



Institutional Affairs Committee

On the State of Teachers College

Samson Lim, Chelsey Saunders, Daniel Souleles

Adopted by the Student Senate on February 21, 2014

Contents

<u>Prologue and Thanks</u>	3
<u>Introduction</u>	4
<u>File Sort Visualization</u>	7
<u>Disparate Attitudes and Values on Campus</u>	8
<u>Students and Tuition</u>	10
<u>Historic Tuition Appendix</u>	13
<u>Departments and Department Chairs</u>	16
<u>Senior Administration</u>	18
<u>Coda</u>	20
<u>Methods</u>	21

Prologue and Thanks

Many hands made light work. We thank Christian Moya and Justine Allen for their help in conducting research. We thank Bobby Cox for his leadership and support. We thank the Student Senate for support and adopting this report. We thank the administration, faculty and staff of Teachers College for putting up with our questions and making time to tell us about their worlds. We really do feel lucky to be at TC.

If you read this report right, it's a love letter.

Introduction

Over the last few months the Institutional Affairs Committee of the Student Senate from Teachers College, Columbia University researched how Teachers College works. We wanted to know how Teachers College spends its money, and how those who run TC's various offices and departments feel about their work, as well as how their work fits into the larger operations of the institution. In turn, we hoped to take this information and offer a student vision of how the College should be organized and how its resources should be allocated. As far as we know, this is an unprecedented endeavor. To our knowledge the Student Senate has never articulated a holistic vision for TC's operations and budget; and TC students have never systematically studied their home. Given that, some background is in order.

The spring of 2013 saw the faculty of TC reject a budget proposed by the College's senior administrators. Bundled in this budget were bonuses for senior staff and a 4.5 percent tuition hike to \$1,344 per credit hour¹. An inventory of the bonuses of 14 key employees listed on TC's Form 990 is instructive²:

Title	Bonus amount
President	\$90,000
Provost	\$35,000
VP for Development	\$35,000
VP for Finance and Administration	\$50,000
Presidential Chief of Staff	\$25,000
Associate VP for School and Community Partnerships	\$25,000
General Counsel	\$25,000
Vice President for Diversity and Community Affairs	\$0
Vice Provost	\$25,000
Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor of Early Childhood and Family Policy; Co-director, National Center for Children and Families	\$1,100
George & Abby O'Neill Professor of Economics and Education and Director, Community College Research Center, Director, National Center for Analysis of Postsecondary Education and Employment	\$1,100
Ruth L. Gottesman Professor of Educational Research, Professor of Sociology and Education, Executive Editor of the Teachers College Record, Director of the Gottesman Libraries at Teachers College	\$1,100
Enid and Lester Morse Professor in Teacher Education and Program Coordinator, English Education/The Teaching of English	\$1,100
Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor of Child Development and Education, Teachers College and College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; Co-director, National center for Children and Families; Co-director, Columbia University Institute for Child and Family Policy	\$1,100

¹ Ryes, Cecilia 2013 Teachers College faculty vote not to support proposed 2013-14 budget *Columbia Spectator* May 10 accessed <http://www.columbiaspectator.com/2013/05/10/teachers-college-faculty-vote-not-support-proposed-2013-14-budget> on February 19,2014

² "Teacher's College 990 Tax Form from 2010-11 fiscal year" accessed <http://www.scribd.com/doc/140725231/Teachers-College-s-990-Tax-Form>, February 19, 2014

Setting aside for a moment the politics of particular types of compensation packages, and who knew what about compensation when, these numbers tell a story. Bonuses for senior administrators are at a minimum 22 times higher than that of the highest paid professor. At a maximum the bonus is 81 times greater than that given to the highest paid professor. And this is not limited to the people charged with administering the college—the President, Provosts, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The General Counsel and the President’s Chief of Staff are also receiving 22 times more in supplementary compensation than the most senior professors. This was against the backdrop of a projected staff reduction of ten administrative and ten academic positions. If one of the ways an institution shows who it values is via pay, then these bonuses tell a story of lopsided priorities.

So in a sense, our project grew out of the simple question: How could the faculty and administration of the school we attend be so out of step that compensation of administrators would come as a surprise to faculty, such that the administrators’ own budget would get voted down 101 to 1 with one abstention? Any consideration of these issues quickly leads one to the nationwide debates and conflicts over the state of universities. Far from being an anomaly³, university presidential pay is going up nationwide; the *Chronicle of Higher Education* notes that 180 university presidents are earning more than \$500,000 in total compensation in 2011, compared with 50 in 2004⁴. This ballooning is not limited to the president’s office. Benjamin Ginsberg, who gave us the terms deanlings and deanlets, argues that the functions and operations of the university are increasingly being usurped by a class of full time administrators with no desire to step back into teaching⁵. It seems that the only thing that has stayed steady or declined is the plight of adjunct faculty and indebted grad students, increasingly relied upon to teach core program content⁶.

And all this brings us back to TC. The way we decided to learn about the institution was to talk to everyone who was listed as having a budget line in the Fiscal Year 2014 TC budget. This meant talking to administrators, department heads and managers for the forty offices and departments of the college. At each office we asked all the things the office did, how the individual got the job, what they thought of their office’s budget, what they thought of how their office fits at TC. We also asked them to complete a pile sort⁷ of all the offices at the College⁸.

³ TC’s form 990 lists the President’s total compensation at \$625,231.

