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CHAPTER 1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

OVERVIEW OF INSTITUTION

The Graduate School and University Center, known as The Graduate Center, is the
doctorate-granting unit of The City University of New York. An internationally
recognized center for advanced studies, The Graduate Center is also a national
model for public doctoral education. According to the most recent National
Research Council report, more than a third of The Graduate Center’s rated doctoral
programs rank among the nation’s top 20 at public and private institutions, nearly a
quarter are among the top 10 when compared to publicly supported institutions
alone, and more than half are among the top five programs at publicly supported
institutions in the Northeast.

The Graduate Center’s campus in a landmark Fifth Avenue location in Manhattan
provides the city with a major educational, research, and cultural center where over
3800 doctoral students from 30 states and about 90 foreign countries and over 1600
faculty in 30 doctoral programs in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences come
together to expand the boundaries of knowledge. Our graduate programs derive
their strength from The Graduate Center’s unique consortial model for doctoral
education, whereby each doctoral program can draw the needed intellectual critical
mass from the range and depth of faculty expertise across the 19 CUNY campuses.
Graduate Center doctoral programs also draw faculty from experts affiliated with
major New York City institutions such as the American Museum of Natural History,
the New York Botanical Garden, and the New York State Institute for Basic
Research in Developmental Disabilities.

Since the first two CUNY doctoral degrees were awarded in 1965, over 8500 alumni
have passed through the rigorous process of earning a Ph.D. to become leaders in
the private, not-for-profit, and public sectors of our society as well as in the
academy. The Graduate Center is committed to including in the academy the
diversity of our nation’s population and, in 1995, received the Council of Graduate
Schools/Peterson’s Award for its innovative programs aimed at recruiting and
retaining minority students. Our faculty, students, and alumni are regular recipients
of important honors and awards. Some recent examples include the MacArthur
“Genius” Award, the National Humanities Medal, the Bancroft Prize, the Pulitzer
Prize, the George Jean Nathan Award for Dramatic Criticism, the Baccalaureate
College Professor of the Year Award, Grammy Awards, an Academy Award,
Fulbright Fellowships, Guggenheim Fellowships, Mayor’s Awards for Excellence in
Science and Technology, and Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and
Engineers.
The Graduate Center houses 28 research centers and institutes that provide a forum for internationally renowned scholars, artists, scientists, policy makers, and diplomats to discuss issues of concern across interdisciplinary lines. Their seminars, conferences, public programs, and research projects, which often focus on current public policy issues, are available to the public as well as to students and faculty at The Graduate Center. The Graduate Center also serves as a focal point for such University-wide activities as the CUNY Baccalaureate Program, the CUNY Honors College, and the School for Professional Studies. Finally, The Graduate Center offers a wide range of continuing education and cultural programs of interest to the general public. All of these activities flow from our mission statement, revised in conjunction with the last Middle States reaccreditation review and reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Graduate School and University Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(numbers updated May 2005)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Graduate School and University Center of The City University of New York (CUNY) is a state-funded public institution offering 30 doctoral programs (with a variety of associated interdisciplinary certificate programs and concentrations, as well as seven master's programs) in the humanities, the social sciences, the physical sciences, and the professions. These programs are offered within the context of a unique consortial structure that draws on the resources of the 18 other CUNY colleges. Of the 1600 members of the doctoral faculty, 118 hold Graduate Center appointments; the others are selected from throughout CUNY and reflect the diverse and comprehensive strengths of its colleges. The Graduate Center functions as CUNY's university center by housing, in addition to its doctoral and master's programs, 28 research centers and institutes, the CUNY Baccalaureate Program, and several other intercampus programs.

The Graduate Center's fundamental mission is to provide a broad range of excellent doctoral programs to prepare students to become scholars and leaders in academe and in the private, nonprofit, and government sectors. We strive also to enhance access to doctoral education for traditionally underrepresented groups. In our role as a university center, we seek to foster significant research by faculty and students within and across disciplines, including research that addresses the problems and challenges faced by urban areas, and to facilitate interaction among CUNY faculty and students from throughout the system. More generally, The Graduate Center strives to be an educational, economic, and cultural resource for the complex urban community it serves.

### SUMMARY OF PREPARATION OF THE PRR

In 2004 President Frances Degen Horowitz appointed a PRR Steering Committee and charged the members to prepare the Periodic Review Report required by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education for confirmation of reaccreditation. A cochair of the PRR Steering Committee and a senior staff member attended a Periodic Review Report Preparation Workshop in April 2004 to prepare The Graduate Center to undertake the review in accordance with the new guidelines outlined in *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports* (Middle States Commission on Higher Education, 2004).

The steering committee cochairs developed a timeline and a PowerPoint presentation with which to inform the steering committee, and eventually the
Graduate Center community, about the PRR process. Appendix 1 includes a listing of steering committee members, subcommittee members, the timeline, and text about the PRR process.

The preparation of the PRR followed this timeline, with subcommittee members preparing drafts of chapters for review by the steering committee as a whole. The resulting draft of the document was reviewed by the president’s cabinet and subsequently presented to the GC community in the form of both paper copies and a web-based version. An open meeting with the GC community — faculty, staff, and students — was held to solicit input; written comments and suggestions were also encouraged. After reviewing these comments and suggestions, the PRR Steering Committee prepared this final PRR.

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR CHANGES IN THE INSTITUTION**

In 1999 The Graduate School and University Center moved into a historic building at 365 Fifth Avenue (the former B. Altman department store). The Graduate Center fills the front two-thirds of the building, with the rest occupied by a university press and a branch of the New York Public Library. By 2000, when the Middle States reaccreditation visit took place, even though we still faced inconveniences associated with the completion of construction, we were beginning to feel at home. This was a perfect time to undertake the serious self-examination occasioned by a Middle States visit. During preparation of the self-study document, and when we received the evaluation team’s suggestions, we recognized — as had most U.S. institutions of higher learning — that much more self-assessment was becoming necessary for accreditation, for review by governing boards, for fund-raising appeals, and, most important, for the institution’s ability to engage in strategic planning and self-improvement. To mark the millennium, a special committee was charged to assess where The Graduate Center stood as the twenty-first century began. The committee’s report and the Middle States self-study and evaluation have formed the basis for strategic planning for the institution by the president, the provost, and the Academic Planning Committee (APC) over the past five years. This Periodic Review Report summarizes those planning endeavors, describing both what has been accomplished and what remains to be done.

The most significant change at The Graduate Center has been a new ability to provide doctoral student funding more in line with other doctoral institutions. Specifically, thanks to the CUNY chancellor and other administrators, beginning with Fall 2004, we were able to offer about half of first-year doctoral students recruitment packages that include five years of tuition scholarships at the in-state level, a guarantee of teaching assistantships or the equivalent for three of those five years, and, in some cases, stipends in other years. Most recently, we have been granted funding for the 2005–06 academic year to allow us to provide tuition scholarships at the in-state level to about half of those doctoral students who teach or provide other service across CUNY (and are not otherwise receiving such aid), with the promise that funding will be provided in future years to cover all such students. Overall, financial aid for doctoral students has tripled in the past seven years. Perhaps not unrelated, GC enrollments are at an all-time high.
Another priority since the 2000 evaluation has been to strengthen The Graduate Center’s academic programs. During the past five years The Graduate Center has experienced an extraordinary renaissance. Of our 118 full-time GC faculty, 27 have been hired since Fall 2000, most already leaders in their fields. Another 4 transferred from other CUNY colleges. (In the same five years we lost 21 to retirement, death, or resignation.) The new GC appointments (excluding librarians, who hold faculty rank at CUNY), include 15 Distinguished Professors in a variety of disciplines, 8 full professors, and — in response to concerns about aging faculty expressed in the self-study and the Middle States evaluation — 4 associate and assistant professors. In addition, in the past five years, the University has added full-time faculty at an astonishing rate (some 900 have been added over this period), from whom we have already begun to draw, resulting in further enrichment and depth to the doctoral faculty.

The Graduate Center has also encouraged curricular innovation in the past five years. The Ph.D. Program in Urban Education, now in its fourth year, has become well established. In response to student and professional demand, the Ph.D. Program in Psychology added a subprogram in Forensic Psychology. In an example of increasing consortial cooperation among the CUNY colleges and The Graduate Center, three clinical doctoral degree programs are in stages of development. The first, in audiology (the Au.D.), is scheduled to accept its first class in Fall 2005. Clinical doctorates in physical therapy (DPT) and nursing (DNS) are in process, with the goal of admitting their first classes in 2006. In response to suggestions that The Graduate Center do more to enhance its interdisciplinary offerings, the administration appointed a dean for interdisciplinary studies. The dean helps faculty members develop new interdisciplinary courses and concentrations and is working on ways to systematize assessment of them and as well as certificate programs.

The Graduate Center’s ability to assess its functioning has been greatly enhanced by the addition of an Office of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation. This office has developed mechanisms for systematically gathering and analyzing data on student experiences, both inside the institution and once they have graduated, and has expanded The Graduate Center’s ability to monitor its deployment of teaching resources. A GC Fact Book is available online, and annual surveys of GC alumni have been instituted. The administration reviews the results of these and other surveys to improve the education and mentoring provided to students. The upcoming National Research Council (NRC) assessment of doctoral programs will be an important focus of the office in 2006–07 and will undoubtedly result in new ways of thinking about outcomes assessment.

The Mina Rees Library completed a major self-study and has already begun to improve its operations as a result of its recommendations. The Information Resources office is currently conducting a search for a new director, who will examine its structure and reporting arrangements.

Other notable goals that have been achieved over this period involve fund raising and research grants. The president’s capital campaign will come to a successful end this spring, with over $30 million raised or pledged by the end of the semester.
Sponsored research also increased dramatically over the period, reaching more than $6 million in the 2005 fiscal year.

A number of ancillary CUNY projects have been placed at The Graduate Center by the central CUNY administration. Some of them are projected to produce income that will help the financial situation of doctoral students, but they also increase crowding in the building, where space is at a premium because of the creation of new doctoral programs and the appointment of new doctoral faculty members.

The most dramatic change at The Graduate Center will be the appointment of a new president, which is expected to occur in June 2005. The installation of the new president will provide a natural occasion for a renewal and reassessment of The Graduate Center’s mission, goals, and procedures.

**FORMAT OF THE PRR**

The PRR follows the suggested format of the *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports*. The second chapter reviews the suggestions of the Middle States team and the 2000 self-study, along with the subsequent internal recommendations they helped generate. It examines the progress that has been made in each area, including strategic planning, outcomes assessment, tuition scholarships, student mentoring, and faculty issues. Chapter 3 looks at the challenges that still remain and how The Graduate Center is planning to respond to them. It also looks at recently developed programs and at the new School of Professional Studies. Chapter 4 discusses enrollment trends and financial projections for The Graduate Center and the uncertain economic environment in which CUNY operates. Chapter 5 covers the relation between budget and planning. Chapter 6 gives a detailed description of the expansion in outcomes assessment that has taken place since 2000 and summarizes planned assessment activities.

**CONCLUSION**

The CUNY Graduate Center, in the five years since the 2000 Middle States visit and reaccreditation, has conducted deep and far-ranging forms of self-assessment in an effort to improve student services and financial aid, faculty quality, evaluation capacity, and financial stability. To review the accomplishments to date and the challenges that remain, we are pleased to present this Periodic Review Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

May 25, 2005
PRR CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York

is seeking REAFFIRMATION of ACCREDITATION.

The undersigned hereby certify that the institution meets all established eligibility requirements of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and the accreditation standards detailed in Characteristics of Excellence.

__ exceptions or important qualifying comments are noted in an attached memorandum (Check if applicable)

Frances Degen Horowitz, President

May 25, 2005
CHAPTER 2
SUMMARY OF THE GRADUATE CENTER’S RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

In its report of May 17, 2000, the Middle States review team presented a positive view of The Graduate Center and its accomplishments. It also suggested a number of areas of concern where institutional improvements would be warranted, all of which had been discussed in the self-study prepared by The Graduate Center for the Middle States evaluation (“The Graduate Center Self-Study: Seizing Opportunity/Sustaining Excellence,” January 2000). Note that the Middle States Handbook for Periodic Review Reports makes an important distinction between recommendations of a review team and suggestions. Action is required on recommendations to maintain accreditation. Suggestions are just that, the expression of “collegial advice for institutional consideration” (Handbook, p. 9). The Middle States team in its report made no recommendations in this technical sense, only suggestions. Thus this chapter is actually a review of progress on Middle States suggestions, plus progress on internal recommendations made since 2000.

Since 2000, The Graduate Center has produced three documents evaluating its own condition and providing specific recommendations for the future. The first was prepared by an ad hoc committee that had been appointed on the occasion of The Graduate Center’s 40th anniversary in 2002. This committee’s report (“Doctoral Education in the First Decade of the 21st Century,” March 2002 (21C)) was designed not so much to set goals as to initiate conversations on The Graduate Center’s provision of doctoral education. Nonetheless, it offered a number of specific suggestions on ways to improve academic training and the general institutional environment. The second document, prepared by the Academic Planning Committee (APC), reviewed the self-study recommendations and the 21C recommendations and provided an update and a list of priorities for the administration (“Academic Planning Committee Review of Recommendations of the 2000 MSA Self-Study and the 2002 Report of the Committee on Doctoral Education in the First Decade of the 21st Century,” July 2003). A further update of how The Graduate Center has responded was prepared in September 2004 by the Office of the Provost in preparation for this Periodic Review Report (“Update on Recommendations of the 2000 MSA Self-Study and the 2002 Report of the Committee on Doctoral Education in the First Decade of the 21st Century, The Graduate Center, CUNY,” Appendix 2).

This chapter starts with a focused discussion of the Middle States evaluators’ concerns; it then provides a summary of The Graduate Center’s responses to the array of recommendations produced in the self-study, the 21C report, and the APC report. Note that this organization leads to some unavoidable duplication in the two sections of the chapter.
THE GRADUATE CENTER RESPONSE TO MIDDLE STATES TEAM SUGGESTIONS

**Strategic Planning.** Throughout its report, the Middle States team emphasized the need for strategic planning on the part of The Graduate Center. The team acknowledged the difficulties in accomplishing such planning because The Graduate Center never knows its budget situation beyond the current year and because of uncertainties in The Graduate Center’s larger institutional environment. Its own resources do not come in a steady and predictable flow, but are influenced by state fiscal policies and by the central CUNY administration’s overall priorities. Nonetheless, strategic planning is a management tool designed to help organizations define and reach goals even in the face of uncertainties, and the review team suggested that The Graduate Center would benefit from more attention to such planning. It saw this as a neglected area, noting that “there is relatively little history of in-depth strategic planning and prioritization at either The Graduate Center or the campus-based program levels” (p. 5). Since 2000, the administration has been actively engaged in implementing planning to the extent feasible, as noted in the following five sections.

1. **Faculty.** The report called particular attention to the problems in academic planning in terms of faculty hiring. (See Table 1 for a distribution of doctoral faculty and student enrollment by program.) The team recognized that the large majority of doctoral faculty are hired at the other CUNY colleges, and therefore doctoral programs do not have systematic input into the selection process. Nor do departments at the different CUNY colleges coordinate with each other; that is, college appointments are responsive to teaching and programmatic needs at the local campuses instead of to the needs of the relevant doctoral program. The effect is to create a pattern of hiring that at its best yields rich resources for The Graduate Center, but at its worst can create an unplanned set of more or less random hires when seen from the perspective of doctoral needs.

The Middle States team pointed out that these problems become particularly acute when hiring is slow, as in the 1990s; when there is rapid growth of faculty, the overall pool is likely to be large enough to provide faculty members with the specializations and research orientations required for doctoral training. Over the past two or three years, the situation has turned around. The University has committed to replenishing the faculty, accompanied by appropriate funding, and some 900 new full-time faculty members have been hired. In addition, a cluster-hiring framework for recruiting faculty over this period initiated CUNY-wide consideration of areas in which hiring should be focused.

The Middle States team also called attention to the issue of aging doctoral faculty. Doctoral programs have an incentive to hire academic stars to improve their standing and to provide for a solid core of distinguished members of the program, but may lack the young faculty who often bring vitality and innovation to learning. The paucity of hiring of junior faculty at the other CUNY colleges during the 1990s
Table 1: Faculty and Student Headcounts by Program, Fall 2004, Graduate Center, CUNY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Program</th>
<th>Total Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Graduate Center Appointments</th>
<th>CUNY Appointments (Other than GC)</th>
<th>Other **</th>
<th>Doctoral and Master’s Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic Languages &amp; Lits.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic &amp; Luso-Brazilian Lit.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Studies (M.A.)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech &amp; Hearing Sciences</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences Total</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Total</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>4031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Faculty counted in one doctoral program only; multiple program appointments excluded.
** Graduate Center excludes administrators who hold doctoral faculty appointments, joint GC/campus appointments whose home is not The Graduate Center, University professors, visiting faculty, and postdocs.
*** Non-CUNY institutions, such as the American Museum of Natural History, New York Botanical Garden, Institute for Basic Research, NY State Psychiatric Institute, Mt. Sinai Hospital, and Haskins Laboratory.
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Exacerbated this problem. Since Fall 2000, however, the Graduate Center has hired 27 new faculty members, of whom 4 are at the associate or assistant professor level. In addition, some of the faculty hired at the senior level were recruited from junior ranks. Robust hiring at the other CUNY campuses over the past few years has also provided a natural counterbalance to older doctoral faculty because these new hires are typically at the junior level. Thus, overall, the issue of faculty aging is slowly diminishing in importance.

2. Academic Review Processes. The Middle States team suggested that lack of strategic planning has also affected review processes for academic units. Doctoral programs are regularly evaluated in accordance with CUNY policy (which requires program reviews on a regular cycle), and the new GC Office of Institutional Planning and Program Evaluation has tightened and codified evaluation procedures. The Middle States team pointed out that the research centers and institutes at The Graduate Center had been evaluated sporadically and suggested that they be more systematically reviewed. The self-study committee made the same recommendation, specifically proposing that centers undergo an outside evaluation every five years. During the Spring 2005 semester the GC vice president for research and sponsored programs conducted a preliminary review of all centers and institutes. This review is the first step in a more detailed evaluation to take place after the arrival of the new GC president.

3. Curriculum Planning. The Middle States team stated, “Curriculum review by the Curriculum Committee is the closest that Graduate Center programs seem to come to integrated academic planning” (p. 5). In response to this assessment of the role of the Committee on Curriculum and Degree Requirements, the process for presenting curricular changes has been streamlined (Appendix 2, p. 11). The resulting greater efficiency, in turn, has increased program willingness to review and update course offerings carefully on a regular basis.

4. Library. The Middle States team suggested that the Mina Rees Library should evaluate its services and its collection policies in order to plan for the best use of its resources. In response, the library undertook a self-study, “Mina Rees Library: Self-Study and Strategic Plan” (draft 6/30/04; rev. 11/17/04) [http://library.gc.cuny.edu/INFO/SelfStudy_StrategicPlan_rev1104.htm], and developed goals and objectives relating to improved access to research collections, a shift toward electronic collection development, technology applications for service delivery, and the provision of instructional services appropriate for doctoral students. A number of library projects related to the emerging objectives were initiated and some have already been completed, as described later in this chapter. Additional good news is the recent appointment of a CUNY university librarian to coordinate overall library services and planning across the campuses and a commitment to greater centralization of the purchase of electronic resources.

