess its quality.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

Columbia engages in only some of the educational activities covered by this standard. It does not conduct basic skills programs, offer credit for experiential learning, have branch campuses or engage in correspondence education.

Certificate Programs: Columbia currently has 74 programs leading to a certificate, all of them at the post-baccalaureate level. These programs are developed, approved, delivered, supported and evaluated in the same manner as those leading to degrees. The types of information about degree program as described under Standard 11 are also available for certificate programs.

Non-Credit Offerings: The University offers many non-credit programs designed to meet the need for continuing education in specific professions, industries and even individual companies. These are developed by the schools to further their educational missions while generating additional revenues, delivered by their faculty and subject to periodic review. Non-credit programs require the approval of the Provost to ensure that they further the academic goals of the University. Some are also reviewed by the University Senate. Documents describing their programs and their oversight exist within the schools, in the Provost's Office and the University Senate.

Branch Campuses, Additional Locations and Other Instructional Sites: While Columbia does not have branch campuses, it does offer education at locations away from its main campus and Medical Center. The University reports these to the Commission as additional locations and other instructional sites as part of its annual institutional profile. The programs and courses taught at remote locations are managed no differently from the degree and certificate programs offered at Columbia proper. They are developed by the faculty and

subject to the oversight of the appropriate University committees. Their students are admitted through the normal admission processes of their schools, taught by members of the University's faculty and are subject to the same standards of evaluation as those who study on campus. Each program and course given off-campus is described in documents similar to those described under Standard 11.

Distance Education, Distributed Learning and Correspondence Education: In recent years, several of the University's schools have turned to distance learning as a means of furthering their educational goals. We expect the number of on-line courses and programs to continue to grow as the schools gain experience in delivering distance education and the technology becomes more sophisticated.

The programs and courses offered through distance learning are all on-line versions of those that are already taken in residence at the University. They cover the same content, are taught by the same faculty and are subject to the same oversight as their on-campus equivalents. Thus, the documents described under the Commission's other standards apply to Columbia's engagement with distance education as well as the educational programming offered on campus. Additionally, the University has developed special policies and procedures, described in other documents, that address those features of distance learning that are distinctive from the education it offers on its campuses.

Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers: Columbia has over 100 joint degree programs with other universities. In addition, some of its schools, most notably Dental Medicine, Medicine, Nursing and Social Work, utilize non-educational organizations such as hospitals, clinics and social service agencies as sites for clinical rotations, fieldwork placements and internships that are required parts of their curricula. Each of these relationships is defined in a contract that defines the contributions of the two organizations to the activities described in the agreement and reserves to the University control of its educational programming.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Each of the University's educational programs has in place a written learning outcomes plan that specifies how it measures its educational effectiveness in the context of its field and how it uses the results to improve the quality of the education it offers. Each of its schools has a process described in written documents for monitoring the implementation of the programs' outcomes plans and using the information they provide to evaluate the effectiveness of the degree programs it offers. At regular intervals, the programs submit to their respective schools written reports on their measurement of student learning and the changes they have made in the curricula after reviewing the results of that assessment.