⁴ 2013 Executive Compensation at Private Colleges, 2011 *The Chronicle of Higher Education* December 15 accessed <http://chronicle.com/article/Executive-Compensation-at/143541#id=table> February 19, 2014; see also Lewin, Tamar 2013 Pay for U.S. College Presidents Continues to Grow *New York Times* December 15 accessed <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/16/us/pay-for-us-college-presidents-continues-to-grow.html?ref=us&r=0> February 19, 2014

⁵ Ginsberg, Benjamin 2013 *The Fall of the Faculty* Oxford: Oxford University Press

⁶ Sanchez, Claudio 2013 The Sad Death of and Adjunct Professor Sparks Debate *NPR* September 22 accessed <http://www.npr.org/2013/09/22/224946206/adjunct-professor-dies-destitute-then-sparks-debate> February 19, 2014; see also the Website of the New Faculty Majority <http://www.newfacultymajority.info/equity/> February 19, 2014; see also Student Loan Statistics from the American Student Assistance <http://www.asa.org/policy/resources/stats/> February 19, 2014

⁷ A pile sort is an anthropological technique for seeing what groups of people see as similar or different. In this case people would take a pile of forty index cards, one for each office at TC and create piles of what they thought went together. Anthropologists then use a computer program to do a multidimensional scaling of all of the piles to mathematically and visually see what people thought went with what. For a further explanation see Weller, Susan C.

Two things are immediately apparent when looking at the budget and our data. First, of listed budget lines in FY '13, \$48,463,978 is spent on the departments and programs, and \$93,192,617 was spent on everything else⁹, a rough ratio of 2:1. Our pile sort reflects this split. The ten academic departments are clustered tightly, academic services are clustered a bit less tightly and both are separate from senior administrative functions. So when people show their understanding of TC physically, they put academic departments all together and very far from the senior administration of the college. A visualization of the pile sort follows this section.

In what follows we will explain the nature of this administrative faculty divide at Teachers College, how it manifests, and what different attitudes and understandings of the institution flow from it. It is our assertion that this split and all the baggage that comes with it is the logic behind faculty disempowerment, rising tuition, and poor working condition for adjuncts and graduate students. To that end, we have sections on 1) Attitudes and Values at TC, 2) Students and Tuition, 3) Faculty, 4) Senior Administrators, and 5) Conclusions and Recommendations. What is more, our recommendations will seek to structurally address this schism.

One final note: in pursuing our work we have run into a peculiar intransigence. Often when someone is skeptical of our project they will give one of two objections. The first objection is some combination of everything is natural, everything makes sense, or one cannot even imagine changing things. This imputes an unwarranted fixity to the College. Our rebuttal to this is simply that people can and have changed things here. Often change comes from the President's Office¹⁰, but occasionally change is the fruit of deliberation and shared governance¹¹. We aim to join the ranks of the latter. The second and more confusing objection is the dual argument that on the one hand every policy recommendation must be accompanied with a litany of comparable cases from our peer institutions to justify institutional action, and that on the other hand Teachers College is a superlative place and there can be no comparison. This dual argument taken in tandem can veto any idea that someone in power does not like. Either Teachers College need not listen to alternatives because it is special, or Teachers College requires research and evidence ad nauseam to make a persuasive case for change. We take full notice of the way in which these arguments can be marshaled to stifle the opinions of those out of power, regardless of the merit of their ideas. We are students of the College. By virtue of the principles of shared governance we have a right to critique and shape the organization of our College.

and A. Kimball Romney 1988 *Systematic Data Collection* London: Sage Publications, Chapter 2 and 3. The computer program we used was Borgatti, S.P. 1996. *ANTHROPAC 4.0*. Natick, MA: Analytic Technologies

⁸ There is an expanded methods section at the end of this report.

⁹ Keen and informed readers will note that this sums to \$141,656,595 whereas TC's total expenses are \$228,043,000. This gap is not reflected in the forty departments itemized in the budget. Some of it likely goes to scholarship, debt servicing, and capital projects, but we do not know how these things are allocated and where they are managed.

¹⁰ Take the reorganization of departments under President Levine.

¹¹ Take the Office of Teacher Education and School Based Support Services.

Disparate Attitudes and Values on Campus: A Fragmented Institution?

Through our conversations, we saw a clear separation in attitudes across different groups at the College, varying by where people fit within the existing TC structure. Three distinct categories stood out: faculty, office managers, and senior administration. The attitudes and values expressed — particularly the sometimes stark differences — are troubling in the sense that TC feels like a ship without a rudder.

Last year the Faculty voted down the College’s budget. In light of this, we were not surprised then that we heard strong feelings from our faculty about what TC’s budget represents. As one department head put it, “Ultimately, the budget is the expression of what we care about and what we value. The fact that there isn’t a strong sense of mission that animates and inspires us is evidenced through this budget.” The attitudes regarding TC’s structure ranged from indignation to resignation and from pragmatism to frustration. While there was praise for the work of the Vice President for Finance and Administration, we heard consistent concerns from the majority of department heads about student funding, about not being able to offer more colloquia and departmental programs due to funding issues, and about institutional priorities. Although the department heads’ perspectives indicated a strong pulse on students’ concerns, we also heard about faculty’s perceived lack of agency in how they are involved in steering the direction of the institution. There was a time when faculty were more involved in the administration of the college, but over the past decade, we have seen a growth in the representation of non-faculty administrators in the higher education work-force.¹²

In speaking to senior administration, we heard a sense of mission and purpose – but exactly what that mission and purpose is was unclear, not only to us but also to the faculty. We heard consistent remarks that “this is the way higher education is, so we are no different from other institutions in trying to address issues of funding and governance.” Senior administration, for the most part, seemed to express a sense that things were working well and that the “budget is informational” or “transparent.” In our conversations about office budgets, we heard a bit more defensiveness in how resources are utilized. Across the board, most administration offered implicit trust in the President’s vision for the College. While we, as students, appreciated the general willingness of the administration to sit down with us, they were also cautious, and perhaps slightly skeptical of what the Student Senate’s Institutional Affairs Committee hoped to accomplish.