5. General Planning Process. In response to the need for strategic planning, the GC provost charged the Academic Planning Committee (APC) in 2002–03 to review the recommendations and suggestions associated with the 2000 Middle States self-study and the 2002 21C report and to provide a prioritized list of the most important institutional goals for the subsequent five years. The resulting report (“Academic
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Planning Committee Review of Recommendations of the 2000 MSA Self-Study and the 2002 Report of the Committee on Doctoral Education in the First Decade of the 21st Century,” July 2003) was presented to the provost in July 2003. The APC monitored progress toward these goals during 2003–04 and issued an “Update on Recommendations” in Summer 2004 (Appendix 2). The PRR Steering Committee, which includes a subset of the members of the APC, is providing a further update and review in this Periodic Review Report.

**Outcomes Assessment.** Procedures for evaluating outcomes also bear on strategic planning, but differ in that they require ongoing data-collection efforts so that The Graduate Center can know at any point where it stands in regard to such important matters as student academic progress and occupational outcomes. The Middle States team endorsed the self-study’s detailed recommendations for enhancing outcomes assessment. In response, The Graduate Center created an Office of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation, an important step in advancing the management of internal data. The office has initiated new projects, such as summarizing the results of the student exit survey, initiating a five-year-postgraduation survey, tabulating annual time-to-degree data, and conducting a biennial student-satisfaction survey (see Chapter 6 for details). The results of these studies and projects are made available in an annual Fact Book, online and in hard copy.

**Tuition Scholarships.** The Middle States team was one with The Graduate Center administration, faculty, and student body in highlighting the importance of tuition scholarships for recruiting and retaining highly qualified students. Tuition scholarships for doctoral students who teach or perform other services at a CUNY college has been the “top budgetary priority” for The Graduate Center (Appendix 2, p. 18), which for years has thrown its lobbying resources into the effort to obtain a tuition scholarship plan similar to that in the SUNY system. It has also repeatedly raised this issue in every forum available. The CUNY administration made this a priority and in 2004 achieved a significant improvement in student funding with the development of multiyear funding packages. The packages provide five years of in-state tuition and guaranteed teaching assignments at CUNY colleges in years two through four (see Chapter 3 for details). This was an extraordinary step that has already reaped rewards. The Graduate Center has now been granted funding for the 2005–06 academic year to allow tuition scholarships at the in-state level to about half of the doctoral students who provide service across CUNY (and are not otherwise receiving such aid), with the promise that funding will be provided in future years for all such students.

**Support for Science Faculty.** The Middle States team concluded that the faculty in bench sciences perceive themselves as occupying a secondary status at The Graduate Center because they are located on the campuses instead of in the GC building. This problem is clearly important, but the challenge of addressing it goes beyond the will and inclination of The Graduate Center itself. This concern has been positively affected by the University’s initiative to implement a cluster-hiring policy, involving coordinated recruitment across campuses in specified academic areas such as photonics. In addition, a provision in the current budget to initiate a new Advanced Research Science Center is projected to improve the research
environment for scientists at CUNY. The Committee for Doctoral Education in the Sciences completed a comprehensive review of CUNY's needs in this area; specific recommendations are available at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/Chemistry/reports/doced.htm, and actions being taken are consistent with these recommendations.

Although the Committee for Doctoral Education in the Sciences continues to address such concerns and the science program EOs meet regularly in their cluster group with GC administration officials, improving the situation for doctoral programs in the sciences depends crucially on increases in CUNY-wide support for the sciences. In remarks delivered during the Spring 2005 semester, the CUNY Chancellor announced that the upcoming years would be “the decade for investment in science at CUNY.”¹ This initiative is a welcome step; we anticipate that it will significantly ameliorate the problems identified by the Middle States team.

**OVERVIEW OF THE GRADUATE CENTER’S RESPONSES TO INTERNAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

The self-study recommendations, along with those of the succeeding committees, have been addressed by the GC administration since 2000. They all coincide with suggestions of the Middle States team, discussed previously in this chapter, but are more specific. Responses to these internal recommendations are the focus of the remainder of this chapter.

**Student Progress, Mentoring, and Development.** Many recommendations from the 2000 self-study concerned students' progress toward degrees and their mentoring and support from faculty members. Following up, the 21C and APC reports called for better mechanisms for tracking student progress. They also called for programs to identify possible bottlenecks for students and ways of removing them without harming degree quality. The Graduate Center responded by initiating development of a longitudinal database that will follow entering cohorts throughout their GC careers. This project will enable far closer tracking of time-to-degree and allow comparisons to be made across programs and broad disciplinary clusters. The Graduate Center also addresses student-progress issues in monthly meetings of disciplinary cluster executive officers. This allows EOs to compare policies across programs and develop a set of “best practices” for keeping students from getting stalled (see http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Best1.pdf and http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Best2.pdf). To assist EOs in monitoring student progress and expedite degree completion, the GC reviewed the adequacy of the existing progress "benchmarks" and added two new ones. They identify and direct attention and supplementary mentoring to advanced students, those who are approaching candidacy and those who are at the dissertation level, whose progress toward the degree has been stalled.

Perhaps most important, The Graduate Center worked with CUNY’s central administration to provide increased financial aid for students. A crucial way to enhance students’ progress is to reduce their financial need to work while pursuing their studies; financial aid permits students to maintain their academic focus at critical points in their graduate careers. Notable improvements were made in tuition scholarships, as discussed earlier in this chapter and in detail in Chapter 3.

Many Graduate Center students teach at the CUNY colleges. Indeed, in the 2002–03 academic year, almost 50 percent of doctoral students were employed (primarily as teachers) on the CUNY campuses or by the CUNY Research Foundation. Doctoral students’ employment is important for their economic support, for their professional development as teachers, and for the maintenance of CUNY’s undergraduate teaching mission. The self-study recommended that The Graduate Center provide better teacher training for its students; in response, we surveyed programs to determine what types of teacher training were being provided. Results of this survey were disseminated to executive officers, who were encouraged to enhance their own program’s teacher-training efforts. Further, GC-wide training for Graduate Teaching Fellows (GTFs) was enriched; they now receive a one-day orientation and follow-up sessions each semester that cover special topics. In addition, GTFs are advised to identify a mentor in the campus department where they teach to help them with pedagogical issues. Finally, new forms of financial aid (the Chancellor’s and Provosts’ Fellowships) include special training components for recipients, who will be entering the classroom in years two through four of their fellowships. In Fall 2005 the GC will launch a pilot teacher-training program for GTFs at one of the community colleges.

Placement issues are crucial for those receiving doctoral degrees at The Graduate Center. The self-study recommended that The Graduate Center continue the development of techniques for tracking graduates and their placement. The Graduate Center responded by initiating an annual “five-years-after-graduation” survey. This began with the cohort that graduated in 1995–96 and is now in its fifth cycle, surveying the cohort that graduated in 1999–2000. Survey results are available to the GC community at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/reports&surveys.htm.

Data from this survey show that a substantial proportion of The Graduate Center’s alumni pursue careers outside of education. For example, for 1998–99 graduates, 47 percent of those in the sciences, 34 percent of those in the social sciences, and 18 percent of those in the humanities report careers outside of the academy. The Graduate Center has taken several steps to respond to the recommendation for professional-development strategies to enhance the career options of such students. In Spring 2004 and Spring 2005, the Provost’s Office sponsored a course, “Working Outside the Academy: An Overview of Management, Finance, and Marketing Issues for Doctoral Students in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences,” designed to give students background in seeking jobs outside academe. Graduate Center alumni employed in business, government, and the nonprofit sectors visited the course to offer students their expertise. The GC also established an Alumni Council for Professional Development and invited alumni to workshops in which they discussed their nonacademic careers with students in the same discipline cluster.
**Interdisciplinarity.** The self-study recommended that The Graduate Center increase interdisciplinary research and teaching. The Graduate Center has responded in several ways. A new position was created, emphasizing the importance to interdisciplinary studies (IDS) in doctoral education: dean for interdisciplinary studies. A new series of colloquia was established in the three discipline clusters and was expanded, with the addition of semester-long seminars. Six interdisciplinary seminars were funded (through faculty workload credit, following a “competition” for course proposals) for Fall 2004 and will expand in Fall 2005. Monitoring of student enrollment in IDS courses has increased since 1999. IDS concentrations have been reviewed to make sure that they are fully functioning; such review resulted in the discontinuation of two concentrations (Modern German Studies; Crime and Politics). A new Certificate Program in Interactive Technology and Pedagogy was implemented in 2003, and a new IDS concentration in Africana Studies was initiated in 2004.

**Diversity.** Evaluation teams (both the Middle States team and the self-study committees) recognized the diversity of The Graduate Center's student body — in ethnicity, background, experience, age, and career goals — as one of its greatest strengths. The reports recommended further efforts to enhance diversity among students and among faculty. The Graduate Center has affirmed the priority placed on the hiring of minority faculty; as of 2004, the CUNY Affirmative Action Summary states that 12.7 percent of the GC full-time faculty (including librarians) were members of minority groups. Minority representation among students (citizens and permanent residents) in that same year was 28 percent (10 percent black, 12 percent Hispanic, and 6 percent other minorities). The Office of Educational Opportunity and Diversity Programs will be reviewed by a team of outside evaluators in Spring 2005 to determine how best to serve student needs with limited resources. To assist in the efforts to strengthen faculty and student diversity, in Fall 2003 the GC Affirmative Action Committee drafted a document, “Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students and Faculty: Best Practices.” With the installation of a new president, the GC will renew its efforts to retain as well as recruit students and faculty from underrepresented groups.

**Academic and Faculty Issues.** Evaluators suggested that CUNY’s allocation system for sharing faculty members between the colleges and the doctoral faculty be better explained to community members, including faculty, staff, students, and administrators in all CUNY institutions. The Graduate Center administration notes that deans and provosts on the campuses are well informed about this system; the GC has publicized its basic operations more broadly through a detailed description of the system at [http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Allocation.htm](http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Allocation.htm). The provost has asked executive officers to communicate directly with department chairs to explain the system and has encouraged doctoral programs to interact with department chairs through meetings, colloquia, social events, and consultations about faculty hiring.

The Graduate Center has also responded to recommendations that master’s programs be evaluated. Future doctoral program evaluations will include reviews of any associated master’s programs (Comparative Literature, Linguistics, Philosophy, Political Science, Classics). The MALS (Master of Arts in Liberal Studies) program,
which is independent of any doctoral program, was also added to the regular review cycle.

In response to suggestions that appointments to the doctoral faculty be made through transparent processes, programs were surveyed about their practices for appointing members of the doctoral faculty. The survey results, posted at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Appointment.htm, give programs the information required to assess their own policies and allow faculty to compare the policies of different programs.

Hiring defines the nature of an institution and safeguards its future. The Graduate Center has made substantial investments in new faculty both through the workings of the consortium and through direct hiring with faculty appointments at The Graduate Center. A policy of “cluster hiring” in areas to create a flagship environment for the University was implemented by the CUNY central administration, providing for concentrated hiring in areas deemed high priority (foreign languages, photonics, new media and computer science, and teacher education). In addition, a CUNY-wide commitment to expanding the full-time faculty has resulted in 900 new hires in the past five years. The Graduate Center has taken full advantage of hiring opportunities: since 2000, of a total of 118 full-time faculty at The Graduate Center, 27 are new hires and four are transfers. Taking into account resignations, deaths, and retirements, the GC has had a net increase of 12 faculty. In Spring 2005 the GC published a brochure, “New Faculty Appointments: Spring 1999 – Fall 2005,” to help publicize the depth and strength of the new faculty.

The Graduate Center has also offered overscale salaries, as is now permitted in the PSC-CUNY contract (the Professional Staff Congress/CUNY represents teaching and nonteaching instructional staff). With the recommendation of the Academic Review Committee and the approval of the president, such salaries can be offered in recruitment and retention cases. Overscale salaries have enhanced The Graduate Center’s ability to hire and retain high-level faculty in a competitive market.

**Technology Issues.** The self-study committees and the Middle States team made many recommendations regarding improving the technology skills and resources of The Graduate Center. Substantial advances have been made. The Student Technology Fee ($75 annually, initiated in 2002) has provided additional resources that have funded skills-training workshops and have allowed The Graduate Center to purchase more hardware and software to support instructional technology. Financial aid resources have been used to appoint Technology Fellows to work with Honors College students to conceive and develop cross-campus collaborations that feature student use of computers and other digital media. Help-desk support for technology users has been stabilized and improved. Graduate Center staff members have received expanded training in computer skills. The structure and staffing of the Information Resources office will be assessed after a new director is appointed in Fall 2005.

**Library.** In response to the suggestions that focused on the Mina Rees Library, over the past five years the library has enhanced services in a number of dimensions, most notably in the area of electronic resources. Since 2000, the library has tripled
the number of electronic database subscriptions to major social science and humanities resources such as JSTOR and Project Muse. It has also expanded access to science resources such as SciFinder Scholar and Elsevier Journals and to interdisciplinary databases such as Dissertations Online and NetLibrary. The library website was revamped to provide more direct access to these resources and to other web-based resources important to Graduate Center programs. Library hours were expanded to permit greater on-site accessibility.

To increase access to collections not available in the Mina Rees Library, Student Technology Fee funds were used to improve document-delivery services. New software was implemented that permits students to make and check the status of Interlibrary Loan requests via the web, download bibliographic data from the WorldCat database directly into a loan-request form, receive articles electronically to student or faculty desktop, and double the number of simultaneous requests permitted. Interlibrary Loan activity has tripled since 2002 as a result of these changes.

Electronic Reserves and a Virtual Reference Chat Service were also implemented. These allow students to access reserve information and receive real-time reference assistance via the web. Students now have three ways to access databases from home: Remote Patron Authentication (RPA), Dial-up Access, or Virtual Private Network (VPN).

In an effort to increase resources available to the library — outside of the tax-levy budget — a friends of the library organization, “Library Associates,” was initiated in 2000. Library Associates holds regular book readings and events to encourage contributions to the library and to raise its visibility. The resulting “gift account” permits the library to purchase books and monographs that would otherwise strain its budget.

**CONCLUSION**

This summary provides an overview of the suggestions and recommendations, and responses to them, made by the Middle States evaluators, the Middle States Steering Committee, and internal planning committees. These groups addressed a wide range of issues of fundamental importance to The Graduate Center. The “Update on Recommendations” (Appendix 2) provides a detailed summary of these recommendations and The Graduate Center’s response to them so far. The Middle States review (along with the 40th anniversary of The Graduate Center) thus precipitated extensive internal analysis and planning. The Graduate Center has greatly benefited from these suggestions and recommendations and has made enormous progress in acting on many of them, notably in the areas of financial aid for students, faculty replenishment, institutional research, student mentoring and professional development, fund raising, and research grants. Where The Graduate Center has not responded, it was generally because of resource limitations. The Graduate Center operates within a complex environment that makes it hard to predict or control resources over time; this challenge is not unique to The Graduate Center, but is especially significant in its demanding role as the doctorate-granting unit for the huge, disaggregated, and dynamic university of which it is a part.
CHAPTER 3

MAJOR CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The Handbook for Periodic Review Reports indicates that Chapter 3 of a PRR is “designed to allow the institution maximum opportunity to record briefly and to analyze its chief accomplishments and any significant obstacles or challenges.” The Graduate Center’s accomplishments have been summarized in the previous chapter, which documents progress in responding to the recommendations of both the 2000 Middle States self-study and the subsequent report of the Middle States visiting team. This chapter highlights the most important challenges and opportunities The Graduate Center faces over the next five years; it also identifies recent academic program changes at The Graduate Center, including the establishment of three new doctoral programs and a new School of Professional Studies.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES, 2005–2009

The primary opportunity and challenge for The Graduate Center is now in process: identifying and appointing a new president. Frances Degen Horowitz is stepping down in June 2005; a search began in November 2004 and interviews were conducted with four candidates in May 2005. A new president by definition brings new ideas, new personnel, and new approaches. The faculty, staff, and students of The Graduate Center look forward to consulting with the new president and contributing to that person’s vision for CUNY’s doctoral education.

To identify other challenges and opportunities The Graduate Center faces, the PRR Steering Committee consulted with The Graduate Center’s president and provost, representatives of the Doctoral Students’ Council, and members of the Doctoral Faculty Policy Committee. In addition, the PRR committee reviewed the 2003 and 2004 reports of The Graduate Center’s Academic Planning Committee, three members of which serve on the PRR Steering Committee. The resulting challenges and opportunities are listed below in priority order.

1. Expand doctoral student support. Since its founding, The Graduate Center has been underresourced, especially in comparison with the four doctoral-degree–granting branches of the State University of New York. Unlike every other research university in the country — public and private — CUNY has not in the past been able to offer most doctoral students four- or five-year financial aid packages, including a tuition scholarship, or to remit tuition for doctoral students who teach in undergraduate classrooms. Similarly, unlike most other doctoral schools, The Graduate Center has not been able to promise teaching assistantships or adjunct teaching positions to incoming students (such teaching positions are filled at the discretion of the individual undergraduate CUNY colleges). Admitted doctoral students were told that they were likely to find teaching positions at one of the CUNY colleges, but because those hiring decisions lay outside the purview of the doctoral programs, no promises could be made. That most students were ultimately
placed in adjunct positions made little difference to applicants who were offered
guaranteed teaching and tuition support at other universities.

During the 2003–04 academic year, the University made significant strides toward
addressing this problem. Tuition support for doctoral students was recognized and
embraced as a University responsibility and as an organic element of CUNY’s Master
Plan. The Chancellery committed five years of tuition support, at the in-state level,
to 300 outstanding doctoral applicants every year beginning with the Fall 2004
entering class. At full implementation — by Fall 2009 — 1500 students will be
receiving these tuition awards.

Further, with the cooperation of the CUNY executive vice chancellor and the
provosts at the undergraduate campuses, for 200 of the 300 entering students
receiving tuition awards each year The Graduate Center will be able to offer
guaranteed teaching assignments. These are the first such guaranteed assignments in
The Graduate Center's history. As part of this general initiative, the University has
also committed — budget permitting — to providing funds to cover tuition (at the
in-state level) for other ongoing doctoral students who are teaching within CUNY.
As a first step, the University will provide $1 million toward this goal for the 2005–
06 academic year. Overall, CUNY’s 2005–06 budget request to New York State
included $7.5 million for tuition support for doctoral students.

These steps comprise an important start toward achieving our goals of: (1) offering
half of all incoming doctoral students financial aid packages that guarantee five years
of tuition support and five years of stipend support at the level of $16,000, with
teaching assistantships in years two through four and no work obligation in years one
and five; and (2) providing tuition scholarships to all students who are providing
service to CUNY as teachers or research assistants who are not covered by the
financial aid packages described in (1). The challenge is to secure the funding to
achieve these goals in the next five years. Related challenges for improving student
recruitment are obtaining affordable housing for students (see item 3 below) and
finding a way to fund student health insurance, which students must currently
purchase for themselves.