The third group we identified was office managers and staff. These individuals lead offices that provide essential services around the College. From them, we heard a number of attitudes that ranged from inspiration or mild satisfaction to true impatience. Those in charge of these offices felt they were doing what they were supposed to and were less worried about the umbrella politics that might be happening elsewhere in the College. Some relayed very positive attitudes, noting “there were good people working at the College.” Some were a little less enthused, wondering whether the budgets of non-teaching offices should be limited. Overall, however, a dispassionate nonchalance suffused with the sense that the offices are serving students in the way that institutions of higher education are supposed to, and a recognition that decisions regarding

¹² Carlson, S. (2014, February 5). “Administrator Hiring Drove 28% Boom in Higher-Ed Work Force, Report Says.” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

the direction of the college would be left to senior administration.

As student leaders, we know that very few students are free from financial burden or debt; we see attitudes range from apathy and blithe satisfaction to frustration and anger. Everyone knows that tuition is exorbitant, and that tuition only rises. In spite of these emotive and disgruntled overtones, many students also hold a paradoxical reverence for their professors and are exceptionally happy with their programs. But as a collective, there is grave concern that an institution charged with preparing us for careers in public service-oriented fields is paying for itself on the backs of already-strapped students.

From our interviews, three major themes emerged that we believe ought to drive the dialogue about how to ensure TC can truly be a global leader in education and in the way it treats its faculty and students: agency, priorities, and trust. Both faculty and students expressed frustration with their sense of agency (or lack thereof) in the actual decision-making at TC. While the senior administration discussed a sense of mission, beyond “Celebrating a Tradition for Tomorrow” or “Where the Future Comes First,” that mission is left unclear and unexplained to the rest of the college. The priorities reflected in the college’s budget point to an unsustainable and questionable model that follows the general trends in higher education of offering lavish compensation for a select few while noting potential cuts to faculty positions and continuing to raise tuition for the majority of students. Finally, trust. It is implicitly understood that the priorities of the College flow from the College’s leadership; however, trust in leadership must come from an actual demonstration that students and faculty are the priority of the College. We see this coming from true shared governance, governance where faculty or students can actually oppose or propose or shape the priorities of the College.

TC calls itself a leader in a number of fields, but instead of cohesion and shared mission we saw silos across the College – offices and departments that were focused only on their area of work. In terms of running an organization, it makes sense to specialize by offices and departments — but only if everything works *together*. What we have at TC is a fragmented and frustrated cluster of individuals and programs. Communities can form and silos can break down when we allow for work on shared values, but the structure of TC works against us embracing these values. Absent a solution that addresses TC’s structure, and thereby its ability to cultivate its shared values, TC will be nothing but a famous follower in higher education.

Students and Tuition: The road to debtor's prison is lined with the best education

As noted in the introduction, one part of Teachers College's budget from the spring of 2013 was a 4.5 percent tuition increase. This puts tuition at \$1,344 per credit hour. This is the highest it has ever been in both nominal and real dollars. The difference between nominal and real dollars has to do with inflation. The nominal amount is the actual historic price of tuition. The real amount is when you figure out how much money the nominal amount would be worth today. To give some perspective, just twenty years ago in the 1993-94 school year, tuition was \$520 in nominal dollars and \$820 in 2013 dollars¹³. So 2013 tuition prices represent a 61 percent increase in the real cost of a tuition point at Teachers College. This more or less tracks national statistics for private undergraduate college cost, which have increased 42 percent between 2000-01 and 2010-11¹⁴. That the cost of college is going up most everywhere is no secret; and that Teachers College gets more unaffordable each year is hardly profound. What we do about this fact is the point of this section.

We aim to do the following: 1) to address some of the common explanations we have heard for why tuition is as high as it is, 2) to show a number of alternative tuition rates drawn from TC's own history and other universities, and 3) to argue for an attitude towards tuition that directly links affordability to Teachers College's ability to achieve its mission. Put simply, higher tuition means more student debt. More student debt means fewer people going into poorly paid altruistic professions. If the people we educate cannot pursue their chosen professions, we have failed. This is why tuition must come down.

The President met with the Student Senate this past fall. In the course of the conversation, tuitions levels came up. The President noted that this is an expensive place to receive an education and tuition levels always go up. In real terms this is incorrect. Prior to 1967-68 tuition would hold at a particular nominal amount for a number of years. Tuition stayed at \$55 per credit for 1965-66 and 1966-67 (a drop from \$408 to \$397 in 2013 dollars). Tuition stayed at \$25 per credit from 1952-53 through 1956-57 (a drop from \$220 to \$214 in 2013 dollars). And tuition stayed at \$12.50 per credit from 1935-36 through 1945-46, ten whole years (a drop from \$213 to \$162 in 2013 dollars). Surely there were presidents who dreamed big dreams and wanted to expand the College prior to 1967. Surely there were trustees who wanted to keep faculty salaries competitive. Surely our buildings were difficult to maintain. But for whatever reason the belief in year-on-year nominal tuition increases had not taken hold. Even in broader terms we can divide tuition levels at TC into rough epochs. We know that tuition remains below \$200 in 2013 dollars from 1915-16 through 1934-35, twenty years. We also know that tuition remains below \$520 in 2013 dollars from 1935-36 to 1981-82, just shy of fifty years. Finally, we know that from 1981-82 onward tuition soars and never looks back, breaking \$1,000 in 2013 dollars in 2002-03.

Our review shows a few things about tuition at TC. First and foremost, tuition has not always gone up; in fact, for long stretches it stayed stable in nominal terms and declined in real terms. Second, for most of its history, TC has been relatively affordable, given current options. To take

¹³ All inflation adjusted numbers were calculated in October of 2013 using the bureau of labor statistics inflation adjustor found here http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

¹⁴“National Center for Education Statistics, Fast Facts” accessed <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=76> February 19, 2014

one example, at the CUNY grad center for the 2013-14 school year part time doctoral students pay \$465 per credit if they are in-state and \$795 per credit if they are out of state¹⁵. This fits well into the rates of TC's second most affordable epoch 1935-36 through 1981-82 where tuition never exceeds \$520 in 2013 dollars. This suggests that there was a different conception of what tuition should be and what counts as affordable. TC's mission has not changed. Our willingness to accept extortionate tuition and the onerous debt burden that comes with it has.

So what else is out there? First, it should be noted that both UPenn and Stanford schools of education offer guaranteed full doctoral scholarship for their first four and five years respectively¹⁶. Stanford also notes that most of its master's students receive some kind of award. Second, some schools offer a higher fee that covers as many courses as a student might take. Berkeley's school of education charges \$7,900.75 per semester for in state tuition, and \$15,451.75 for out of state students (it should be noted that this includes health insurance)¹⁷. A 12-credit student's tuition at most is \$658.40 per credit for in state tuition and 1,287.58 per credit for out of state tuition. So our competitors, both public and private, fund their students at different levels than we do. In addition to these outside comparisons, we should remember, as noted above, that TC has also funded things differently for most of our history.

To its credit, the administration of Teachers College has made student funding a priority. This past year it added 50 funding packages for incoming doctoral students. Administrators have also created a one-time scholarship in celebration of the 125th anniversary of Teachers College, which will give \$10,000 to 90 students. We admire these efforts and appreciate every bit we can get as students. However, the larger point remains—there are over 5,000 students (including over 1,000 doctoral students) at Teachers College, and we want to make TC's education affordable for all of them.

We know that for most of its history, TC has been much more affordable than it is now. We also know that there is no current commitment to making TC affordable for all students. On the contrary the past thirty years of tuition increases seems to suggest that TC sees its student as a bottomless resource, content with allowing students to accumulate an absurd amount of debt, becoming the first generation in decades that will not earn more than the preceding generation¹⁸. We also know that scholarship and work opportunity is scattered; and we did not hear of guaranteed funding for research. The professors we spoke with sounded off again and again about the capricious and opaque nature of funding at the College. And most students, should they be fortunate enough to qualify for federal student aid to help with the cost of attending TC, rely on federal loans, while still others who do not qualify for federal aid must rely on private loans.

¹⁵ "CUNY Graduate Center Tuition Rates 2013-14" accessed http://www.gc.cuny.edu/CUNY_GC/media/CUNY-Graduate-Center/PDF/Registrar/Tuition_2013-14.pdf February 19, 2014

¹⁶ "UPenn GSE Planning for your future: Tuition and Aid" http://www.gse.upenn.edu/admissions_financial/finaid February 19, 2014; and Stanford Graduate School of Education Financing Your Degree" accessed <https://ed.stanford.edu/admissions/financing/doctoral> February 19, 2014

¹⁷ "University of California, Berkeley, Graduate School of Education: Fees and Financial Support" accessed <http://gse.berkeley.edu/fees-and-financial-support> February 19, 2014

¹⁸ Pew Research 2014 "The Rising Cost of Not Going to College" accessed <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2014/02/11/the-rising-cost-of-not-going-to-college/> February 19, 2014

Based on the above, we could now make several arguments for different tuition levels. \$1,000 per credit hour would bring us in a bit below our private peers for their unfunded students (which again, at the doctoral level don't exist). We could target \$520 a point, which fits much more within TC's historic average. We could even go to a flat semester fee, say \$6,000-\$10,000 for a full time student, which might encourage people to finish quicker and lower the per point as Berkeley does. The larger issue though is that unless we make affordability a priority and build some mechanism to lower and keep in check tuition all of this will be immediately dismissed and derided. We've heard repeatedly that this is a tuition dependent institution, that tuition never goes down, that TC is a luxury good. We reject this way of thinking. We say these things to ourselves because we have not decided to make affordability a priority. TC managed to carry itself just fine for the 50 years when tuition never cracked \$520 in 2013 dollars. If affordability is not a priority, students will continue to go into debt, unable to do good work that doesn't pay well.