2. Continue to recruit outstanding faculty at The Graduate Center
and to make best use of college faculty through the consortial
system. One of The Graduate Center’s greatest strengths is the quality and size of
the doctoral faculty. Thanks to the consortial model, students can do course work
and dissertation research with a wide range of eminent faculty members based at The
Graduate Center and at the CUNY colleges. But this system has also generated
problems in allocating often-limited faculty resources and in ensuring that
appointments are made with the needs of all constituencies in mind. Among the
challenges we will face in the next five years are how best to attract scholars of the
first rank to Graduate Center lines, to collaborate with the colleges in recruiting and
retaining new faculty committed to training Ph.D. students, to secure resources that
support teaching and research for scholars throughout CUNY, and to encourage
research-oriented faculty from across the University to participate in the intellectual
life of The Graduate Center.
One of CUNY’s most promising initiatives is cluster hiring — planned investment in identified fields where CUNY has an opportunity to have regional and national impact (foreign languages, photonics, new media and computer science, and teacher education). This effort has resulted in significant hiring in a number of areas. While the implementation of this initiative must remain in the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs and intimately involve the college presidents and provosts, The Graduate Center has a potentially important role to play. As the hub of CUNY’s consortium, it is well placed to assist the executive vice chancellor in organizing cluster initiatives and in drawing together the faculty hired in these initiatives. A related benefit of involving The Graduate Center is that its input would minimize the possible duplication of faculty expertise and ensure that doctoral teaching possibilities exist for the faculty these initiatives produce.

Another opportunity to enhance doctoral faculty is presented by the CUNY chancellor’s recent emphasis on securing additional funding and developing better facilities for the natural sciences — the Advanced Research Science Center, for example. To the extent that these initiatives increase the number and prominence of the science doctoral faculty, they will enhance doctoral education and the overall research environment at CUNY.

3. Secure affordable housing for students. Ever since the lease on West Hall, a rental building near the former GC campus, was not renewed in 1999, The Graduate Center has been struggling to find affordable housing for doctoral students. New York is one of the most expensive housing markets in the United States. Without a physical campus beyond the building at 365 Fifth Avenue, we have no land on which to build, making the cost of securing a dormitory even more expensive. The vice president for finance and administration, working with the vice president for student affairs, continues to explore a variety of options and partnerships to achieve this goal. Members of The Graduate Center Foundation Board who are in the real estate industry have been instrumental in identifying potential sites and exploring financing options. As of Spring 2005, negotiations are under way for student housing in a nearby building.

4. Reduce time-to-degree and enhance student professional development. Doctoral students at The Graduate Center often take longer to complete their degrees than national averages, in large part because of insufficient financial aid. Many students must do an inordinate amount of adjunct teaching to support themselves, thereby slowing their progress. The improved financial aid picture described in item 1 above will help mitigate this problem. We are also cognizant of the role of mentoring. Since the Middle States accreditation visit in 2000, The Graduate Center has taken three steps to improve student mentoring. First, at monthly “cluster” meetings, the executive officers in each discipline cluster exchange ideas and “best practices” about how to mentor students more effectively. Second, the newly established “No Record of Progress” grade has enabled EOs to identify students who are not making progress on their dissertations and to facilitate timely interventions to help get them back on track. An additional benchmark has been developed to identify students who are not passing their Second Examinations in a timely way, again with the goal of arranging suitable intervention and mentoring.
Third, a longitudinal student database is in development that will allow programs to identify the points at which students’ careers are held up and to design appropriate interventions. The challenge is to continue and improve on these efforts.

The Graduate Center is pursuing two new avenues of professional development, one for students who are interested in teaching careers and one for students who would like to consider careers outside of the academy (students may take advantage of both). A survey of doctoral programs to identify what types of professional teaching activities are offered within each program identified a wide range, from almost nothing to semester-long courses in pedagogy. By sharing with all doctoral programs the results of this survey, we hope to encourage an upgrading of program-specific activities and collaborations among smaller programs. In addition, the provost’s office has initiated a series of workshops for incoming students who have received the new financial aid packages described in item 1. Academic year 2004–05 is the pilot year for this professional development series. The challenge is to find a way to make this opportunity available to all GC students.

To acquaint students with the types of careers that are available outside of the academy, The Graduate Center initiated several activities. First, a two-credit course, “Working Outside the Academy: Essential Management Skills for Doctoral Students in the Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences,” is offered once a year. Second, an Alumni Council for Professional Development holds workshops in which alumni discuss their nonacademic careers with students in the same discipline cluster. Third, each semester a course, “Scientific Career Management: Strategies for Enhancing Job Prospects and Career Opportunities for Ph.D. Scientists and Engineers,” is team-taught by a scientist and a professional career guidance counselor. This course enables graduate students to enhance and enlarge their employment prospects by covering such topics as skills assessment, resume preparation, interview techniques, and networking.

5. Build The Graduate Center endowment. The Graduate Center conducted a $30 million capital campaign that successfully concluded at the end of the Spring 2005 semester. Meeting and exceeding the $30 million goal was a tremendous accomplishment of the current president. The challenge for the new president will be to bring the endowment up to the next level so that it can provide income to meet financial aid, housing, faculty salary supplements, and other needs.

6. Continue to strengthen and renew the curriculum. The Graduate Center has always been committed, through periodic program review and faculty governance, to reflecting critically on the overall structure of the curriculum offered in the doctoral, master’s, and certificate programs and, where appropriate, to rethinking, revising, and initiating course offerings and areas of study to reflect important transformations of scholarship, intellectual inquiry, and pedagogy. Each doctoral program has its own curriculum committee that oversees program curricular developments, and the GC-wide Committee on Curriculum and Degree Committee meets regularly to review the additions, deletions, and other modifications to curriculum recommended by doctoral programs. In addition, The Graduate Center broadens this process of intellectual reflection and curriculum renewal through
ongoing periodic assessment of student satisfaction, faculty interest, and regular external reviews.

When and where appropriate, based on periodic doctoral program review, the GC, with the approval of the CUNY Board and the New York State Education Department, suspends programs and modifies areas of study that no longer respond to faculty and student interest and intellectual and academic demand. At the same time, the GC provides financial support for new approaches to doctoral education, including underwriting a limited number of newly conceived courses that encourage interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary study and that push the boundaries of intellectual inquiry. In response to new requirements in certain clinical disciplines, The Graduate Center is developing doctoral degrees that will meet licensure requirements in audiology, physical therapy, and nursing (see below).

7. Space and resources. When The Graduate Center moved to 365 Fifth Avenue in 1999, faculty, staff, and students immediately filled the entire space. With the net addition of some 12 new faculty members, a large new doctoral program (Urban Education), an expanding Continuing Education and Public Programming effort, and new staff members, the building has become increasingly crowded. This crowding has been exacerbated by the growth in student enrollment over the period: total headcount enrollment, including doctoral, master’s, and nonmatriculated students, increased by 18 percent between Fall 1999 and Fall 2004, from 3590 to 4234 students (see Table 2). Further, the GC provides space for a number of University programs, such as the CUNY Honors College, the CUNY Baccalaureate Program, and the new School of Professional Studies, whose needs for space and other resources (including supervisory personnel) grow annually. The Graduate Center and the CUNY central administration must address how best to define the space needs of CUNY’s doctoral education versus those of ancillary activities.

NEW DOCTORAL PROGRAMS

Since the 2000 Middle States accreditation visit, The Graduate Center has established three new doctoral programs and is in the process of developing two more.

Urban Education. The Ph.D. Program in Urban Education was approved by the New York State Education Department in July 2000 and accepted its first class in Fall 2001. About 60 students are currently enrolled in the program. The Urban Education program was designed to prepare leaders in educational research and policy analysis who have a broad understanding of the complex issues facing urban education. The unique focus of this program is at the intersection of two principal research agendas: (1) research on issues of curriculum and instruction in urban schools; and (2) policy analysis research on broader social, political, and economic issues that shape the context of urban education. The intellectual resources of the CUNY Graduate Center enable students in this program to draw on elective courses and research faculty in many relevant partner disciplines, including history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology, economics, and political science, and to draw more broadly on expertise in the humanities, mathematics, and the sciences, when appropriate to their interests.
Forensic Psychology. The Ph.D. Program in Forensic Psychology is a new subprogram within CUNY’s Ph.D. Program in Psychology. After approval by the New York State Education Department as a licensure-eligible doctoral program, the Forensic Psychology program accepted its first class of students in Fall 2004.

Forensic psychology is rooted in the discipline of psychology, but it also draws on the disciplines of law, sociology, political science, anthropology, philosophy, medicine, and linguistics. The educational goals of the program are to: (1) prepare students to develop and conduct independent research in the field of forensic psychology; (2) prepare students to assume academic positions and leading roles in forensic psychology; (3) prepare students to practice forensic psychology within and in response to the needs of the legal system, including conducting psychosocial interventions in forensic settings, performing forensic psychological assessments, and serving as consultants and experts to the courts, law enforcement, correctional agencies, and the legal system generally; and (4) provide students with a critical perspective on the legal system to enable them to develop and analyze public policy relevant to legal settings. In 2004–05 the Graduate Council approved two separate tracks for Forensic Psychology: Clinical Forensic Psychology and Experimental Forensic Psychology.

Audiology. Currently being implemented (with Hunter and Brooklyn colleges), the program in audiology will award a licensure-qualifying clinical doctorate in audiology, the Doctor of Audiology (Au.D.) degree. This Au.D. program was developed in response to the new standards for professional training adopted by the
Council on Academic Accreditation in Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA), to take effect January 1, 2012. The Au.D. program will replace existing master’s programs in audiology at two of the CUNY undergraduate campuses and will utilize the current academic and clinical faculty and facilities at those campuses.

The goal of the program is to prepare students to be highly qualified autonomous clinicians providing state-of-the-art audiology services to individuals with hearing loss across the lifespan. The program will: (1) prepare audiologists to meet the hearing health-care needs of the culturally, linguistically, and socioeconomically diverse population of the greater NYC metropolitan area; (2) train audiologists through a full-time, intensive clinical doctoral program for autonomous practice so that they are able to deliver exceptional hearing health care; and (3) educate audiologists to be active contributors to the clinical science that serves audiology and to encourage them through experiences in the training program to commit to the continuing development of the profession. A proposal approved by Graduate Council and the CUNY Board of Trustees was approved by the New York State Education Department in May 2005. Every effort is being made to permit the first cohort of students to enter in Fall 2005.

Other Program Changes. Proposals are under development for two new professional clinical degrees, the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) and the Doctor of Nursing Science (DNS), which hope to start admitting students in 2006. The proposal for the DPT program has been approved by the Graduate Council and is now being considered by the CUNY Board of Trustees. A Letter of Intent for the DNS program has been approved by the Graduate Council. A Certificate Program in Interactive Technology and Pedagogy was approved and initiated in Fall 2003. An Interdisciplinary Concentration in Africana Studies was initiated in Fall 2004. The M.A./Ph.D. Program in Germanic Languages and Literatures was suspended in Spring 2004 after an extensive review of dwindling applications and available faculty.

THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES

Graduate Center administrators and the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs developed a CUNY School of Professional Studies (SPS), based at The Graduate Center. SPS was conceived to enhance the skills and expertise of New York City’s workforce by providing the city’s diverse population access to postbaccalaureate and baccalaureate credit programs and courses. SPS educational programs are designed primarily to respond to the educational needs of New York’s working adults and employers, including businesses, nonprofit organizations, unions, and government agencies. SPS launched its first program in Summer 2003, quickly expanding the number of courses and certificate programs it has offered to more than 1500 students as of Spring 2005.

Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Resources. SPS has a staff of eight full- and part-timers, in addition to a dean and an associate dean, who develop and administer its courses and certificates. The school also relies extensively on the administrative and physical resources of The Graduate Center,
including its registrar, human resources office, information technology infrastructure, and finance/business office. The Graduate Center president appointed the associate provost and dean for interdisciplinary studies as the liaison between SPS and The Graduate Center’s operational and administrative staff to help integrate SPS activities into GC daily operations. SPS staff are in the process of developing an overall strategic plan for the next three years. Tuition revenue generated by SPS academic programs, CUNY tax-levy funding, and a number of grants provide the financial support that underwrite the cost of the school’s academic programs and administrative staff. A portion of net revenues has been promised for financial support for CUNY doctoral students; $100,000 has been committed for 2005–06.

**Leadership and Governance.** SPS has an independent nine-member Governing Committee that provides oversight of the school’s academic programs. Cohorts of three Governing Committee members, each of whom is a faculty member at a CUNY college, are appointed to staggered three-year terms by the University Faculty Senate chair, the Graduate Center president, and the University’s executive vice chancellor (all three of whom serve, ex officio, on the Governing Committee). The committee’s role is to ensure that the school offers academically rigorous courses and certificate programs. The committee reviews all new credit offerings, including curriculum, the rationale for offering the course through SPS, and the credentials of the development and instructional faculty. All credit certificate programs approved by the committee must then be formally approved by the CUNY Board of Trustees and registered with the New York State Education Department.

**Academic Rigor and Faculty Quality.** SPS has focused on ensuring the academic quality and rigor of its programs and certificates. Each SPS course is developed with participation from highly qualified experts and integrates participation of full-time CUNY faculty, whether as the primary course developers or in advisory roles. SPS appoints an academic coordinator for each of its certificate programs, usually a CUNY faculty member who is an expert in the field and who has been central to developing the particular certificate program. The academic coordinator participates in hiring and training instructors, evaluates instructors, oversees implementation of curriculum, and reviews student course evaluations.

**Institutional Assessment.** SPS is developing ongoing evaluation and assessment mechanisms and procedures for its courses and certificate programs. At present, SPS requests written student evaluations of every course. The Provost’s Office at The Graduate Center will include the SPS operation in its periodic outside assessment and review process; the first formal review of SPS is planned for 2008.

**CONCLUSION**

The Graduate Center, like any other dynamic institution, faces many challenges and opportunities in the next five years. The person selected as president will have a major impact on every facet of Graduate Center life, especially fund-raising and the public face of CUNY’s doctoral efforts. When that person is installed, the Graduate Center community will begin to assess the best ways to respond to the challenges identified in this chapter.
CHAPTER 4
FINANCE AND ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

The Graduate Center is one unit of The City University of New York. The CUNY senior colleges, including The Graduate Center, are funded by the State of New York, while the CUNY community colleges are funded primarily by New York City. Most faculty and staff belong to one of several unions, which negotiate contracts for salary scales and benefits.

For the past 20 years the State of New York has not adopted a budget before the commencement of its fiscal year (April to March). (The fiscal 2006 budget, a remarkable exception, was passed in April 2005.) More often than not the delays in implementing a budget have been extreme; for example, the state did not adopt its fiscal 2005 budget until August 24, 2004, and the CUNY colleges did not receive their final allocations until three days later — essentially two months into the CUNY fiscal year. This consistent pattern of late budget adoptions makes it difficult to link multiyear institutional planning with budget planning and to manage fiscal resources efficiently within a particular fiscal year.

GRADUATE CENTER FINANCES

For its modest size and focused academic mission The Graduate Center is a financially complex institution. Its financial profile consists of a federation of the following six distinct financial entities and sources of funds:

- **Tax-Levy Graduate Center Funds**: annual operating budget appropriations and marginal (in excess of New York State tuition targets) tuition revenues from the State of New York.

- **Nontax-Levy Graduate Center Funds**: (1) unrestricted funds and sponsored research and other temporarily restricted funds that are managed at The Graduate Center; and (2) unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted funds from fund-raising and investing activities of The Graduate Center held in an investment pool with the City University treasurer.

- **Research Foundation**: sponsored research funds and unrestricted grant overhead recovery funds that are managed for The Graduate Center by the Research Foundation of The City University of New York, Inc., a private, not-for-profit corporation.

- **Graduate Center Foundation**: unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted funds from the fund-raising and investing activities of The Graduate Center Foundation, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation that is the current GC fund-raising arm.
• **Auxiliary Enterprises**: unrestricted funds generated by the auxiliary enterprise activities of The Graduate Center held in the CUNY Graduate School and University Center Auxiliary Enterprises Corp., a not-for-profit corporation.

• **Child Development and Learning Center**: unrestricted funds for the operation of The Graduate School and University Center Child Development and Learning Center, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation that provides preschool services for the children of Graduate Center students.

What follows is a description of the most significant financial trends related to each of these financial entities and funding sources during the five-year period fiscal 2000 through 2004, and projections for the future. Also included in this chapter is a review of enrollment trends over the same period and enrollment projections.

**TAX-LEVY GRADUATE CENTER FUNDS**

New York State tax-levy funding for the City University continued to decline on an inflation-adjusted basis in the five-year period fiscal 2000 through 2004. Even the Office of the State Comptroller recognized the seriousness of the decline when it reported in its “2004 Comptroller’s Report on the Financial Condition of New York State.”

- “Over the past 10 years [fiscal 1994 through fiscal 2004], New York State has increased its support for higher education by only 22%, while national spending [average of all states] rose by 47%. During the same period the Higher Education College and University Operations Price Index (HEPI) rose 42%.”

- “New York State spends $194 per person annually on higher education, a $6 reduction from fiscal year 2002-03. New York spending, ranked 33rd in the nation, is also less than the national median spending rate of $211.”

Given this poor record of overall New York State support for higher education, it is not surprising that in each year of the five-year period, fiscal 2000–2004, the tax-levy operating budget of The Graduate Center, shown in Table 3, could not fully support The Graduate Center’s annual operating expenses. In fiscal years 2000–2002 the gap between overall operating expenditures and the state budget allocation exceeded $2 million annually. This excess of expenditures over budget allocation was ultimately funded through the use of nontax-levy funds and the use of tuition overcollections (marginal tuition revenues, those in excess of the state tuition target) produced by a 3.8 percent enrollment increase in fiscal 2002.

Uncomfortable with funding basic operating expenses with excess tuition and nontax-levy funds (sources of revenues that are not reliable from year to year), The Graduate Center in fiscal 2003 engaged in a series of permanent operating expenditure reductions that lowered the tax-levy deficit to $1.1 million in 2004. At this level of tax-levy deficit, The Graduate Center was in a position to build modest reserves in its tuition revenue account with New York State that resulted from additional enrollment increases of 7.2 and 5.5 percent in fiscal 2003 and 2004, respectively.
Table 3: Tax-Levy Budget Allocation, Fiscal Years 2000–2004, The Graduate Center, CUNY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003*</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>$23,790,423</td>
<td>$25,630,396</td>
<td>$25,919,551</td>
<td>$24,477,780</td>
<td>$28,493,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Support Staff</td>
<td>3,962,821</td>
<td>4,845,264</td>
<td>4,727,598</td>
<td>4,102,687</td>
<td>4,761,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Teaching &amp; Writing</td>
<td>4,694,394</td>
<td>4,372,991</td>
<td>4,950,604</td>
<td>4,613,992</td>
<td>6,280,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows</td>
<td>493,295</td>
<td>441,853</td>
<td>439,926</td>
<td>369,494</td>
<td>482,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Personnel Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Instruction</strong></td>
<td>32,940,933</td>
<td>35,290,504</td>
<td>36,037,679</td>
<td>33,563,953</td>
<td>40,017,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>3,047,489</td>
<td>3,163,773</td>
<td>3,454,831</td>
<td>3,231,561</td>
<td>3,884,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Personnel Services</td>
<td>705,826</td>
<td>839,477</td>
<td>843,491</td>
<td>764,856</td>
<td>1,136,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Academic Support Services</strong></td>
<td>3,753,315</td>
<td>4,003,250</td>
<td>4,298,322</td>
<td>3,996,417</td>
<td>5,020,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>1,661,298</td>
<td>1,846,634</td>
<td>1,821,378</td>
<td>1,799,895</td>
<td>1,925,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Fellows</td>
<td>1,150,119</td>
<td>1,486,538</td>
<td>1,527,997</td>
<td>1,728,123</td>
<td>1,618,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>6,814,098</td>
<td>5,865,782</td>
<td>6,115,421</td>
<td>7,485,842</td>
<td>7,376,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Personnel Services</td>
<td>155,283</td>
<td>302,826</td>
<td>221,813</td>
<td>185,222</td>
<td>187,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Student Services</strong></td>
<td>9,780,798</td>
<td>9,501,780</td>
<td>9,686,609</td>
<td>11,199,082</td>
<td>11,108,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>5,787,557</td>
<td>5,780,409</td>
<td>5,874,056</td>
<td>6,512,181</td>
<td>6,308,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Personnel Services</td>
<td>4,907,900</td>
<td>4,387,640</td>
<td>6,217,609</td>
<td>6,997,270</td>
<td>7,068,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Institutional Support Services</strong></td>
<td>10,695,457</td>
<td>10,168,049</td>
<td>12,091,665</td>
<td>13,509,451</td>
<td>13,377,264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**  

|               | $57,170,503 | $58,963,583 | $62,114,275 | $65,208,903* | $69,524,172 |

*The budget allocation shown here for 2003 includes $2,940,000 of salary increases that have not been distributed among the categories listed in the table.
The eventual elimination of this tax-levy deficit is one of The Graduate Center’s primary financial goals for the coming years. Achieving a balance between operating expenditures and the state budget allocation will, over time, result in the creation of financial reserves to act as a hedge against further erosion in state support and declines in current levels of tuition revenue. These reserves will also be available to fund the capital needs of The Graduate Center not addressed by the University’s capital budget.

The success story for The Graduate Center’s tax-levy budget during this period was the achievement of substantial progress in 2004 toward the long-standing goal to give tuition assistance to all doctoral students in their first five years of training who provide service to the University. The University’s chancellor agreed to support through tax-levy funds a plan whereby tuition assistance for doctoral students would be phased in over a six-year period. By fiscal 2009, therefore, and in all subsequent years, approximately 1500 students will be provided full in-state tuition scholarships at an anticipated cost of $5.2 million annually.

**NONTAX-LEVY GRADUATE CENTER FUNDS**

The Graduate Center receives unrestricted, temporarily restricted, and permanently restricted funds from numerous nontax-levy sources. A detailed breakdown of these various categories is shown in Table 4.

Unrestricted nontax-levy funds are generated primarily from institutional overhead recoveries from research grants and sponsored projects. The second major source of unrestricted nontax-levy funds is unrestricted gifts invested in the City University investment pool. Unrestricted net assets declined 40 percent since fiscal 2000 (from $4.5 to $2.7 million) because of the need to support the tax-levy budget with unrestricted nontax-levy funds. Since fiscal 2002, however, unrestricted net assets have doubled (from $1.3 to $2.7 million) because of the decreased need for nontax-levy operating budget support in fiscal 2003 and 2004.

Temporarily restricted nontax-levy funds, which represent the largest category of nontax-levy funds, derive primarily from externally funded research grants and awards for sponsored projects. These grants and awards are generated by the active research faculty and by the 28 research centers and institutes that reside at The Graduate Center. Temporarily restricted net assets vary from year to year primarily based on the acquisition and expenditure activity of these research grants. The other important source of temporarily restricted nontax-levy funds is the investment income from endowment funds invested in the City University investment pool. Temporarily restricted net assets totaled $5.7 million in fiscal 2004.

The permanently restricted nontax-levy funds are gifts of endowment that are invested in the City University investment pool. The endowment corpus in the pool is approximately $4.9 million.
### Table 4: Nontax-Levy Funds, Balance Sheet, Fiscal Years 2000–2004, The Graduate Center, CUNY (in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$749</td>
<td>$382</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$3,616</td>
<td>$1,488</td>
<td>$715</td>
<td>$802</td>
<td>$2,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>$152</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Other Funds</td>
<td>$637</td>
<td>$958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$4,545</td>
<td>$2,022</td>
<td>$1,574</td>
<td>$1,942</td>
<td>$2,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$256</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Other Funds</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>$187</td>
<td>$256</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$1,519</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$427</td>
<td>$922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$8,429</td>
<td>$6,357</td>
<td>$5,625</td>
<td>$5,833</td>
<td>$5,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from Other Funds</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$8,545</td>
<td>$7,920</td>
<td>$6,430</td>
<td>$6,332</td>
<td>$6,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$284</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Other Funds</td>
<td>$246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERMANENTLY RESTRICTED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>$5,031</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$5,031</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$4,532</td>
<td>$1,835</td>
<td>$1,318</td>
<td>$1,916</td>
<td>$2,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>$8,545</td>
<td>$7,797</td>
<td>$6,404</td>
<td>$5,802</td>
<td>$5,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>$5,031</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
<td>$4,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$18,108</td>
<td>$14,498</td>
<td>$12,588</td>
<td>$12,584</td>
<td>$13,244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESEARCH FOUNDATION

The Research Foundation is a private, not-for-profit educational corporation that provides a variety of services to the City University in support of its research mission. The Graduate Center directs its governmental grants (federal, state, and municipal), and grants that require payroll services, to the Research Foundation for administration. Other grants and contracts are managed as part of the nontax-levy budget described in the preceding section.

The Graduate Center receives unrestricted grant overhead recovery fees from the grants that fund the Research Foundation’s administrative fees and provide supplemental support for the GC operating budget. Annual grant overhead recoveries averaged $1.1 million and Research Foundation fees averaged $880,000 over the past five years. The grant overhead account balance was $192,000 at the end of fiscal 2004.

A notable accomplishment over the past five years has been the increase in the number and dollar value of grants and sponsored project awards received by the GC (those administered by the Research Foundation and those administered internally), as shown in Table 5. Annual awards increased 128 percent (from 75 to 171), and annual dollars received increased 77 percent (from $6.9 million to $12.2 million) in this five-year period. These were increases in awards both to the GC’s academic programs and to its research centers and institutes.

Table 5: Grants and Sponsored Projects, The Graduate Center, Fiscal Years 2000–2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AWARDS</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>$6,910,510</td>
<td>$10,649,007</td>
<td>$11,509,495</td>
<td>$9,936,863</td>
<td>$12,249,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARDS TO RESEARCH CENTERS AND INSTITUTES</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>$5,635,877</td>
<td>$6,485,902</td>
<td>$9,010,975</td>
<td>$6,572,894</td>
<td>$5,789,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARDS TO ACADEMIC PROGRAMS</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>$1,274,633</td>
<td>$4,163,105</td>
<td>$2,498,520</td>
<td>$3,363,969</td>
<td>$6,459,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Awards</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GRADUATE CENTER FOUNDATION

The Graduate Center Foundation was founded as a not-for-profit corporation in 1994. It was established to make, solicit, and administer gifts and grants in support of the mission, objectives, and goals of The Graduate Center. A detailed view of the assets and grants of the foundation over the past five years is presented in Table 6.

The foundation started the 2000 fiscal year with $10 million in total net assets, $6.2 million of which were endowment assets (these data are not shown in Table 6). By the end of the 2004 fiscal year its net worth had grown to $18.9 million, and its endowment assets had grown by an extraordinary 134 percent, from $6.2 million to $14.5 million.

Progress over this period, however, was not constant. Unrestricted net assets hit a low of $(506,000) in 2002 as a result of a protracted decline in the market value of investments and multiple years of operating deficits. The total change in unrestricted net assets for the three-year period 2000 through 2002 was $(1.6) million. One-half of this decline came from operating activities. Unrestricted net assets were restored

Table 6: Selected Financial Statement Information, Fiscal Years 2000-2004, The Graduate Center Foundation (in thousands of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
<td>$138</td>
<td>$(506)</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>$929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>$10,082</td>
<td>$11,574</td>
<td>$12,289</td>
<td>$12,353</td>
<td>$14,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Assets</td>
<td>$13,601</td>
<td>$14,174</td>
<td>$15,098</td>
<td>$15,887</td>
<td>$18,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Unrestricted Net Assets from Operating Activities</td>
<td>$(153)</td>
<td>$(207)</td>
<td>$(454)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>$3,519</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$2,809</td>
<td>$3,534</td>
<td>$4,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value of Investments</td>
<td>$12,463</td>
<td>$13,322</td>
<td>$14,056</td>
<td>$16,083</td>
<td>$16,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets Released from Restrictions</td>
<td>$1,522</td>
<td>$1,602</td>
<td>$1,171</td>
<td>$830</td>
<td>$1,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts and Grants (total)</td>
<td>$5,397</td>
<td>$2,954</td>
<td>$2,961</td>
<td>$1,305</td>
<td>$4,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Fellowships</td>
<td>$1,691</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
<td>$913</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Chairs</td>
<td>$255</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$1,109</td>
<td>$1,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Programs &amp; Research Centers</td>
<td>$2,942</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>$1,010</td>
<td>$251</td>
<td>$835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$764</td>
<td>$495</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$356</td>
<td>$1,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Grants</td>
<td>$249</td>
<td>$271</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fiscal 2003 was a 6-month year because of the change in the foundation's fiscal year from a calendar year (January - December) to an academic year (July - June).
in 2004 to just below the 2000 level because equity markets have somewhat recovered, and the foundation has generated surpluses from operating activities ($57,000 in 2003 and $684,000 in 2004). This recovery in unrestricted funds can also be seen through the increase in expendable net assets. These net assets declined 20 percent between 2000 and 2002, but recovered in 2003 and reached a new high of $4.4 million in 2004.

Notwithstanding this fluctuation in assets, during the 2000–04 period, the foundation continued to provide The Graduate Center and its doctoral students with substantial academic program support and fellowship support through the release of temporarily restricted funds. The foundation averaged more than $1.4 million in annual expenditures for these purposes (not including the six-month 2003 year).

**AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES**

Unrestricted funds from The Graduate Center’s auxiliary enterprise activities, shown in Table 7, are administered through the CUNY Graduate School and University Center Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation, a not-for-profit corporation. The primary sources of these funds are facility rental income, commissions from food service and bookstore sales, and net revenues from housing services.

Auxiliary enterprise activities produced year-end deficits in fiscal years 2000 through 2003 because expenditures exceeded revenues for housing services (as the result of an unsuccessful rental arrangement). This imbalance was corrected in fiscal 2003 and 2004, resulting in an ending unrestricted net asset balance of $575,000. Positive net asset balances in each year are used to help fund deficiencies in the tax-levy budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Statement of Revenues and Expenses</th>
<th>Fiscal Years 2000–2004, Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>$(135,693)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$ 10,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$(146,095)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>$(135,693)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING CENTER**

The Child Development and Learning Center, a not-for-profit corporation that opened in 2000, provides preschool services to children of Graduate Center students on a fee-for-service basis. (New York State law restricts attendance only to students’ children; staff and faculty have no such resource.) As shown in Table 8, the center’s
primary sources of revenues are grants from the State of New York, parent fees, and personnel and space support from The Graduate Center.

The fiscal health and stability of the center are primarily dependent on the continuation of state grant support and support from The Graduate Center (the value of donated space provided and the salary of the director), which represent 34 percent and 44 percent of total revenues, respectively. Parent fees represent only 14 percent of total revenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assets*</td>
<td>$ 83,588</td>
<td>$ 80,087</td>
<td>$ 77,932</td>
<td>$ 91,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Net Assets</td>
<td>$ 83,588</td>
<td>$(3,501)</td>
<td>$(2,155)</td>
<td>$ 13,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expendable Net Assets</td>
<td>$ 34,078</td>
<td>$ 39,250</td>
<td>$ 45,768</td>
<td>$ 68,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$ 364,801</td>
<td>$ 279,010</td>
<td>$ 305,023</td>
<td>$ 341,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants</td>
<td>$ 262,822</td>
<td>$ 109,232</td>
<td>$ 114,617</td>
<td>$ 116,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from Parent Fees</td>
<td>$ 33,329</td>
<td>$ 38,918</td>
<td>$ 42,590</td>
<td>$ 47,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Center Support**</td>
<td>$ 68,650</td>
<td>$ 125,542</td>
<td>$ 131,893</td>
<td>$ 151,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All net assets are unrestricted.
** Includes value of donated space provided.

**ENROLLMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS**

Graduate Center average annual enrollment trends over the past five academic years are documented in Table 9. Over this period, average headcount enrollment of Graduate Center matriculants increased by over 16 percent. Although enrollment went up across the board, science disciplines, with an increase of almost one-third, led the way. Enrollment continued to climb despite a tuition increase in Fall 2003 of over 12 percent for most students, and as much as 50 percent for new out-of-state and international students. The Fall 2002 imposition of a $75 annual student technology fee amounting to between 2 and 12 percent of tuition charges also did not appear to halt enrollment growth.

The Graduate Center intends to maintain stable enrollments in its doctoral programs. The enrollment increases that were experienced over the past five years were, in part, the result of a weak economy and job market. We anticipate that both will improve over the next five years, leading to a reduction in enrollment growth. Our financial goals are therefore predicated on stable, not growing, enrollments.
Table 9: Average Annual Headcount Enrollment*, The Graduate Center  
Academic Years 1999–00 Through 2003–04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>1178</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1229</td>
<td>1284</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Total</td>
<td>3144</td>
<td>3123</td>
<td>3235</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>3635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Enrollment</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>3369</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>3806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual headcounts for each academic year are averages of fall and spring semester matriculated headcounts.

**Finance Projections**

As a result of the many complex economic and political factors that enter into the determination of The Graduate Center’s annual tax-levy budget allocation, projecting future budget allocations with reasonable accuracy is extremely difficult. Instead of developing specific allocation projections, The Graduate Center has established a series of financial goals for the near future. These goals are as follows.

- The elimination of The Graduate Center’s tax-levy deficit (operational expenditures that exceed the state budget allocation) is a near-term financial goal. Achieving a balance in the tax-levy budget will create financial reserves among the other sources of financial support that will act as a hedge against further erosion in state support and/or declines in tuition revenue, and will help fund The Graduate Center’s capital needs not addressed by the University’s capital budget.

- The Graduate Center will continue to strengthen the financial condition of its affiliated corporations.

- The Graduate Center Foundation will be strengthened by building on its recent history of extraordinary endowment growth and unrestricted fund-raising results.

- The Auxiliary Enterprises Corporation will build on its recent emergence from net asset deficits by continuing to grow auxiliary revenues and operating its housing services in balance.

- The Graduate Center will continue its substantial financial support of the Child Development and Learning Center, with the hope that state support
remains stable, so that it may continue to keep tuition fees relatively low compared to the cost of preschool services in New York City.

- The recent growth in research grants and sponsored projects will be maintained to enhance the research mission of The Graduate Center and to continue to provide external funding to supplement the cost of support operations.
The linking of planning and budgeting is more difficult at The Graduate Center than at many other institutions because of how budgeting is done at CUNY. As was indicated in Chapter 4, the GC’s budget is dependent on the CUNY budget, which in turn is dependent on the adopted budget of New York State. Because the New York State budget is typically not determined until well into the fiscal year, the GC has little opportunity to make budget adjustments. Once the budget is allocated to the GC, most of the funds are already committed. Further, budget allocations are for discrete areas and cannot easily be shifted at will among alternative uses.

Whatever budgetary latitude The Graduate Center has is designated for institutional priorities. Every year The Graduate Center makes a budgetary request to the CUNY central administration based on conversations with the GC Academic Planning Committee and the GC administration. This budget request is the primary avenue for linking planning and budgeting. Our most notable success has been in the area of student financial aid. For the past five years, CUNY has requested funds from New York State to grant tuition scholarships to all doctoral students who provide service throughout the CUNY system in classrooms or laboratories. Such tuition assistance is available at almost every other doctoral institution in the United States and is included as a line item in the budget of the State University of New York system. Although the state has not been responsive to this request, the central administration of CUNY has responded with funds, as discussed earlier in this PRR.

Another area in which planning informs budgeting is faculty hiring. One of The Graduate Center’s most important planning priorities has been to strengthen doctoral programs through renewal of the doctoral faculty. Most of the doctoral faculty members are appointed at the other CUNY colleges instead of at the GC; our influence on these hires is limited. We have had a number of opportunities to replace GC-based faculty over the past five years, however. With the broadening of salary limits enacted in the last PSC-CUNY contract (August 2002), the GC can be much more competitive in salary offers and has reallocated funds within the institution to facilitate making such offers. Further, whenever outstanding scholars are brought to our attention who might be recruited to the GC, the provost has been forceful in requesting additional funding from the CUNY central administration to enable the GC to take advantage of these “targets of opportunity.” In sum, in the areas of both student financial aid and faculty hiring, planning priorities have been instrumental in targeting funds to achieve these goals.

One initiative on the horizon is an examination by the CUNY central administration, which has the ultimate responsibility for the GC budget, of the linking of budgeting and planning at The Graduate Center. To that end, the University commissioned a group of distinguished visitors to evaluate our funding model in Fall 2004. The report of this committee will be an essential starting point for the new president.
CHAPTER 6
OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

In its 2000 Middle States self-study, The Graduate Center recognized that it needed to do more in the area of outcomes assessment. Since the self-study, The Graduate Center has enhanced its ability to conduct outcomes assessment by developing its institutional research capacity. It has also adopted new outcomes-assessment activities related to teaching, learning, and overall institutional effectiveness. These activities include surveying its current and graduating students and its alumni, incorporating a discussion of outcomes into its academic program reviews, and making efforts toward a better understanding of student development and progress toward the degree. A crucial component of this enterprise is the dissemination of the resulting data; a GC Fact Book is now updated annually and available online and in hard copy.

Since the last Middle States review, The City University of New York has begun a performance management process (PMP), which links planning and institutional goal setting and measures annual progress toward those goals. A significant portion of The Graduate Center’s PMP goals and targets for each year relate to student outcomes.

In 2006, the National Research Council will conduct a national assessment of doctoral program quality. The Graduate Center is eager to take part in this effort. The Graduate Center has committed to incorporating many of the NRC indicators of program quality, including outcomes indicators, into the goals and targets it adopts as part of the University’s PMP and into its own program of assessment activities.