Historic Tuition Appendix

All tuition and university fees were taken from course catalogues for the given year. All inflation adjustments were done using the Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation adjustor, which can be found at http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

Year	Tuition Rate	Amount in 2013	Percent real change	University Fee	Amount in 2013
2013-2014	\$1,344.00	\$1,344.00	2.60%	\$408.00	\$408.00
2012-2013	\$1,286.00	\$1,309.99	2.35%	\$398.00	\$405.42
2011-2012	\$1,231.00	\$1,279.91	1.30%	\$388.00	\$403.42
2010-2011	\$1,178.00	\$1,263.47	2.84%	\$378.00	\$405.43
2009-2010	\$1,127.00	\$1,228.60	4.24%	\$368.00	\$401.17
2008-2009	\$1,085.00	\$1,178.60	1.44%	\$358.00	\$388.88
2007-2008	\$1,030.00	\$1,161.82	2.72%	\$340.00	\$383.51
2006-2007	\$975.00	\$1,131.10	1.02%	\$320.00	\$371.23
2005-2006	\$935.00	\$1,119.69	3.36%	\$240.00	\$287.41
2004-2005	\$875.00	\$1,083.34	3.31%	\$210.00	\$260.00
2003-2004	\$825.00	\$1,048.63	3.41%	\$190.00	\$241.50
2002-2003	\$780.00	\$1,014.03	3.76%	\$185.00	\$240.51
2001-2002	\$740.00	\$977.24	2.06%	\$180.00	\$237.71
2000-2001	\$705.00	\$957.51	1.80%	\$170.00	\$230.89
1999-2000	\$670.00	\$940.56		\$150.00	\$210.57
1998-1999					
1997-1998	\$610.00	\$888.88		\$120.00	\$174.86
1996-1997					
1995-1996					
1994-1995	\$520.00	\$820.62	3.47%	\$100.00	\$157.84
1993-1994	\$490.00	\$793.08	3.43%	\$100.00	\$161.85
1992-1993	\$460.00	\$766.81	2.66%	\$100.00	\$166.70
1991-1992	\$435.00	\$746.96	4.36%	\$100.00	\$171.72
1990-1991	\$400.00	\$715.77	3.97%	\$100.00	\$178.94
1989-1990	\$365.00	\$688.43	0.93%	\$95.00	\$179.18
1988-1989	\$345.00	\$682.06	1.94%	\$110.00	\$217.47
1987-1988	\$325.00	\$669.10	1.15%	\$100.00	\$205.88
1986-1987	\$310.00	\$661.51	5.67%	\$100.00	\$213.39
1985-1986	\$288.00	\$625.99	4.94%	\$100.00	\$217.36
1984-1985	\$265.00	\$596.51	5.85%	\$100.00	\$225.10
1983-1984	\$240.00	\$563.56	5.70%	\$95.00	\$223.08
1982-1983	\$220.00	\$533.19	9.07%	\$90.00	\$218.12
1981-1982	\$190.00	\$488.85	4.38%	\$90.00	\$231.56

1980-1981	\$165.00	\$468.32	-1.10%	\$80.00	\$227.07
1979-1980	\$147.00	\$473.55	-2.21%	\$80.00	\$257.72
1978-1979	\$135.00	\$484.25	-2.73%	\$70.00	\$251.09
1977-1978	\$129.00	\$497.86	-3.10%	\$65.00	\$250.86
1976-1977	\$125.00	\$513.79	12.56%	\$65.00	\$267.17
1975-1976	\$105.00	\$456.45	0.23%	\$35.00	\$152.15
1974-1975	\$96.00	\$455.42	-7.03%	\$30.00	\$142.32
1973-1974	\$93.00	\$489.88	-5.85%	\$30.00	\$158.03
1972-1973	\$93.00	\$520.33	0.12%	\$60.00	\$335.71
1971-1972	\$90.00	\$519.73	1.44%	\$60.00	\$346.48
1970-1971	\$85.00	\$512.36	3.74%	\$60.00	\$361.67
1969-1970	\$77.50	\$493.88	4.98%	\$50.00	\$318.63
1968-1969	\$70.00	\$470.44	3.36%	\$50.00	\$336.03
1967-1968	\$65.00	\$455.15	14.64%	\$50.00	\$350.12
1966-1967	\$55.00	\$397.01	-2.78%	\$50.00	\$360.92
1965-1966	\$55.00	\$408.36	20.28%	\$50.00	\$371.23
1964-1965	\$45.00	\$339.50	-1.29%	\$50.00	\$377.22
1963-1964	\$45.00	\$343.94	11.03%	\$50.00	\$382.15
1962-1963	\$40.00	\$309.77	-0.99%	\$24.00	\$185.86
1961-1962	\$40.00	\$312.88	7.02%	\$24.00	\$187.73
1960-1961	\$37.00	\$292.35	-1.69%	\$24.00	\$189.63
1959-1960	\$37.00	\$297.37	22.49%	\$24.00	\$192.89
1958-1959	\$30.00	\$242.78	-2.77%	\$24.00	\$194.22
1957-1958	\$30.00	\$249.69	16.16%	\$24.00	\$199.75
1956-1957	\$25.00	\$214.96	-1.47%	\$24.00	\$206.36
1955-1956	\$25.00	\$218.17	0.37%	\$20.00	\$174.54
1954-1955	\$25.00	\$217.36	-0.74%	\$20.00	\$173.89
1953-1954	\$25.00	\$218.99	-0.75%	\$20.00	\$175.19
1952-1953	\$25.00	\$220.64	22.64%	\$20.00	\$176.51
1951-1952	\$20.00	\$179.91	-7.31%	\$10.00	\$89.95
1950-1951	\$20.00	\$194.09	-0.23%	\$10.00	\$97.04
1949-1950	\$20.00	\$194.54	0.23%	\$10.00	\$98.27
1948-1949	\$20.00	\$194.09	23.37%	\$10.00	\$97.04
1947-1948	\$15.00	\$157.32	-12.56%	\$10.00	\$104.88
1946-1947	\$15.00	\$179.91	10.78%	\$10.00	\$119.94
1945-1946	\$12.50	\$162.41	-2.23%	\$10.00	\$129.93
1944-1945	\$12.50	\$166.11	-1.70%	\$10.00	\$132.88
1943-1944	\$12.50	\$168.99	-5.78%	\$10.00	\$135.19
1942-1943	\$12.50	\$179.35	-9.82%	\$10.00	\$143.48
1941-1942	\$12.50	\$198.88	-4.76%	\$10.00	\$159.10

1940-1941	\$12.50	\$208.82	-0.71%	\$10.00	\$167.06
1939-1940	\$12.50	\$210.32	1.44%	\$10.00	\$168.26
1938-1939	\$12.50	\$207.34	2.13%	\$10.00	\$165.87
1937-1938	\$12.50	\$203.02	-3.47%	\$10.00	\$162.41
1936-1937	\$12.50	\$210.32	-1.44%	\$10.00	\$168.26
1935-1936	\$12.50	\$213.39	22.26%	\$10.00	\$170.71
1934-1935	\$10.00	\$174.54	-2.88%	\$20.00	\$349.07
1933-1934	\$10.00	\$179.71	5.27%	\$10.00	\$179.71
1932-1933	\$10.00	\$170.71	10.94%	\$10.00	\$170.71
1931-1932	\$10.00	\$153.87	9.87%	\$10.00	\$153.87
1930-1931	\$10.00	\$140.05	2.40%	\$10.00	\$140.05
1929-1930	\$10.00	\$136.77	0.00%	\$10.00	\$136.77
1928-1929	\$10.00	\$136.77	1.76%	\$10.00	\$136.77
1927-1928	\$10.00	\$134.41	1.73%	\$10.00	\$134.41
1926-1927	\$10.00	\$132.13	-1.13%	\$6.00	\$79.28
1925-1926	\$10.00	\$133.64	22.13%	\$6.00	\$80.19
1924-1925	\$8.00	\$109.42	0.00%	\$6.00	\$82.06
1923-1924	\$8.00	\$109.42	-1.75%	\$6.00	\$82.06
1922-1923	\$8.00	\$111.37	6.54%	\$6.00	\$83.53
1921-1922	\$8.00	\$104.53	11.74%	\$6.00	\$78.39
1920-1921	\$8.00	\$93.55	15.34%	\$6.00	\$70.16
1919-1920	\$6.00	\$81.11	-12.72%	\$5.00	\$67.59
1918-1919	\$6.00	\$92.93	-15.23%	\$5.00	\$77.44
1917-1918	\$6.00	\$109.63	-14.84%	\$5.00	\$91.36
1916-1917	\$6.00	\$128.74	-7.34%	\$5.00	\$107.28
1915-1916	\$6.00	\$138.94		\$5.00	\$115.78

Departments and Department Chairs

When we talked to the department heads, we immediately sensed the stress attached to the role. Time is not money to them; rather time rarely exists. We felt extremely fortunate and thankful to have the opportunity to share time with them and hear their perspectives on how they viewed their job and their role in Teachers College. It was variously described as a service, as bureaucratic, and sometimes as something that one had to do. Adding to this was an undercurrent that many of the departments both in organization and structure did not make much sense anyway. We heard from various chairs that the current nonsensical division of departments and programs led to a sense that people associated based on feelings and loyalties of individuals rather than disciplinary or academic formation. This starts to get at the disconnect and cacophony of voices a department head faces when presiding over programs and disciplines not only foreign to his or her own, but also with little budget and little power to shape the course of departmental research.

So who are the professors of Teachers College? The hope is that they are esteemed and respected experts in their field who not only love their discipline and foci of research but also privilege their time to their students first; they are first and foremost teachers. We interviewed almost all department chairs to hear how they saw their role, their budget, and their impact. It seems that the role of department head or a seat on the Faculty Executive Committee is a service and volunteer option that many professors avoid because it takes away from their scholarship and student focus without many notable returns. Although this is true, faculty serve in this position regardless, either because they value the institution as a whole or they were next in line. There are clear expectations attached to this role such as attending monthly meetings, signing off on paperwork, and negotiating inter-departmental as well as College-wide affairs. The job in reality seems to require focused energy, in fact, on negotiating needs within the department and micromanaging a minuscule discretionary budget (that faculty unanimously claim has been the same for years), as well as lots of paper work.

As ill-defined as department heads claimed their position to be, several different chair-styles emerged. Some were go-getters. Several department chairs said they were working hard to find ways to raise more money externally for the department since their discretionary budget was so small and their PhD students needed more funding. Other department chairs took a more detached approach stating that everyone is an adult and the role was meant to just advocate for the department as needed.