BUILDING THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

As a follow-up to the 2000 Middle States self-study, The Graduate Center commissioned an examination of its needs and capabilities for institutional research. The October 2001 report, “Institutional Research at the CUNY Graduate Center: Needs, Current Capabilities, and Recommendations for Closing the Gaps,” has served as a guide to the enhancement of institutional research capacity at The Graduate Center and as a blueprint for a program of institutional research, particularly with regard to student outcomes and institutional success.

In Spring 2002, The Graduate Center reorganized its institutional research staff and hired a director of institutional research and program evaluation. Projects currently undertaken by this office, in addition to the usual mandated reporting, are summaries of the exit survey, annual “five-years-after-graduation” employment surveys, annual time-to-degree tabulations, and a biennial student satisfaction survey (all discussed
below). The Office of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation is developing a cohort-tracking database, and a cohort analysis is planned to evaluate “sticking points” in progress toward the degree.

**ASSESSING STUDENT LEARNING — EXAMINATIONS, ADVANCEMENT TO CANDIDACY, AND THE DISSERTATION**

The Graduate Center, like other doctoral-degree-granting institutions, has a long tradition of assessing student accomplishment at each stage of a student’s academic career. At The Graduate Center, students proceed from Level I status at admission, through Levels II and III, to dissertation completion and graduation. At each level, students must demonstrate knowledge and competencies particular to their program before moving to the next level. The Graduate Center requires that doctoral students make satisfactory academic progress throughout their matriculation toward completion of their course work, exams, and dissertation research and writing by meeting a series of well-defined “benchmarks.”

**Level I Status and the First Examination.** Upon enrollment, new students are accorded **Level I status**, are assigned an adviser, and begin taking their required course work. At least 60 credits of approved graduate work are required for the degree. No student may continue in the doctoral program after completing 45 credits if he or she has not passed the First Examination. In addition, students are required to maintain at least a 3.0 grade point average and to have accumulated not more than two open grades (e.g., Incompletes) to maintain satisfactory academic progress.

The content of the First Examination, its structure, and the criteria for passing it are determined by the faculty of the individual doctoral programs. Typically, it is an on-site written examination, but may be oral or a take-home, and may be spread across several days.

**Level II Status and the Second Examination.** After completing 45 credits and passing the First Examination, the student is accorded **Level II status**. By this time, the student has taken classes and has held one-on-one discussions with a variety of professors in preparation for approaching a faculty member to become her/his research mentor. While at Level II, the student prepares for taking the Second Examination and begins to work with a mentor to help identify a dissertation topic. The Second Examination must be of at least two hours’ duration, and usually is taken after the completion of course requirements.

The Graduate Center recently adopted an additional benchmark of student academic progress, requiring doctoral students to pass their Second Examination before they complete 10 registered semesters of doctoral study at CUNY.

**Level III Status and Advancement to Candidacy.** After completing all program course requirements, generally 60 credits or more, with at least a B average, passing the First and Second Examinations, meeting any language requirements, and completing any special program requirements, the student achieves **Level III status**.
While at Level III, the student, with the advice of the mentor, finalizes the dissertation proposal, selects a dissertation committee, and works to complete the dissertation. The mentor is generally the chair of the student’s dissertation committee.

**The Dissertation.** The preparation of a dissertation and a defense of it form the final evaluation of a candidate’s qualification for the doctoral degree. The student must complete a dissertation that embodies original research. If Level III students receive two successive “No Record of Progress” grades at the dissertation stage, they are deemed not to be making satisfactory academic progress. As with all such benchmarks, students who receive two NRP grades may only be able to continue their dissertation work with the approval of the program’s executive officer.

Working with the adviser, the student completes a draft of the dissertation. The dissertation must be approved by the members of the dissertation committee, which consists of at least three members of the CUNY doctoral faculty. Once the dissertation has been approved, an oral defense is scheduled, and notice of the defense is circulated at The Graduate Center. After a successful defense of the dissertation, the completed dissertation is deposited in The Graduate Center’s Mina Rees Library.

**TRACKING STUDENT PROGRESS**

In discussing students’ time-to-degree (TTD), The Graduate Center’s March 2002 report “Doctoral Education in the First Decade of the 21st Century” recommended:

> Each program should undertake a comprehensive — data-driven — review of student progress. It should revisit curricular, exam, and dissertation proposal procedures to identify bottlenecks and take realistic steps to reduce TTD without compromising academic standards or placement prospects. Programs should also ascertain what effect Writing Fellowships, Graduate Teaching Fellowships, and MAGNET fellowships have on TTD. Each program should adopt a timetable for implementing these steps and assessing their effectiveness. Finally, each program should establish a three-year target for increasing POD [percent on-time degrees] and closely monitor its progress toward that target.

**Cohort Tracking.** As part of its effort to review student progress, The Graduate Center is committed to tracking students through their educational careers to determine what variables (e.g., adjunct teaching, type of financial support, mentoring) predict retention, attrition, and time-to-degree. The Office of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation has begun to develop a longitudinal database that will follow entering cohorts throughout their GC careers. The designs of Banner tables for the student-tracking database are near completion, and programming for the database is to be completed in 2005.

As stated in Chapter 2, overseeing and evaluating student progress have also been addressed in a more anecdotal way through a series of monthly meetings of disciplinary cluster EOs. In these meetings, EOs discuss a range of issues related to time-to-degree, including improvement of program mentoring and student professional development. These monthly conversations have yielded a set of “best

Time-to-Degree Summaries. Each year The Graduate Center produces a summary of time-to-degree statistics incorporating data from the three most recent academic years’ graduates. These statistics are produced for each program and academic cluster as well as for The Graduate Center overall. The results are reported back to the programs and are posted on the Institutional Research web page. Presentations are also made to the Council of Executive Officers and to cluster meetings.

The Graduate Center also selected a measure of student time-to-degree as one of its performance indicators in the University’s PMP discussed below. The performance indicator being monitored is the percent of on-time degrees — that is, the percent of students graduating in eight years or fewer.

SURVEYS OF STUDENT SATISFACTION AND EXPERIENCE

The Graduate Center has made a commitment to a program of biennial surveys of student satisfaction and experience. In Spring 2002 and Spring 2004 we administered the National Association of Graduate and Professional Students (NAGPS) survey of student satisfaction. The instrument covers issues related to students’ assessments of their professional development, the mentoring they receive, their program’s climate, factors affecting their time-to-degree, and the kind of preparation they receive for teaching and for careers inside or outside academe. The results of the 2002 survey were presented to the doctoral programs and posted at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/orirpe/index.htm. The 2004 NAGPS survey is currently being analyzed.

In 2006 The Graduate Center will be participating in the National Research Council’s assessment of doctoral programs (see below). Part of that assessment is a survey of students who have advanced to candidacy. The NRC survey will provide us with additional outcomes data regarding student satisfaction and experiences at The Graduate Center. We may wish to incorporate elements of the NRC survey instrument into a future Graduate Center-developed survey of currently enrolled students.

TRACKING GRADUATES

The Graduate Center has continued to develop its techniques for tracking its graduates so that it can better assess its institutional effectiveness. It has improved its participation rate in the national Survey of Earned Doctorates (SED), developed a GC exit survey of graduating students, and instituted a “five-years-after-graduation” survey.

Survey of Earned Doctorates. The Graduate Center participates in the national Survey of Earned Doctorates conducted by the National Academy of Sciences. This survey collects data on graduating students’ time-to-degree and on postgraduation plans for employment. At the time of the last Middle States review,
The Graduate Center’s response rate for this survey was relatively low. The response rate has since increased to over 95 percent.

Each semester, The Graduate Center collects data from the completed SED surveys prior to sending the forms to the National Opinion Research Center, the organization commissioned to collect and tabulate the SED data. The results of the surveys are summarized annually along with the results of the exit survey of graduating students, described below. These summaries are shared with the doctoral programs and posted at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm.

**Exit Surveys of Graduates.** Each semester The Graduate Center collects data from graduating students regarding their postgraduation employment plans. The information includes students’ prospective employers, job titles, whether or not a position utilizes a student’s degree, and, for students expecting employment in education, whether a position is tenure-track. These data are summarized at the end of each academic year, along with the results of the SED survey. These summaries are shared with doctoral programs and posted at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm.

**Annual Surveys of Alumni Five Years After Graduation.** Each year The Graduate Center conducts a survey of alumni who graduated five years earlier. To date, we have surveyed the graduates of 1995–96, 1996–97, 1997–98, and 1998–99. The survey of 1999–00 graduates is currently under way. The information collected from alumni includes their current employer, job title, contact information, whether their current position utilizes their degree, and, for those employed in education, whether the position is tenure track. Response rates have averaged above 60 percent for these surveys.

These surveys are a cooperative effort among the Office of the Provost, the Development and Alumni Relations Office, and the doctoral programs. The results of the surveys, along with comparisons to past surveys, are shared with the programs and posted at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm.

Through the exit and alumni surveys, we recognized that a large number of our graduates are working outside of higher education. This led to the development of a course for students planning careers outside the academy. The first such course was offered in Spring 2004 and is described more fully in Chapter 2.

**Survey of Teacher-Development Opportunities for Doctoral Students**

Although many of our students pursue careers outside of academe, most will work in higher education after graduation. As a member of CUNY, The Graduate Center is in an exceptionally advantageous position to provide teaching opportunities for its students. To assess how the doctoral programs provide students with experiences to develop their teaching skills, we asked executive officers to describe the kinds of opportunities available to their students.
The results of the survey showed that most programs do encourage their students to teach while pursuing their doctorate. As preparation for that teaching, many students receive an orientation to teaching at the campus at which they will teach. In addition, over a third of the doctoral programs offer a teaching orientation at The Graduate Center itself.

Many programs expressed the opinion that although opportunities to develop teaching skills are available through the doctoral programs, it would be beneficial to have additional opportunities made available at the GC. In response, the Provost’s Office has now expanded its offerings to students receiving Chancellor’s or Provosts’ Fellowships to prepare them for entering the classroom (see Chapter 2).

SURVEY OF COURSE-EVALUATION PRACTICES

A survey of program practices related to course evaluation was conducted in late 2002. About two-thirds of the programs that responded carry out course evaluations. The results of the survey were made available to the programs and appear at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm. Sample course-evaluation forms were solicited from programs and are made available to programs contemplating adding course evaluations as part of their assessment efforts.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEWS

All doctoral programs at The Graduate Center are on a 10-year cycle of academic program review mandated by the City University (see Appendix 3). Since academic year 1997–98, 33 doctoral programs and subprograms have been reviewed. In 2003, The Graduate Center’s master’s and certificate programs were added to the review cycle. In 2006–07 all certificate programs will be reviewed.

Each review consists of a program self-study and a site visit by external reviewers. As part of the self-study, programs are asked to review outcomes-related issues including student mentoring, professional development, time-to-degree, and postgraduation activity. Each program is required to have a postreview conference with the provost to discuss the reviewers’ comments and proposed actions to be taken.

The programs themselves conduct any mandated licensing or credentialing reviews. The New York State Education Department cycle of doctoral program reviews, instituted in 1994, was suspended in 1998 because of staffing limitations.

Assessment of Master’s Programs. As stated in Chapter 2, all future doctoral program evaluations will include a review of the master’s programs that reside within a doctoral program: Comparative Literature, Linguistics, Philosophy, Political Science, and Classics. The Master of Arts in Liberal Studies, which is independent of a doctoral program, has been added to the cycle of program reviews and is scheduled to be reviewed in 2005–06. The reviews will determine whether or not the master’s programs contribute to The Graduate Center’s mission, justify the resources they are receiving, determine whether they are appropriately housed at The Graduate Center, and make appropriate recommendations.
Assessment of Certificate Programs and Interdisciplinary Studies Concentrations. The Graduate Center has established policies and procedures for the periodic assessment of certificate programs and interdisciplinary concentrations. Periodic reviews of certificate programs have been integrated into the schedule for doctoral program reviews and are scheduled for 2006–07. Regular reviews of interdisciplinary studies concentrations, in consultation with the IDS Advisory Committee, will start in Spring 2005.

Assessing the Diversity of the Doctoral Faculty

The 2000 Middle States self-study suggested that The Graduate Center establish a methodology for assessing the ethnicity of the entire doctoral faculty. This has been done. Because most doctoral faculty have appointments at other CUNY campuses, demographic information on faculty is decentralized. The Graduate Center now works with the CUNY central administration to obtain data on the distribution of the entire doctoral faculty by race, gender, ethnicity, and age. Summaries of the demographics of the doctoral faculty of CUNY have been prepared annually since Fall 2002. The Graduate Center will continue to gather this information. The data are shared with The Graduate Center’s Affirmative Action Officer.

One PMP goal The Graduate Center has adopted is to maintain its commitment to diversify faculty and staff consistent with CUNY policies and to encourage CUNY colleges, which supply most of our faculty, to increase the numbers of underrepresented groups.

University Performance Management Process

The City University of New York employs a performance management process (PMP) that links planning and goal setting by the University and its 20 colleges and graduate schools, measures annual progress toward key goals, and recognizes excellent performance.

Each spring, the chancellor states the University’s performance targets for the upcoming academic year, guided by the University’s Master Plan. CUNY presidents, working with their executive teams and college communities, then map out performance goals and targets for their institution for the coming year, in alignment with those of the University.

Individual college targets reflect differences in campus missions, resources, and circumstances and recognize that colleges all start from different performance baselines. The Graduate Center’s goals and targets for academic year 2004–05 are at http://www1.cuny.edu/resources/performancetargets/gc_04_05.pdf. Several of these goals and targets pertain specifically to performance measures related to student outcomes. These measures are listed below.

- Two outcome measures from the five-years-after alumni surveys: (1) the percentage of graduates reporting that their employment utilizes their doctoral training; (2) the percentage of graduates employed in education who are in tenure-track positions.
• A measure to assess time-to-degree, the percent of on-time degrees for the most recent graduating classes. The goal is to advance from the current 63 percent (3-year average for 2000–01 thru 2002–03 graduates) toward 68 percent on-time degrees for 2007–08 graduates.

• Two measures of professional development of doctoral students: (1) the dollars awarded for student research and travel to professional conferences; (2) the number of events, courses, and activities provided for student professional development.

• Continuing a program of administering a biennial survey of student satisfaction and experience. We most recently fielded, for the second time, the National Association of Graduate and Professional Students survey of doctoral students. Survey results are shared with programs and posted to the Institutional Research website.

• Following up on the survey of program activities related to student evaluations of teaching, and continuing to supply sample evaluation forms for programs that do not currently conduct course evaluations, but are considering adopting some form of course evaluation.

• Developing a tracking database to establish benchmark measures of student progress. The database will allow us to conduct student tracking analyses to inform the selection of an appropriate measure of student attrition, and to help us identify critical points in students’ careers where progress toward the degree may be hindered.

Each year The Graduate Center and the University review The Graduate Center’s performance in reaching each goal and target and set new goals and targets for the following year.

**NRC ASSESSMENT OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS**

In 2006 The Graduate Center will participate in the National Research Council’s assessment of doctoral programs. This effort is an attempt to judge doctoral program quality using a common set of measures. Some of the measures of program quality that will be used are indicators of professional-development support, effective mentoring, library expenditures, support for teaching-skill development, faculty productivity, and time-to-degree. The NRC is also including as an indicator of program quality whether or not a program collects and publishes outcomes information for the benefit of prospective students and as a means of monitoring program effectiveness.

The NRC recommends that universities track the career outcomes of Ph.D. recipients, both immediately upon program completion and at least five to seven years following degree completion, as preparation for a future NRC doctoral assessment. The Graduate Center’s program of surveying students upon graduation and alumni five years after graduation is in line with these NRC recommendations.

The NRC assessment also includes a survey of students who have advanced to candidacy, covering issues regarding students’ assessment of their educational experience, their research productivity, program practices, and institutional and program environment.
The Graduate Center has committed to incorporating many of the NRC indicators of program quality, including outcomes indicators, into the goals and targets it adopts as part of the University’s performance management process.

**FUTURE ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES**

In going through the periodic review process, The Graduate Center has identified three areas for possible future assessment activity. One area is an examination of why students, formally or informally, leave The Graduate Center without completing their degree. Another area is an examination of the work life of students for the purpose of understanding how work competes for students’ time and how it may impact academic progress. The third is an evaluation of how well the GC is meeting the educational needs of the community it serves.

**Understanding Why Students Leave.** As part of its larger effort to understand student attrition, The Graduate Center is considering ways to collect additional data directly from students on their reasons for leaving prior to completing their degrees. One option for collecting information on why students leave is to revise the current withdrawal form. The current open-ended question, “Reasons for Requested Withdrawal,” could be revised to offer the students several closed-ended responses, such as lack of finances, inadequate funding, family crisis, program not a good fit, career change, or lack of support. A second option is to survey nonreturning students — those who leave without completing their degree — to collect information on the reasons students leave and what they do after leaving. Leavers would be surveyed within one year after departure.

**Survey of Student Workload.** We believe that a significant determinant of time-to-degree for our students is lack of sufficient financial aid forces, leading many students to work long hours. The Graduate Center is considering conducting a survey of student workload in order to determine to what extent students’ work responsibilities aid or hinder their overall pursuit of a degree. The information that such a survey would seek could include whether or not the students’ work is pertinent to their fields of study, the amount of time spent commuting to work, whether students work at a CUNY or a non-CUNY institution, and, if students are teaching, how much time is spent preparing to teach.

While the main purpose of a workload survey would be to collect data regarding students’ work responsibilities not directly related to the pursuit of a degree, the survey could also provide data that reveal the time students spend in their actual course work, research, and writing. This would allow for a comparison between the time students spend working to support themselves and the time spent on their scholastic endeavors.

**The Graduate Center Mission and Student Demographics.** As part of its institutional mission, The Graduate Center strives “to enhance access to doctoral education for traditionally underrepresented groups.” To monitor the degree to which it is serving the adults and youth from the New York City area, The Graduate Center is considering what would be the best way to examine periodically...
the match between the demographic characteristics of the ongoing GC student population and the demographic characteristics of the city as a whole, with special emphasis on ethnicity, race, and social class. To start this effort, The Graduate Center is considering forming a study group to determine what new demographic information needs to be collected through the application process that would make such comparisons possible. In addition, it would be useful for The Graduate Center to begin reporting data on the number of its students who have attended other CUNY schools.
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PERIODIC REVIEW REPORT:
MIDDLE STATES CYCLE, COMMITTEE MEMBERS, TIMELINE

The Middle States Accreditation Ten-Year Cycle

Self-Study and Evaluation Visit 2000
Periodic Review Report 2005
Next Self-Study and Evaluation Visit 2010

Definition of a PRR
- Retrospective, current, and prospective analysis of an institution
- Progress and planning report

PRR Goals
- To help institutions gauge their progress in the achievement of their own goals and objectives
- To enable the Middle States Commission to assess the current status, as well as the future prospects, of institutions in the context of accreditation standards
- To fulfill the MS’s accountability to the academic community and to the public

Components of the PRR
- Executive summary
- Summary of responses to self-study recommendations
  - Self-study recommendations and MSA visiting team report
  - Recommendations from 21C report
  - Progress report on GC responses to recommendations
- Major opportunities and challenges facing the institution
- Enrollment and finance trends and projections for the next five years
- Assumptions and data on past enrollment and fiscal trends
- Evidence of linked institutional planning and budgeting processes
- Review of current assessment processes and plans
PRR Steering Committee

CoChairs
- **Linda Edwards**
  Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs and Professor, Ph.D.
  Program in Economics
- **Julia Wrigley**
  Professor, Ph.D. Program in Sociology, Graduate Center

Senior Staff
- **David W. Adams**
  Director, Institutional Research and Program Evaluation
- **Rosamond W. Dana**
  Special Assistant for Academic Affairs, Office of the Provost

Staff to the Committee
- **Ann W. Batiuk**
  Assistant to the Associate Provost

Faculty
- **Prof. Martin Burke (History) Lehman**
- **Prof. Richard Chappell (Biology) Hunter**
- **Prof. William Cross (Psychology) Graduate Center**

Students
- **Stephanie Domenici Cabonargi (Environmental Psychology)**
- **Thurston Domina (Sociology)**
- **Paul McBreen (Classics)**
- **Jinzhong Niu (Computer Science)**

Staff
- **Stephen Brier**, Associate Provost for Instructional Technology and
  Dean for Interdisciplinary Studies
- **Julie Cunningham**, Chief Librarian
- **Lynette C. Gibson**, Assistant Program Officer, Theatre
- **Steven Gorelick**, Vice President for Institutional Advancement
- **James Haggard**, Vice President for Information Resources (to
  October 2004)
- **Sebastian Persico**, Vice President for Finance and Administration
- **Matthew G. Schoengood**, Vice President for Student Affairs
- **Brian Schwartz**, Vice President for Research and Sponsored
  Programs
- **Gail Smith**, Acting Assistant Provost for Educational Opportunity
  and Diversity Programs
PRR Subcommittees

1. Responses to Recommendations
   - Chair: Julia Wrigley, Professor, Ph.D. Program in Sociology (GC)
   - Richard Chappell, Ph.D. Program in Biology (Hunter)
   - Thurston Domina, Ph.D. Program in Sociology
   - former Vice President for Information Resources
   - Rosamond W. Dana, Special Assistant for Academic Affairs, Provost’s Office

2. Challenges and Opportunities
   - Chair: Linda N. Edwards, Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs
   - Martin Burke, Ph.D. Program in History (Lehman)
   - Stephanie Domenici Cabonargi, Ph.D. Program in Psychology (Environmental)
   - Stephen Brier, Associate Provost for Instructional Technology
   - Julie Cunningham, Chief Librarian
   - Rosamond W. Dana, Special Assistant for Academic Affairs, Provost’s Office

3. Enrollment & Finances; Institutional Planning
   - Chair: Sebastian Persico, Vice President for Finance and Administration
   - Jinzhong Niu, Ph.D. Program in Computer Science
   - Matthew G. Schoengood, Vice President for Student Affairs
   - Brian Schwartz, Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs
   - Steven Gorelick, Vice President for Institutional Advancement
   - David W. Adams, Director of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation

4. Outcomes Assessment
   - Chair: David W. Adams, Director of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation
   - William Cross, Ph.D. Program in Psychology (GC)
   - Paul McBreen, Ph.D. Program in Classics
   - Lynette C. Gibson, Assistant Program Officer, Ph.D. Program in Theatre
   - Gail Smith, Acting Assistant Provost for Educational Opportunity and Diversity Programs
### PRR Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2004</td>
<td>PRR Steering Committee meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 2, 2004</td>
<td>Steering Committee meets; subcommittees identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 29, 2004</td>
<td>First drafts due from subcommittees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 5, 2004</td>
<td>Committee meets to review drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 19, 2004</td>
<td>Subcommittees submit revised drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 2004 &amp; Jan. 2005</td>
<td>Write draft PRR &amp; circulate to Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 28, 2005</td>
<td>Steering Committee meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2005</td>
<td>Write Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2005</td>
<td>Cabinet and Academic Planning Committee review draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March &amp; April 2005</td>
<td>Campus reviews draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2005</td>
<td>Write final PRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>Prepare backup materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 2005</td>
<td>Submit PRR to Middle States Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UPDATE ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE 2000 MSA
SELF-STUDY AND THE 2002 REPORT OF THE
COMMITTEE ON DOCTORAL EDUCATION IN THE
FIRST DECADE OF THE 21ST CENTURY
THE GRADUATE CENTER, CUNY
SEPTEMBER 2004

INTRODUCTION
In preparation for a Spring 2000 evaluation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and
Schools, The Graduate Center prepared a self-study ("Securing Excellence, Seizing Opportunity," January 2000). After visiting the GC, reading the self-study, and holding discussions with groups
representing many GC constituencies, the MSA evaluation team wrote a report that in essence
agreed with the recommendations in the self-study.

During 2001–02, in preparation for The Graduate Center’s 40th anniversary celebration in March
2002, an ad hoc committee met and prepared a report ("Doctoral Education in the First Decade of
the 21st Century," March 2002) that addressed specific topics of concern and presented a series of
recommendations.

In this update, the recommendations for each topic from each of the two reports are placed
together (with MSA material in italics). Those topics that are addressed by only the MSA report
appear at the end. For each recommendation we identify (in bold for 21C or bold italics for
MSA) what has been accomplished to date.

1. SHORTEN TIME-TO-DEGREE, WITH AN EMPHASIS ON
MENTORING
Time-to-degree (TTD) is a matter of nationwide concern, a factor frequently invoked to measure
the effectiveness of graduate programs. While there is general agreement about the importance of
TTD, there is less clarity about how best to derive and benchmark that measure. The measure
chosen by The Graduate Center is the percentage of on-time degrees (POD), defined to be the
percentage of graduates who complete their degrees within the 16 registered semesters specified
in the GC Bulletin. This measure focuses on reducing the number of students who take an
extended period of time to complete their degrees, rather than shortening TTD for those who are
already completing their work in a timely manner. Our baseline value for POD, based on data for
cohorts of students who graduated in 1999–2000, 2000–01, and 2001–02, is 68.2 percent.

21C Time-to-Degree Recommendations

1.1. Each program should undertake a comprehensive — data-driven — review of student
progress. It should revisit curricular, exam, and dissertation proposal procedures to identify
bottlenecks and take realistic steps to reduce TTD without compromising academic standards or
placement prospects. Programs should ascertain what effect Writing Fellowships, Graduate
Teaching Fellowships, and MAGNET fellowships have on TTD. Each program should adopt a
timetable for implementing these steps and assessing their effectiveness. Finally, each program
should establish a three-year target for increasing POD and closely monitor its progress toward
that target.
The longitudinal database required for this type of review does not currently exist, but the GC is now in the process of developing an appropriate database that will follow entering cohorts throughout their GC careers. The Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation, working with the Office of Student Affairs, began this data project during 2003–04, and we expect the programming to be completed during summer 2005.

The issue of overseeing and evaluating student progress has been addressed in a more anecdotal way through a series of monthly meetings of disciplinary cluster EOs. In these meetings, EOs discussed a range of issues related to TTD, including improvement of program mentoring and student professional development. These monthly conversations have yielded a set of “best practices” related to these issues, at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Best1.pdf and http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/Best2.pdf.

1.2. Each program should review its mentoring strategies and where appropriate develop enhanced services to expedite student progress. See 1.1 above.

To improve monitoring of the progress of students at the dissertation level, the GC created a new “grade” for Level III (dissertation) students, “No Record of Progress.” The NRP grade is to be used when students have made little or no progress on their dissertations over the course of the semester. This grade will facilitate the closer supervision of Level III students because it provides a way to alert both student and faculty mentor that the student is not making clear progress in a given semester. A student who accrues two consecutive NRP grades will be identified as not making satisfactory progress. This process will enable the program and the administration to intervene quickly, ascertain the problem, and take necessary corrective steps, including, where appropriate, asking the student to withdraw until he/she can make discernible progress in writing the dissertation. Another proposed benchmark of student progress will be presented to the Committee on Curriculum and Degree Requirements in Fall 2004: a requirement that students take the Second Examination by the time they complete 10 semesters of work (8 if they come in with a master’s degree). Students who do not meet this requirement will be identified as not making satisfactory progress, a designation that triggers intervention from the program and the Office of Student Affairs.

1.3. Each program should review its expectations about the dissertation and consider ways of reducing writing time consistent with preserving standards and protecting placement prospects. It should consider how its dissertation requirements align with market demands. The Provost’s Office will ask doctoral programs to review these issues in 2005/06.

1.4. Each program should review how enrollment levels influence time-to-degree statistics and consider whether reducing program enrollment would speed TTD. Determining the relationship between enrollment levels and TTD is a project that cannot be undertaken until longitudinal data on entering cohorts (described in 1.1 above) have been put in place.

The Graduate Center should align staffing and mentoring resources with the size of student cohorts. In Fall 2003, the Provost’s Office implemented a course-limits policy, by which all the programs must adhere to a defined limit on the number of courses they can offer as a way of conserving resources, both financial and human. These course limits take into account the size of each program’s student body.

1.5 The GC and the respective programs should review their financial aid strategies and their relationship to time-to-degree objectives.
The GC administration has begun a review of the entire financial aid process and should be ready to propose any changes by Spring 2005 (see next paragraphs).

Efforts to win tuition remission and expanded financial aid must be continued. During the 2003-04 academic year, the GC made remarkable progress toward this goal. Thanks to the support of former Executive Vice Chancellor Louise Mirrer and Vice Chancellor Ernesto Malave, the CUNY Central Administration is committed to supporting the recruitment of doctoral students through the offer two new fellowships, called Chancellor’s Fellowships and Provosts’ Fellowships. These fellowship packages include five years of in-state tuition and an assurance of teaching during years two through four. These fellowships will begin with the entering class of Fall 2004 and will be phased in over six years. By year six, $5.2 million will be available for in-state tuition for 1500 students. The assignment of the associated teaching positions Graduate Teaching Fellowships (GTFs) and Graduate Adjunct Fellowships (GAFs), which will grow from 300 to 600, will be determined a year in advance by Executive Officers in consultation with college department chairs (based on college department needs) rather than current practice in which appointments are made solely by department chairs at the time the teaching is to take place. Thus, EOs will be able to promise packages to new students of tuition remission for five years and a GTF or GAF for the second through fourth years. The Provost hopes that CUNY will be able to fund tuition for all doctoral students who teach or provide service to CUNY, not just for the 1500 students with five-year packages. (Note that doctoral programs received their base financial-aid budget in addition to the new funds associated with this initiative.)

These five-year packages are an important first step toward making the GC competitive with other top doctoral programs in the U.S. The next step is to obtain funding to provide, in addition to five years of paid tuition, stipends of $16,000 for years one and five and a similar level of compensation for the three years of teaching. The GC will be reviewing program financial aid budgets to determine to what extent existing budgets can be used toward funding stipends for the first year, as well as providing support for continuing students. Funding for the fifth-year stipend will be sought from a variety of sources, including the Office of Development.

We will track the paths of the new recruits to see if these five-year packages lead to better times-to-degree and better postgrad positions.

1.6. The GC should develop a list of best practices that have enabled programs to reduce time-to-degree. See 1.1 above.

1.7. The GC should revisit the Satisfactory Progress forms to determine whether the current checkpoints are the most appropriate measures of student progress and should recast and/or augment checkpoints on the basis of this review. The Satisfactory Progress forms were the subject of several of the monthly EO cluster meetings; consensus was reached that the current form needed to be enhanced.

1.8. The GC and the programs need to take a firmer stance toward students identified as not compliant with Satisfactory Progress standards; programs should be required to establish written expectations for these students before they are permitted to register, and their performance should be reviewed at the end of the semester. Students who receive an NRP grade are required to meet with their Executive Officer and dissertation adviser to devise a set of written expectations for future progress.
1.9. Appropriate faculty panels in each program should undertake an annual review of each student's progress.

In some programs committees regularly review individual student progress, but this policy has not been adopted by all.

1.10. The DSC should be requested to survey student perceptions of impediments to timely completion of degree and recommendations for remedial strategies, including key moments when special strategies might offer extra support.

1.11. The GC should enforce the one-year time limit on incompletes and relocate appeals to extend that deadline from the programs to the Office of Student Affairs.

1.12. Programs should expand dissertation seminars and other workshops devoted to expediting student progress.

The Office of the Dean for Interdisciplinary Studies, in partnership with the Provost's Office and the Office of Student Affairs, sponsors two no-credit sections every semester on “The Art of Academic Writing,” a course aimed at helping students with writing the dissertation.

1.13. A committee should be established to review the current efforts of the Counseling Office to address writer's block and other impediments to degree completion.

The Wellness Center's Counseling Office is offering an expanded series of workshops and one-on-one counseling sessions every semester, with additional outside funding, to help students deal with writer's block and other impediments to degree completion. See also 1.12

1.14. All programs should strive to make their requirements and expectations transparent to students and faculty.

With increasingly detailed websites, and review of program handbooks by the Provost's Office, updated program information is now more readily available than in the past.

1.15. Programs should publish degree timelines specifying expectations for student progress.

See 1.14 above.

1.16. Each program should revisit its second examination and where possible link that exercise to the development of the dissertation proposal and dissertation.

A number of individual programs are pursuing this approach to the second exam. This topic will be raised during the 2005-06 cluster meetings of Executive Officers.

1.17. Programs should examine how better to align their curriculum and exam structures. Exams should flow organically from course work, not require a year's worth of separate preparation.

Some programs have examined the problem. This topic will be raised during the 2005-06 cluster meetings of Executive Officers.

2. MENTORING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Many of the recommendations for TTD in Section 1 focused on reexamining and improving mentoring strategies and policies. Below are recommendations aimed at enhancing student professional development, rather than their progress to the degree. Section 4 discusses teacher training as a discrete area of professional development.

21C Recommendations on Mentoring and Professional Development

2.1. Revisit, revise, and recirculate the 1995 mentoring report.

See 1.1 above.
2.2. Survey programs and develop a best-practices list.
See 1.1 above.

2.3. Institute a student survey similar to that conducted by NAGPS to measure response to program mentoring. Charge each program with responding to this survey by reviewing its mentoring practices and, where necessary, enhancing the services it provides. The NAGPS survey was administered to GC students in Spring 2002 and Spring 2004 using an online format. Results from the first survey for discipline clusters and the GC as a whole were distributed to programs in Fall 2002; 2004 results are being analyzed and will be discussed at the 2004-05 series of cluster meetings of EOs.

2.4. Establish as a goal for each program a multitiered approach to student mentoring, a strategy that ensures effective counseling at each level of a student's doctoral training.

2.5. Provide appropriate resources to programs to support mentoring initiatives.
The Alumni Council on Professional Development, formed in Spring 2003, links GC alumni with their Ph.D. programs and encourages them to participate in professional development workshops and individual mentoring of students.

In Spring 2004, the Provost's Office sponsored a course, "Working Outside the Academy: An Overview of Management, Finance, and Marketing Issues for Doctoral Students in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences," designed to provide students with the background to seek employment outside of academia. A component of the course is a series of visits from GC alumni and others with Ph.D. degrees who have pursued careers in government, business, and the nonprofit sectors. The course will be offered again in the Spring 2005 semester.

**MSA Time-to-Degree/Mentoring Recommendations**
These MSA recommendations cover the same areas as the 21C recommendations above, but with less specificity.

2.A. MSA: Track students through their educational careers at The Graduate Center to determine what variables (e.g., adjunct training, type of financial support, mentoring) predict retention, attrition, and years to degree. Use this information to reassess policies and practice. <7.2>
See 1.1 above.

2.B. MSA: Obtain funding on an ongoing basis for tuition waivers for CUNY doctoral students who teach within the CUNY system and seek increased student financial support as top priorities for students. <7.3>
See 1.5 above.

2.C. MSA: Continue to strengthen the mentoring of students, especially at the dissertation-writing stage. <7.4>
See 1.1, 1.2, and 2.5 above.

3. **STUDENT PLACEMENT**
Recent data on the 1995–96 cohort of GC graduates five years after graduating demonstrate that, depending on the discipline cluster, a substantial proportion of graduates do not have careers in education. Specifically, of the alumni who responded to the survey, 50 percent of those in the social sciences, 53 percent of those in the sciences, and 18 percent of those in the humanities were not employed in academe. Doctoral programs need to use these data as they prepare students for the actual range of positions they will fill.
21C Recommendations on Placement
3.1. Programs should arrange frequent workshops that bring alumni and other speakers from within and outside the academy to speak about career opportunities and employment paths.
See 2.5 above for GC-wide activities in this area.

3.2. Programs should accurately inform students about market realities from the start of the admission process. The GC should provide information gathered from five-year alumni surveys to all students and faculty in each program.
Beginning in Fall 2001, placement information was provided to programs annually. Placement data are available to Executive Officers on the GC Institutional Research web page at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm.

3.3. The GC should consider establishing a career placement office to identify employment opportunities and conduct GC-wide workshops.
Current budget stringency makes following up on this recommendation infeasible at this time.

3.4. Programs should review their professional development strategies to ensure that students are as well prepared for academic and nonacademic placement as possible.
Cluster meetings of EOs have included discussions of professional development for students.

3.5. The GC should develop a certificate program in business management so as to enhance the employment opportunities of students who complete its requirements.
The Alumni Council (see 2.5) will be asked to suggest what form such a certificate program might take — its curriculum, focus, and expectations — or if an alternative structure would be better.

As a first step, a course was offered to doctoral students in Spring 2004: “Working Outside the Academy: An Overview of Management, Finance, and Marketing Issues for Doctoral Students in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Sciences.”

MSA Recommendation on Placement
3.A. MSA: Continue the development of our techniques for tracking our graduates so that with more precise information we can better assess institutional effectiveness. <11.1>
An annual “five-years-after-graduation” survey has been put in place, beginning with the cohort that graduated in 1995–96; the results are disseminated to doctoral programs. During 2002–03 the third cycle of this survey was conducted for the cohort that graduated in 1997–98. The survey report and comparisons to prior years’ results are available on the Institutional Research website: http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm. The fourth cycle of the alumni employment survey (1998–99 graduates) is in progress.

4. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT; TEACHER-TRAINING INITIATIVES
Unlike many doctorate-granting institutions, The Graduate Center offers its students a wide range of teaching opportunities. CUNY community and senior colleges boast the most diverse student body in the nation. Because most GC students teach in those colleges, they are well prepared to function in the multicultural classrooms of the twenty-first century. Because they teach a wide range of courses extending from freshman composition to advanced electives, they are well prepared to tackle courses at every level.
21C Recommendations for Teacher Training

4.1. The GC should review training strategies of GTF and CWF programs and expand workshops where appropriate.

Preparation for GTFs includes a one-day orientation/training session for new GTFs and follow-up sessions each semester (in January and May) that cover special topics requested by the GTFs. Workshops in how to use Blackboard in the classroom are provided to all GTFs. In addition, GTFs are advised (and department chairpersons are requested) to identify a mentor in the campus department in which they are teaching to assist them with pedagogical issues. Beginning with Fall 2004, a more extensive professional development program will be offered to recipients of the new Chancellor’s and Provosts’ Fellowships to prepare them for the teaching (as GTFs and GAFs) they will be doing in years two through four of their fellowships.