What then do we make of this wide spread discomfort with departmental leadership? First, in contrast to most of the senior administrators and vice presidents we talked to, most faculty have either small or non-existent discretionary funds to pursue research or their own work. Second, the institution supports the initiatives of senior administrators who in turn bestow largess on faculty; faculty has little to no control over institutional funds coming to their own research. Third, the departments that faculty are expected to lead make little sense. Housing disparate programs and a variety of academic disciplines, it can be hard to find a critical mass of faculty who are all on the same page regarding what they want to do. Starved of discretionary resources and presiding over confusing academic domains, it is small wonder that the job can hold little appeal. Again this is in contrast to senior administrators and vice presidents who noted that it was their job to connect the disparate parts of the college. The irony is that the departments and

programs are scrambled and nonsensical due to the last Administrative push to reorganize the college. And one response to this was, “Well, it was worse before.”

If the chairs see themselves as and are treated like little bureaucrats instead of people who can sway the direction of the college and the allocation of its resources, then they may resent so-called leadership work. Bureaucracy within departments and beyond, as we can discern, is meant to control, to limit, and to maintain status quo of distrust and individualized orientations. This in turn gives administrators the ability to bridge bureaucratic gaps and to innovate. Rather than promoting collaboration and equity between programs or between departments, the power structure and miniscule budgets create a scenario where the senior administration wins and the faculty loses.

As a Student Senate, we are undeniably proud of our faculty’s accomplishments as scholars. It is why we were drawn here. So we ask the question: Whereas the cost of education is skyrocketing and students are asking for real shared governance, for transparency of processes, and for trust, how might we empower faculty in shaping their own institution? Their vote on rejecting the budget this past spring shows the potential for meaningful shared governance. But without access to resources and decision-making power we see no end to the chair’s malaise.

Senior Administration

The oral history of TC we collected in our interviews reflects a general trend in higher education, a trend where administrators have become an overwhelming part of the college. The idea is that administrative bloat— or the unfettered growth of non-teaching, non-faculty administrative jobs — is becoming more normal at institutions of higher education.¹⁹ This trend comes at a time when tuition costs are at unprecedented levels, and students are graduating more indebted than ever. In contrast to the trend we note, and that many told us about, a number of senior administrators assumed that current staffing levels are normal for running an institution such as TC. We argue that this disjuncture is an opportunity to contest this structure and to make the institution more student and faculty focused.

The administration at TC heads up various offices, ranging from the Provost's Office to the Office of School and Community Partnerships. Beyond the senior staff, there are a number of vice presidents that oversee other offices. As we learned from our interviews, many of these positions were created when the President arrived, thus creating a small circle of administrators close to her. Perhaps then it is no surprise that this group had the greatest grasp of an institutional mission, and was in fact positive about their prospects of working towards such a mission. While the growth in non-faculty executive positions mirrors national trends in higher education, we are concerned about this type of administrative expansion. Few individuals seem to be able to explain the context around which these positions came to be, yet some of these offices represent large allocations within the college's budget. Moreover, less blessed parts of TC notice the recent provenance of many of these offices and wonder, especially in cases where new offices are doing things other offices and departments did, why already existing work was not supported more.

In speaking with senior administration, we were also told that the budget process is natural and that the budget itself is transparent. When compared to the non-administrative interviews, this perspective was in a small minority. We want to acknowledge that some offices are paying for themselves. For example, the Office of School and Community Partnerships raises over \$2.5 million per year from outside funding, which is nearly five times what TC provides in base funding. On the other hand, other offices are less certain in terms of what additional value they bring. The Office of International Affairs and the Office of International Advancement is run by another administrator with a title that is accompanied by significant salary. Yet there is little clarity or reason for why another VP was needed to do work that was already occurring at TC.

Other members of the senior administration see their roles as “connectors” who help bridge gaps in information between students, faculty, and staff. Yet, we question whether having such handsomely compensated connectors makes sense for TC when we are faced with such high tuition and departmental budgets that can barely fund student research, travel grants, and additional academic programming. Can we really claim that there is not enough money to fund our students when we have so many administrators earning well over \$250,000? Is TC truly pursuing a student-centered approach when faculty members are “begging” for funding to meet departmental needs? Many questions still remain for the senior administration in terms of how

¹⁹ Delta Cost Project 2014 “Labor Intensive or Labor Expensive? Changing Staffing and Compensation Patterns in Higher Education” accessed <http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/DeltaCostAIR-Labor-Expensive-Higher-Education-Staffing-Brief-Feb2014.pdf> February 19, 2014

they interpret our institutional priorities.

There seems to be a larger logic to recent administrative growth at TC. In the face of whatever perceived problems there have been at Teachers College, rather than rationalize, change, or support existing structures and functions, the College has added on new layers of administrative function. These new layers answer directly to the highest parts of TC's management, do not have the autonomy of traditional academic departments, and are able to claim the status of institutional connector. But, the institution can only have connectors if there is something dysfunctional about the underlying structures.

So, what can senior administration do next? There are a number of possibilities, though none will be feasible without the commitment and buy-in of those who are charged with leading TC. The first is at the administrative level of the college: we need to eliminate redundant processes and offices. As part of this process, we would propose that offices that are not effectively serving TC's mission or that duplicate work already done in academic departments be eliminated. Furthermore, we would propose a salary cap for administrators, draw administrators from within the faculty for multi-year, but limited, service rotations, and that we cease the practice of creating new vice president positions for every new initiative. Ultimately, TC has an obligation to lead in the world of higher education as a forward-thinking institution dedicated to creating a sustainable model. Without an overhaul of how our senior administration leads the institution, we will not be able to build on our teaching excellence and ensure that financial barriers do not limit the best and brightest from studying at TC.