Students in the CUNY Writing Fellows Program receive ongoing training and supervision through the Writing Across the Curriculum program.

In some cases, teacher-training programs are provided by individual doctoral programs (see 4.2 below).

4.2. The GC should survey program efforts in training their students to be effective teachers and develop a best-practices list.

The Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs conducted a survey of what opportunities the programs provide for their students who are preparing to teach. Results were shared across programs; the survey report is available on the Institutional Research website: http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm.

4.3. The GC should encourage programs to widen their professional development strategies to embrace all areas of faculty responsibility and develop seminars and workshops devoted to pedagogy.

See 1.1 above.

4.4. Where possible, the GC should coordinate its teacher-training efforts with those currently in place at the CUNY colleges.

5. INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

Most national reports argue that interdisciplinarity provides breadth as well as depth to doctoral education. Some question whether interdisciplinarity has run its course in the postmodern world, as most disciplines have become more interdisciplinary, but few disagree about the virtues of wide-ranging knowledge. Two issues remain unresolved, however. First, a call to expose students to a greater range of disciplines would seem to conflict with a desire to lower TTD. Second, many doctoral courses are not accessible to students lacking a substantial grounding in the field.

One avenue mentioned in the 21C report is to design interdisciplinary seminars to explore the interaction of disciplines that work on a common subject area, such as one that would bring together students from Economics, Sociology, and Psychology to study urban health.

21C Recommendations on Interdisciplinarity

5.1. The GC should survey programs to determine restrictions on taking courses outside the program and use these data to promote a GC-wide conversation on the role of interdisciplinarity in doctoral training. Consider establishing a GC policy to ease restrictions and encourage interprogram registration. Chart how many credits outside
each program are permitted. Investigate whether GC regulations (such as the five-
student-per-class minimum) discourage interdisciplinarity.

Executive Officers were surveyed to determine whether programs have placed any
restrictions on doctoral students taking courses outside the program. While
almost all programs indicated they did not have formal restrictions against such
course taking, a number of EOs indicated that several informal inhibitions served
to discourage students from taking such additional course work, including
pressure on students to complete all program requirements promptly and the
additional financial burden of taking other courses.

5.2. Establish “blue-ribbon” interdisciplinary seminars (like those currently supported at
the GC by the Mellon and Ford foundations), providing workload credit for conveners
and, where possible, resources to invite speakers.

During 2001-02 the Coordinator for Interdisciplinary Studies initiated such a
seminar (“Bioethics: Policies and Cases”). The Associate Provost and Dean for
Interdisciplinary Studies arranged for a series of colloquia for Spring 2003 in the
three discipline clusters and expanded of such presentations and colloquia as well
as semester-long seminars in 2003-04. (The question of workload for faculty in
zero-credit seminars is being investigated.) An RFP process was instituted to get
new interdisciplinary courses proposed by faculty approved and supported
through a “competition” for funding (i.e., workload credit) for a select number of
such seminars each year. Six such interdisciplinary seminars are being funded in
Fall 2004.

5.3. Utilize the CUNY Faculty Development Program to underwrite these interdisciplinary
seminars.

The CUNY Faculty Development Program offers colloquia each semester.

5.4. Investigate the possibility of having the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies (MALS)
program serve as the base for interdisciplinary studies at The Graduate Center.

In Fall 2002 the Provost’s Office was reorganized, and both MALS and IDS now
report to the Associate Provost for Instructional Technology and Dean for
Interdisciplinary Studies. The Executive Officer of the MALS program is also a
member of the IDS Advisory Committee.

5.5. Weed inactive programs from the current list of interdisciplinary studies
concentrations and focus support on those that are fully functioning.

The IDS Advisory Committee reviews existing IDS programs and recommends
discontinuation when appropriate. Two concentrations have been discontinued:
Crime and Politics and Modern German Studies.

To encourage more active oversight of IDS concentrations by IDS concentration
coordinators, the IDS Advisory Committee recommended that certificates be
printed that can be used by coordinators to acknowledge the completion of an IDS
concentration. These acknowledgments state that the recipient has completed the
work for the designated IDS concentration.

The Associate Provost for Instructional Technology and Dean for Interdisciplinary
Studies has surveyed student enrollment in IDS courses since 1999 to determine
demand for these courses.

5.6. Make interdisciplinary seminars available to Level III students without cost but with
workload credit to the instructors. Arrange for courses to be shown on the transcript.

The recommendation concerning workload credit for instructors of IDS seminars
appears in 21C recommendation 5.2. IDS courses already appear on the student’s
transcript. Recognition of the IDS concentration will take place via the certificates
presented to students by the IDS coordinator when the student has completed the
concentration (see discussion under 5.5). Level III students may take courses for
zero credit without cost; the Provost is investigating how to credit faculty workload for zero-credit courses.

**MSA Recommendation on Interdisciplinarity**

5.A. MSA: Establish a policy and procedure for the periodic assessment of certificate programs and interdisciplinary concentrations. Use the 2000–01 year as a target date for introducing a cycle of reviews covering these programs and concentrations. Use appropriate information collected for outcomes assessment plans. <5.2>

Review of IDS programs will be undertaken on a regular basis by the IDS Advisory Committee. The committee has not yet set a schedule for these reviews.

Reviews of certificate programs have been integrated with the schedule for doctoral program reviews and are scheduled for 2006–07.

6. INCREASE DIVERSITY

The diversity of The Graduate Center's student body — in age, ethnicity, background, experience, and career goals — is one of its greatest strengths. Members of ethnic minorities account for nearly one-quarter of matriculants with U.S. citizenship. International students represent about one-fifth of total enrollment; they tend to matriculate in engineering and sciences, but are also well represented in the humanities and social sciences. Program admissions committees are urged to identify outstanding minority candidates, and the Office of Educational Opportunity and Diversity Programs (OEODP) works to recruit, fund, and retain them. Several recent GC appointments have advanced faculty diversity, but significant change in this area for the doctoral faculty as a whole depends on the enhancement of diversity among all CUNY college faculty.

**21C Recommendations on Diversity**

6.1. The GC should survey methods programs currently use to increase diversity in their recruitment and retention practices.

The Affirmative Action Committee prepared a draft document entitled, “Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students and Faculty: Best Practices,” which was circulated to the GC community in March 2003. A final version was produced in Fall 2003.

6.2. Programs should encourage current students and alumni to mentor students.

See 2.5 above for GC-wide initiatives in this area.

6.3. The GC should ask OEODP to provide programs with data and suggestions for a more diverse student body and for retaining those students.

See 6.1 above.

6.4. Programs should enhance their recruitment of underrepresented students, and the GC should support those efforts with targeted financial aid allocations.

The Office of Educational Opportunity and Diversity Programs (OEODP) has dedicated funding for minority students and works closely with Executive Officers to fund students from underrepresented minority groups. In addition, OEODP has received grants from the NIH and the NSF that provide funds for additional student financial aid and for a variety of retention activities.

6.5. The GC should devote resources to recruiting minority undergraduates both at CUNY and across the nation.

The CUNY Pipeline Program, run by the OEODP, is designed to provide educational and financial support to economically disadvantaged and historically bypassed undergraduates interested in pursuing the Ph.D. in preparation for a career in college teaching and research. Pipeline seeks to recruit students
especially from groups currently underrepresented on our nation’s faculties. Many of the students in the Pipeline Program apply to GC doctoral programs.

The Delmos Jones Visiting Scholar Program, started in 2001–02, is one initiative aimed at helping to recruit top minority students and faculty to the GC. The program brings prominent minority scholars to the GC for several days to give a public lecture, make a presentation on their research, and interact with faculty and students.

6.6. Programs should actively support college efforts to recruit and retain minority faculty members.
See 10.E MSA below for a discussion of program involvement in CUNY college faculty hiring.

**MSA Recommendations on Diversity**

6.A. MSA: Maintain as an institutional priority minority recruitment; strengthen and expand efforts toward minority retention. <7.1>

**Minority recruitment continues as an institutional priority.**

6.B. MSA: Establish a methodology to assess the ethnicity of the entire doctoral faculty; increase efforts to diversify the faculty. <6.2>

**The GC works with CUNY Central to obtain data on the distribution of the entire doctoral faculty by race, gender, and ethnicity. The GC will continue to gather this information annually.**

**Faculty recruitment procedures have focused on increasing underrepresented groups in pools and hiring.**

7. **TECHNOLOGY ISSUES FOR PEDAGOGY/NEW MEDIA**

Technological skills have become increasingly more important in the classroom and in positions outside the university. Students (and faculty) need to acquire and update skills in current technology (especially such programs as PowerPoint, Excel, and Blackboard). Students also need to know how to digitize and manipulate images, how to design web pages, and how to use web search engines. The APC recognizes that developing these skills requires substantial resources, but calls on The Graduate Center’s administration to prioritize training in instructional technologies. The GC’s new Certificate Program in Interactive Technology and Pedagogy (for students enrolled in doctoral programs) is a major step in this direction.

**21C Recommendations on Technology**

7.1. The GC should survey the programs to determine what technology skills they think are essential for graduates in their disciplines and ask them to assess what kinds of training the GC should make available to their students.

**A student survey was conducted in Spring 2002 to determine what workshops in instructional technology skills were wanted. The results indicated that the greatest student demand was for technical workshops on HTML/DreamWeaver, Blackboard, PowerPoint, Photoshop, and SPSS, in that order. These preferences were used to determine what workshops are currently offered.**

7.2. Programs should counsel their students, from their first semester in the program, about the kind of IT skills they will need to ensure effective placement.

7.3. The GC should make it an institutional priority to connect classrooms to the network, so as to allow for the display of PowerPoint presentations and web-based resources in classrooms.
Information Resources is addressing this question with funds from the Student Technology Fee.

7.4. The GC should ensure that appropriate hardware and software are in place to support instructional technology programs such as PowerPoint, Excel, Blackboard (or WebCT).  Information Resources is addressing this question with funds from the Student Technology Fee.

7.5. The GC should provide sufficient resources to enable the new ITP Certificate Program to meet student demand.  A four-station computer lab was installed in the Office of the Associate Provost for Instructional Technology and Dean for Interdisciplinary Studies in Fall 2002 to allow ITP students to develop appropriate instructional technology projects.

7.6. The GC should use some financial aid resources to appoint “Technology Fellows” who would support program and center needs for IT training.  Technology Fellows have been appointed to work directly with Honors College students to conceive and develop cross-campus collaborations that feature student use of computers and other digital media.

7.7. The GC should identify and commit the resources necessary to expand IT workshops for students and faculty.  The Office of the Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs regularly conducts Blackboard workshops for GTFs (and other students when space is available).  Information Resources offers Blackboard workshops regularly.

7.8. The GC should explore whether to conduct intersession workshops on IT skills aimed at improving placement opportunities for GC students.  A survey found that students would prefer weekend and evening workshops.

7.9. The GC should explore ways of noting student enrollment in IT workshops on transcripts.  Records of IT courses are shown on transcripts of persons enrolled in the ITP Certificate Program.

7.10. The GC should create division-wide seminars on technologically based research methods and pedagogy.

7.11. The GC should seek foundation support for expanded IT initiatives.

**MSA Recommendations on Technology**

7.A. MSA: Have Information Resources expand its development and delivery of end-user training, documentation, and help-desk support.  <9.7>

*Training workshops are now ongoing; the Help Desk is stabilized.  Online training has begun for some staff members in a variety of applications.*

*Classroom technology is being upgraded; use of the Blackboard package is expanding.  Training in using Blackboard is being provided to Graduate Teaching Fellows and to other students and faculty through workshops regularly scheduled by the Office of Information Resources.*

*Technology Fellows appointed to the CUNY Honors College provide valuable computer and other digital media training to CUNY undergraduates while honing their own teaching with technology skills.*
8. ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

8.A. MSA: Review, and where needed revise and expand, ongoing training of full-time and part-time staff in ... areas where upgraded skills are needed. Assess current training of staff and make adjustments to conform to needs created by the move to the new building and resulting changes. Revise job descriptions as necessary. <4.1>

Thirty site licenses were bought for staff training in many software titles; Assistant Program Officers were the first staff group to start using the e-training packages. Workshops are held for staff, faculty, and students throughout the year; IT staff go to training workshops; a survey of IR matters was prepared; in 2003-04, the Central Faculty Steering Committee prepared “Survey on APO and Faculty Perceptions of and Experiences with GC-Based Technology Support Services and Systems”; the survey recommendations were reviewed by the Provost's Office and the Office of Information Resources. An internal review of job descriptions is in process as part of a CUNY audit of positions.

8.B. MSA: Each Graduate Council committee (and other Graduate Center committees) should undergo periodic self-assessment to consider its responsibilities, its membership composition, and its role in Graduate Center planning. Use the information generated to assess the committee structure of The Graduate Center and make recommendations and policy changes accordingly. <4.2>

9. ACADEMIC ISSUES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

9.A. MSA: Systematize efforts to inform faculty, staff, students, and administrators throughout CUNY how the allocation system works, the role each has in its functioning, and its impact on their respective campuses. <3.1>

A detailed description of the allocation system used to fund doctoral teaching appears at http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/allocation.htm. In general, college provosts and business offices are well acquainted with how the allocation system is managed. The GC Provost continues efforts to inform department chairs and faculty members about the workings of the allocation system.

9.B. MSA: Encourage expanded collaborations between the centers and institutes and the doctoral programs. <8.1>

This collaboration is occurring both naturally and with encouragement from Research and Sponsored Programs. Of the 28 centers, 21 are currently directed by a faculty member who is on the doctoral faculty, with 10 of the 21 faculty having appointments at The Graduate Center. Five of the remaining 7 centers headed by a director who is not a faculty member enjoy close cooperation with the doctoral programs and significant faculty participation.

9.C. MSA: Undertake a comprehensive assessment of all master's programs offered by The Graduate Center. Determine whether or not they contribute to the GC mission, justify the resources they are receiving, determine whether they are appropriately housed at The Graduate Center, among other considerations, and make appropriate recommendations. <5.1>

The Provost has agreed that future doctoral program evaluations will include a review of the master’s programs residing there. MALS, which is independent of a doctoral program, will be added to the cycle, to be reviewed in 2005-06.

9.D. MSA: Review the current approval process for curricular changes, from new courses to new academic programs, to determine if the procedures can be streamlined. <5.3>

Some streamlining has taken place in the Committee on Curriculum and Degree Requirements, with a template now used to send requests, the use of e-mail to contact committee members and send them agenda items, and a set of procedures produced to consider deregistration of academic programs. Procedures are
The results of C&DR meetings (and of all standing committee meetings) are summarized each year in Graduate Council minutes; final results, of course, are published in the Bulletin and in program handbooks.

9.E. MSA: Review the use of course evaluations, including whether programs should regularly conduct evaluations, how often, and how the results of such evaluations would be used. <5.4>

The Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs conducted a survey of program practices in late 2002. About two-thirds of the programs that responded carry out course evaluations. The results of the survey were made available to the programs and appear on the Institutional Research website at http://inside.gc.cuny.edu/oirpe/index.htm under “Reports and Surveys.”

9.F. MSA: Continue to encourage discipline-wide meetings among EOs and department chairs; provide space for these meetings. <6.7>

The Provost has encouraged EOs to work with college departments. Individual EOs have addressed Council of EO meetings about their dealings with departments.

9.G. MSA: Do a feasibility study on the place of distance learning in the CUNY doctoral consortium and how it would advance the mission of The Graduate Center. <9.9>

10. FACULTY ISSUES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

10.A. MSA: Appointment to the doctoral faculty should be a transparent process; all qualified CUNY faculty should be welcome to apply. <6.1>

The Associate Provost and Dean for Academic Affairs surveyed program practices on appointing members of the doctoral faculty (see http://web.gc.cuny.edu/provost/appointment.htm). With wide circulation and discussion of the differences in procedures, programs have the information they need to adjust their practices, if necessary, to make appointment fair and equitable.

The Provost has encouraged team teaching by nontenured faculty to help new faculty become members of the GC community. He has encouraged the appointment of young faculty when possible.

10.B. MSA: Have The Graduate Center work with the CUNY colleges to renew and extend the recommendations of the 1997 Working Group report. <6.3>

Cluster hiring initiatives have replaced the working group hirings discussed in the 1997 report, Anticipating the next NRC national survey and ranking of doctoral programs, every effort was made to make appointments that would improve GC rankings. There have been 49 new GC hires since 1997; 22 as Distinguished Professor, 12 at the level of Associate or Assistant Professor.

The cluster hiring initiative is CUNY’s choice to renew and enrich the doctoral faculty, and CUNY faculty in general (though two-thirds of CUNY-wide hiring is not in the cluster initiative).

10.C. MSA: Seek resources to establish a pool of start-up funds for the recruitment of doctoral faculty in the sciences at the CUNY colleges. <6.4>

The cluster hiring initiatives in Photonics and Biological Sciences will involve some 20 hires and may include start-up funds. Additional start-up funds in the current budget climate are unlikely.
10.D. MSA: Support the continuation of “recruitment and retention” awards in the next PSC/CUNY contract and encourage the University to provide funding for these awards. <6.5>
Seek continuation of the recruitment and retention supplements for faculty... in upcoming union negotiations. <10.1>

Payment of overscale salaries, when approved by the Academic Review Committee, is now permitted by the PSC-CUNY contract to support recruitment and retention. With this ability, the Provost has been able to hire some excellent faculty members and to match most offers for the faculty we want to retain.

10.E. MSA: Take fullest advantage of the consortial model by broadening participation of college-based doctoral faculty in doctoral teaching and student research and by increasing the number of Graduate Center faculty teaching at the colleges. Explicitly acknowledge the full range of the responsibilities of the doctoral faculty. <6.6>
See 10.A above.

The Provost continues to encourage meetings of EOs with CUNY department chairs to discuss these issues.

The current two-course limit for teaching without being appointed to the doctoral faculty was designed to protect young faculty. The Provost is willing to discuss flexible waivers of the limit to enhance doctoral education and opportunities for new faculty.

During 2003-04, GC faculty taught 18 courses on the CUNY campuses; in the four academic years 200-04, they taught a total of 93 courses at CUNY colleges.

11. STUDENT ISSUES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

11.A. MSA: Establish the following priorities for planning for student services: (1) locate and secure adequate graduate student housing, (2) locate low-cost health insurance for students, (3) secure funds to support continuing needed services, equipment, and personnel to accommodate students with disabilities and to expand wellness and health services. <7.5>

These are ongoing issues that are very high priorities for the GC. The 72-bed lease for the building on 129th Street was not renewed; some 10 apartments were not rented each of the two years we had the arrangement, resulting in a shortfall for the GC. We are looking at other possibilities but need to make sure the demand for rooms will cover the debt service we would be obliged to incur. The GC tried to get legislation passed in Albany to allow the GC Foundation to raise funds for a dormitory building through DASNY but has not so far been successful.

The administration is working with the PSC to investigate health insurance options. Situations vary widely (adjuncts get insurance through the union, but GTFs don’t; many students are covered by spousal policies), so no one solution applies. Student needs are being addressed in current contract negotiations. A Student Services task force is assessing demand, including who has no insurance.

Affordable health insurance, providing expanded accommodations for disabled persons, and any expansion of wellness and health services would all require additional funding that is not available at present.

11.B. MSA: Seize the opportunities provided by the relocation of The Graduate Center to strengthen an increased sense of community and identity. Explore the possibility of student-centered weekend activities, student-sponsored seminars within and across disciplines, and greater involvement of students in cultural and fund-raising events. <7.6>
The Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs has initiated more frequent meetings with officers of the DSC to encourage addressing ways to increase a
sense of the GC community. Students Affairs has supported student gatherings such as a Friday film series. The President and Student Affairs staff visit two CUNY colleges each year to encourage student and faculty communication on the campuses.

The New York Academy of Science has invited graduate science programs in the city, including CUNY, to join in a series of meetings of students at the college campuses throughout the year.

11.C. MSA: Seek continuation of... tuition grants for doctoral students in upcoming union negotiations. <10.1>
The issue of tuition scholarships for students providing service throughout CUNY is being addressed in a different venue (see 1.5).

12. LIBRARY ISSUES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

12.A. MSA: Review the library mission and Graduate Center finances to consider whether collections and/or electronic access should be expanded to include the sciences. <9.1>
A draft of a new library mission statement and strategic plan was submitted summer 2004. The mission statement is a rearticulation; the goals and objectives of the strategic plan focus on document delivery, a shift toward electronic collection development, use of technology, and provision of instructional services appropriate for doctoral students. Some expansion of support for the sciences is included in goals and objectives included in the strategic plan. The draft strategic plan will be circulated for comment and discussion during 2004-05.

12.B. MSA: Consider ways to fund a working Graduate Center archive. <9.2>
A part-time archivist has been working on a volunteer basis. In the current budget climate, it is not possible to fund this position.

12.C. MSA: Obtain increased funding for library materials (digital and print) and services through lobbying for better library budgets at the state, university, and college levels and through exploring alternative funding sources for the library such as seeking to build an endowment or by establishing a Friends group. <9.3>
The Chief Librarian works through the CUNY Council of Chief Librarians to lobby for additional funding and to negotiate the best pricing for digital library resources.

The Chief Librarian serves on the Student Technology Fee Committee and has identified areas where some of the funds generated by this fee are being used to upgrade electronic resources in the library. Funds have been allocated for additional electronic subscriptions that will serve many program areas. Electronic reserve service and improved interlibrary loan service projects have also been partially funded by Student Technology Fees [see also 12.D MSA].

Library faculty received grant support from METRO, the New York State regional library council, for several library service and collection projects

The library has established an ongoing book sale of materials received as gifts that do not fall within library collection-development policies.

A Library Associates group has been formed, has published a brochure, and is sponsoring events jointly with the Continuing Education Program.

A universal question for university libraries is whether they can sustain the costs of electronic databases. In some states the library budget is covered by the state budget. An entirely new approach to budgeting for CUNY libraries would be helpful. A three-year initiative was implemented by the Central Office to support
the addition of some $500,000 in database subscriptions CUNY-wide. The new University Librarian will participate in library planning at 80th Street. This person's input at University levels should help to achieve sustained centralized support (especially for electronic science materials), perhaps in conjunction with SUNY, for materials that support research and study CUNY-wide.

The CUNY Libraries, as a group, became charter members of the New York State Higher Education Initiative (NYSHEI) that includes in its mission the creation of partnerships across the state to improve services and lobby for the needs of NYS academic libraries. Two CUNY Chief Librarians are on the NYSHEI Executive Board.

12.D. MSA: Develop improved ways to publicize the library's digital resources and the availability and importance of training sessions for students and faculty. Increase training opportunities for librarians. Increase use of the library website as a teaching and resource tool. <9.4>

The library’s website has been redesigned to provide easier access to digital resources, document-delivery services, and training opportunities. Library faculty have been assigned as liaisons to provide outreach to each doctoral program. E-mail targeted to programs is also being used as a mechanism for communicating information about new library resources and services. The library has expanded the scope of its workshops and collaborates with Information Resources to provide workshops on databases and access from remote locations.

Information about local training and professional development opportunities is regularly disseminated to library staff who are encouraged to attend.

Technical procedures are under review and are being documented so they can be used for ongoing staff training.

13. TECHNOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

13.A. MSA: Review, and where needed revise and expand, ongoing training of full-time and part-time staff in information systems. <4.1>

Training programs are ongoing in the Office of Information Resources. Information Resources has established ongoing staff workshops in Windows, Microsoft Outlook, Word, Excel, FrontPage, PowerPoint, DreamWeaver, and Adobe Photoshop. The migration to new computer systems necessitated by Y2K problems and by the move to a new building is now complete. CUNY has contracted for online software training packages for faculty and staff. Assistant Program Officers are the first staff group to start using the e-training packages.

13.B. MSA: Pursue additional funding for Information Resources to permit longer hours of computing and audio-video services at The Graduate Center. <9.5>

With the stabilization of the network, existing staff are able to concentrate on providing better services. The audiovisual staff has been reconfigured to provide evening and weekend service.

13.C. MSA: Institute a procedure for regularly assessing the services and staffing of Information Resources as well as updated training where needed. <9.6>

The Student Technology Fee Committee (which includes student members; see the IR site for information) provides a natural vehicle for assessing IR services, as does the Graduate Council Information Resources Committee.

The Student Technology Fee has enabled the updating of many computer services, including upgrades of computers in student areas, and a virtual private network.
that will provide access to campus computer resources from homes (equipped with broadband connections).

In 2003-04, the Central Faculty Steering Committee prepared “Survey on APO and Faculty Perceptions of and Experiences with GC-Based Technology Support Services and Systems”; the survey recommendations were reviewed by the Provost’s Office and the Office of Information Resources.

13.D. MSA: Have Information Resources expand its development and delivery of end-user training, documentation, and help-desk support. <9.7>
Training workshops are now ongoing; the Help Desk is stabilized. Classroom technology is being upgraded; use of the Blackboard package is expanding. The Office of the Associate Provost for Instructional Technology focuses on issues of training students in the use of IT in the classroom and acts as the administrative office for the new Certificate Program in Interactive Technology and Pedagogy. Blackboard training workshops are regularly offered to GTFs and other GC students.

See also 7.A MSA above.

13.E. MSA: Ensure that grant proposals or requests for high-performance equipment are accompanied by parallel requests for personnel to administer the systems and provide end-user support. <9.8>
See 15.C MSA below.

14. CENTERS AND INSTITUTES: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

14.A. MSA: Encourage expanded collaborations between the centers and institutes and the doctoral programs. <8.1>

14.B. MSA: Establish a scheduled review process for centers and institutes and use the results of this review in resource-allocation decisions. <8.2>
A small advisory committee occasionally meets, but most review functions are carried out by the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, who after surveying the existing centers closed some in the past three years. Each center is required to fill out an annual report answering specific questions as to accomplishments, grants awarded and submitted, graduate student research and employment, cooperative research with doctoral faculty and programs, and future plans and directions. The budget allocations for centers have shifted to ensure that those centers meeting The Graduate Center’s mission receive appropriate allocations.

15. RESEARCH FUNDING: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

15.A. MSA: Develop and implement a policy that requires all Graduate Center grant funds administered by the CUNY Research Foundation to include, where possible, a minimum overhead rate. <8.3>
A policy has been instituted that all grants should have at least 15 percent overhead (unless the GC President or the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs grants a waiver). Federal grants have a negotiated overhead rate (usually 52 percent); federal grants go through the Research Foundation (RF), which charges us 8 percent of the money it handles. The difference between the rates goes to a GC presidential fund. Other grants usually get the 15 percent overhead, and thus those that go through the RF (any that have salaries must go through the RF) result in a net of 7 percent to the GC. A few grants come with no
overhead, so when they go through the RF we must pay the required 8 percent from the overhead from other grants, creating a cost to the GC unless an alternative mode of compensation is found. Overall, however, there has been an improvement: in 2003-04 the average overhead rate on new grants increased over the previous year, from 13.8 percent to 18.73 percent.

Encouraging sponsored research and other grants continues, but our 120 GC faculty are mainly not in the sciences, where the most grants are given. The Research Foundation gets 8 percent of all grants; many foundations do not include overhead and thus cost us money. Return for achievement is not possible for foundation grants but should be possible for federal grants. The new head of the Research Foundation is making progress toward more efficient operation.

15.B. MSA: Design and implement a fair return-for-achievement policy that would return a share of those funds to the centers and researchers who are successful in generating surplus overhead funds. <8.4>

The distribution of the funds in the tax-levy budget of the Office of Sponsored Research takes into account centers that qualify for a return on investment.

15.C. MSA: Ensure that grant proposals or requests for high-performance equipment are accompanied by parallel requests for personnel to administer the systems and provide end-user support. <9.8> (see also 13.E MSA)

Because of increasingly sophisticated and reliable equipment, this is less of a problem than it was three years ago. Programs with high equipment use are Speech and Hearing, whose grants sometimes have funding for personnel, and Computer Science, whose grants include funding for maintenance personnel. Information Resources can provide small amounts of maintenance.

15.D. MSA: Obtain funding to expand the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs in both staff and responsibilities and have the Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs take a proactive role in encouraging and facilitating collaborations among researchers and across colleges to generate grant applications and funding. <10.2>

The Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs has worked to increase the value of research grants at the GC so as to generate more overhead to be retained by The Graduate Center. He suggests that faculty be encouraged to apply for federal grants, which may have higher dollar amounts and higher overhead funds. Increased funding for expansion of this office is not feasible in the current budget climate because much of the overhead funds are used to meet budget shortfalls in other areas.

16. FUND RAISING: MSA RECOMMENDATIONS

16.A. MSA: Continue to explore ways to enhance our ability to raise private funds for fellowship aid and program development. <10.3>

A three-year $30 million capital campaign now in its final year. The Vice President for Institutional Advancement notes that the Office of Development must raise $600–800,000 in unrestricted funds annually to operate the office. Some $22 million of capital campaign funds have been raised [$30 million by March 2005], but the current economy is impacting pledges and contributions, as well as the value of the endowment. The office is now asking contributors to provide about 15 percent extra for overhead expenses (a standard operating practice).

The President devotes some 50 percent of her time to raising funds, and the Vice President for Institutional Advancement also focuses on fund raising, talking with the programs about their needs. The Development Office has continued its efforts to raise funds by sponsoring an annual gala, encouraging donations, and promoting the capital campaign, which is making slow progress, given the current economy.
17. MSA EVALUATION TEAM CONCERNS

The evaluation by the team from the Middle States Association agreed with the self-study’s assessment of problems still facing The Graduate Center. The team’s report included the following concerns.

1. “Sustaining (and building upon) the enormous effort required to effectuate the migration from multiple sites to the new campus will require at a minimum, dedicated and predictable resources for maintenance and completion of the presently planned outfitting of the 365 Fifth Avenue. Clearly, the Central Administration and Albany must be made to understand the importance of protecting, through adequate budget, this extraordinary space. Similarly, once transition issues and encouragement of a strategic planning culture within the Center have been addressed and fully resolved, including Banner implementation, more strategic planning beyond the utilization of the new space should commence in earnest. The Team is encouraged by the representation made that this strategic planning will commence in the near term.”

The move to the new building was successfully completed. The GC is still seeking to obtain adequate funding from CUNY Central for the maintenance of the building.

Strategic planning for the future is ongoing as a result of the Middle States self-study and the team’s report. The Academic Planning Committee (APC) has been charged with reviewing the recommendations from the Middle States report and from the 21C Committee report over the past two years and gauging our progress. The APC prioritized the recommendations resulting from this two-year review in a June 2003 report to the Provost. These recommendations, in conjunction with the work of the MSA Periodic Review committee (scheduled for completion in June 2005) will form the backbone of a strategic plan for the next five years.

2. “Tuition Remission. Again, the Graduate Center must continue to press its efforts to convince the Central Administration and Albany to assign the highest priority to tuition remission. The anticipated hiatus of at least one year in the awarding of tuition underscores this point.”

The top budgetary priority of The Graduate Center has been to obtain tuition remission; see 1.5. The GC continues to press CUNY Central for funding for tuition remission that is comparable to that received by SUNY for its university centers.

3. “Outcomes Assessment. The Commission on Higher Education believes that an important part of academic excellence in the education of a graduate student is an institution’s ability to connect convincingly what it claims it is doing with what it actually is doing in the areas of teaching, learning, and overall institutional effectiveness. The observation in the self-study of more required work in this area was confirmed by our visit.”

The Graduate Center reorganized its institutional research staff and hired a Director of Institutional Research and Program Evaluation. Projects undertaken by this office, in addition to the usual mandated reporting, are summaries of the exit survey, annual “five-years-after-graduation employment” surveys, annual time-to-degree tabulations, and a biennial student satisfaction survey. A cohort analysis is planned to evaluate “sticking points” in progress toward the degree.

4. “Library. The library is as unique as the parent it serves. Originally organized to service the courses offered at the Graduate Center, with the expectation that research would be conducted at campus-based libraries, the New York Public Library and other accessible library facilities, the new library may want to reconsider in a deliberative manner, its mission and centrality of role in the life of the Graduate Center.”

In 2002-03 the Mina Rees Library began work on a strategic plan. Central to this planning process is consideration of the unique characteristics of The Graduate Center and how the library can best leverage the strengths and opportunities
present in those characteristics with the expanding availability of digital resources, expansion and/or implementation of new library services, and application of new information technologies. See Section 12.A MSA.

5. “Faculty Replenishment. The self-study and the Team’s observation, all underscore the urgency of this issue. The Graduate Center must be accorded a greater role in the recruitment of graduate faculty. Though some considerable progress has been made in this regard, more must be done than the modest recommendations found in the self-study. The Team is fully aware of the inherent limitations found in the consortial model as effecting change. However, the Graduate Center can and should be deeply engaged beyond the “cluster” hiring model and the present coordinated hiring. The potential positive impact of hiring junior faculty cannot be underestimated — there should be further conversation in this regard. Minority faculty must be included as a central focus of the replenishment initiative.”

In 1997, The Graduate Center committed itself to an aggressive recruitment campaign to reinvigorate its faculty appointments. With the substantial support of the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs and the reallocation of existing resources, that initiative has succeeded beyond expectations. Since Fall 1997 forty-nine new GC faculty members have been appointed — 22 at the rank of Distinguished Professor.

Seven of these new recruits were persons of color. The total number of Graduate Center faculty, including joint appointments with the colleges, is 131 (121 FTE) as of September 2004. Work remains to be done with regard to finding ways to have the needs of the doctoral programs play a role in the hiring at the other CUNY campuses.

6. “Faculty, (more specifically, the science faculty). The 1987 visit found that the plan for the consortial Graduate School, now Center, kept the scientific laboratories on the college campuses rather than duplicating them with costly new facilities in the Graduate Center. This plan has, in the main, worked. Yet, it has over time created a sense that the social sciences and the humanities are the Graduate Center’s core concerns, with science relegated to secondary status. This notion, however unfounded in actual policy, warrants the continued attention of the Graduate Center. The planning and realization of the proposed Science Center as part of the new campus may address some of these concerns. The larger question of science and the campus is more properly addressed by the Central Administration, although the Graduate Center has a substantial role and its voice must be part of any system-wide dialogue.”

The Committee for Doctoral Education in the Sciences continues to meet sporadically to address such issues as these; cluster groups of EOs in the sciences meet regularly. The CUNY Chancellor is currently planning a CUNY-wide center for leading-edge science research to be located at City College. We will need to explore ways to use the opportunities presented by this new facility to enhance doctoral education in the sciences.
### APPENDIX 3

**THE GRADUATE CENTER OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1996-1997</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1997-1998</strong></td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germanic Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>---*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Germanic Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>---*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1998-1999</strong></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1999-2000</strong></td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000-2001</strong></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology - Clinical</td>
<td>92066</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Clinical</td>
<td>80250</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>02335</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>78766</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>78745</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>02305</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>77309</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>78758</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>02325</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Learning Processes</td>
<td>92065</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>78757</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>77308</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology - Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>80252</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>92069</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Environmental</td>
<td>80253</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Environmental</td>
<td>92070</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Social - Personality</td>
<td>80251</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Social - Personality</td>
<td>92067</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>78749</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>02311</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Psychology</td>
<td>Educational Psychology - School</td>
<td>92059</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Psychology - School</td>
<td>92060</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Engineering: Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>22361</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>22362</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>19588</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>19587</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Civil Engineering</td>
<td>19652</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Civil Engineering</td>
<td>19651</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>19589</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>19592</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering: Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>19591</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>78750</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>02312</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology - Experimental Cognition</td>
<td>80248</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychology - Experimental Cognition</td>
<td>92062</td>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2004-2005

**Psychology**
- Psychology - Experimental Psychology: Cognition, Learning and Perception 92061 M.Phil. 2014-2015

**Speech and Hearing Sciences**
- Speech and Hearing Sciences 02319 Ph.D. 2014-2015
- Speech and Hearing Sciences 78779 M.Phil. 2014-2015

**Theatre**
- Theatre 78751 M.Phil. 2014-2015
- Theatre 02313 Ph.D. 2014-2015

### 2005-2006

**Business**
- Business 78748 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Business 02308 Ph.D. 2005-2006

**Computer Science**
- Computer Science 85074 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Computer Science 85073 Ph.D. 2005-2006

**Educational Psychology**
- Educational Psychology - General 80112 Ph.D. 2005-2006
- Educational Psychology - General 83259 M.Phil. 2005-2006

**Psychology**
- Psychology - Biopsychology 80255 Ph.D. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Biopsychology 92074 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Industrial and Organizational 92068 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Industrial and Organizational 86420 Ph.D. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Neuropsychology - Clinical 92072 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Neuropsychology - Clinical 92073 Ph.D. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Neuropsychology - General 92071 M.Phil. 2005-2006
- Psychology - Neuropsychology - General 80254 Ph.D. 2005-2006

### 2006-2007

**CUNY**
- CUNY Baccalaureate 02336 B.S. 2006-2007
- CUNY Baccalaureate 02337 B.A. 2006-2007

**Liberal Studies**
- Liberal Studies 80269 M.A. 2006-2007

**American Studies**

**Film Studies**
- Film Studies 92320 Adv. Cert. 2006-2007

**Interactive Tech. and Pedagogy**

**Medieval Studies**

**Renaissance Studies**

**Women's Studies**

**New Program**

**Urban Education**
- Urban Education 23057 Ph.D. 2009-2010
- Urban Education 26395 M.Phil. 2009-2010

**New Program**

**Psychology**
- Psychology - Forensic Psychology 28268 M.Phil. 2012-2013
- Psychology - Forensic Psychology 28267 Ph.D. 2012-2013

* Program suspended.