Coda

As a result of our endeavor to gather information, we are clear that the “Teachers College Way” is no longer clear to anyone except to those at the top. They have a vision, a mission, and a campaign, summed as “Where the Future Comes First.”

If the budget is informational and is telling a story, then our close reading has uncovered that our school is not unified, our processes are not transparent, and our people do not trust one another. It does not take a quote search through hundreds of thousands of famous thinkers to offer the much needed wisdom that these signs are harbingers of a budget and a story that will not have a happy ending for our indebted students.

Perhaps it is youthful naiveté that we believe we have the time and the agency to change our story. We know the administration wants what is best for students and the institution. We know faculty want what is best for students and the institution. We all want Teachers College to be a beacon for progressive education and scholarship for a long time to come. Throughout this process, we listened to the people of Teachers College, and we appreciate how they not only listened to our questions but also offered us sincere answers. We are indebted to them for their time and thankful for the respect they have shown us. Now that we have talked to the players in our story, we realize that we are not alone in our belief that it is time for 1) affordability, 2) shared governance, 3) administrative retreat, and 4) faculty empowerment.

Understanding is no longer enough. We want our dissatisfaction, our confusion, and our voice--as students--to be a meaningful part of change. In sum, we are asking for real shared governance.

Students are the future. We want to know: Do we really come first?

Methods

We enumerated and repeated the goal of our project in the above sections. This appendix will spell out what we asked and of whom.

Despite there being 40 budget lines in the document we were working from, we ended up talking to 34 offices. Some budget lines are gathered under one office (as in computing). And there were a few offices that we never managed to schedule a meeting with (like the post office). On the whole though, gathering our sample went well.

Interviews lasted from 20 minutes to well over an hour, depending on how much people wanted to talk. Our interview questions were open ended and designed to elicit broad categories and attitudes. We were not seeking particular feelings on specific issues. Our interview schedule follows.

Structured Basic Demographic

1. Could you please tell me a little bit about this office/department? How old is this department? How long has it been a part of the university?
2. Could you please tell me a bit about your job? How long have you worked this job? How did people usually get this job? How did you come to get it?
3. Could you please tell me all the things this office department does?

Open-Ended Elicit How They See the Budget

1. Here is your budget. How do you see it? Explain it. How do you perceive it working?
2. Pile-Sort of Departments “Here are a deck of cards, which is a breakdown of the units of the University. I want you to sort these in whatever ways you see fit. Please put like with like however you see it.”

One final note: At a fairly late stage in our research we heard a few people ask questions of whether this study is permissible under the College’s IRB guidelines. Setting aside for a moment that IRBs were only designed to address federally funded research²⁰, there are several categories of research that the College’s training modules say are not human subjects research. One such type of study includes:

Information-gathering interviews where questions focus on things, products, or policies rather than about people or their thoughts regarding themselves are not human subjects research. Example: canvassing librarians about inter-library loan policies or rising journal costs²¹.

Since we were interested in how offices of the College operate and how they see their budgets and their place in the larger structure of Teachers College, we feel that our work falls within the above category of not human subjects research.

²⁰ Lederman, Rena 2006 The perils of working at home: IRB “mission creep” as context and content for an ethnography of disciplinary knowledges *American Ethnologist* 33(4) 482-491

²¹ Galves, Jackie, Susan L. Rose, Jennifer Hagemann and Monica Aburto 2012 “Students in Research” module for human subjects research training at Teachers College, Columbia University

Interviews

Title	Date
Finance and Administration, Vice President	November 5, 2013
Department of Mathematics, Science and Technology Chair	November 5, 2013
Office of Financial Aid Director	November 7, 2013
Department of Counseling and Clinical Psychology Chair	November 12, 2013
Office of the President, Chief of Staff and Deputy Chief of Staff	November 12, 2013
International Affairs and Advancement, Vice President	November 13, 2013
Department of Education Policy and Social Analysis Chair	November 13, 2013
Office of the Registrar and Doctoral Studies, Registrar	November 15, 2013
Office of Public Safety and Environmental Health	November 14, 2013
Office of the Vice Provost and Related Activities, Vice Provost	November 19, 2013
Office of Residential Service, Director	November 21, 2013
Office of the General Counsel, General Counsel	November 22, 2013
Academic Computing, Director	November 22, 2013
Development and External Affairs, Vice President	November 25, 2013
Office of Teacher Education and School Based Support Services, Vice Dean	December 2, 2013
Department of Human Development, Chair	December 5, 2013
Department of Organization and Leadership, Chair*	December 9, 2013
Department of Curriculum and Teaching, Chair	December 10, 2013
Controller	December 10, 2013
Department of Arts and Humanities, Chair	December 10, 2013
Gottesman Library, Director	December 10, 2013
Office of School and Community Partnerships, Director and Associate Vice President	December 11, 2013
Office of Diversity and Community Affairs, Vice President	December 11, 2013
Operations and Maintenance, Director	December 12, 2013
Department of Health and Behavioral Studies, Chair	December 12, 2013
Enrollment Services, Associate Dean	December 12, 2013
Department of Biobehavioral Sciences, Chair	December 12, 2013

Office of the Provost, Provost	December 16, 2013
Human Resources, Director	December 17, 2013
Department of International and Transcultural Studies, Chair	December 17, 2013
Institute for Minority and Urban Education, Director	December 17, 2013
Computing and Information Services, Director	December 18, 2013
Capital Projects, Director*	January 6, 2014
Teachers College Press, Director*	February 11, 2014

* No pile sort or pile sort not included.