

FINAL REPORT

Report to the Faculty, Administration, Corporation, and Students of YALE UNIVERSITY New Haven, Connecticut

By an Evaluation Team representing the
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
of the
New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc.

Prepared after study of the institution's self-evaluation report and a visit to the campus on
November 1-4, 2009

The members of the Team:

Chair: Morton O. Schapiro, President, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
Charles R. Beitz, Sanford Professor of Politics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ
Rebecca H. Brodigan, Vice President of Institutional Planning and Assessment, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME
John W. Etchemendy, Provost, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA
Daniel E. Hastings, Dean for Undergraduate Education, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA
Mohsen Mostafavai, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, MA
Julianne D. Ohotnicky, Dean of Student Affairs, Smith College, Northampton, MA
Barry P. Scherr, Provost, Dartmouth College, Dartmouth, NH
Peter J. Shea, Treasurer, Amherst College, Amherst, MA
Karin Wittenborg, University Librarian, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA

Assisted by: Alan K. Cubbage, Vice President for University Relations, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL

This report represents the views of the evaluation team as interpreted by the Chair. Its content is based on the committee's evaluation of the institution with respect to the Commission's criteria for accreditation. It is a confidential document in which all comments are made in good faith. The report is prepared both as an educational service to the institution and to assist the Commission in making a decision about the institution's accreditation status.

FINAL REPORT

Introduction

This report of the evaluation team of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc. is based on the information contained in Yale's self-study report and the team's visit to campus November 1-4, 2009. The team appreciates the openness and cooperation that it received from everyone with whom it met during its visit and particularly thanks Judith Hackman, Associate Dean for Assessment for Yale College, for her extraordinary assistance and guidance during the evaluation team's visit.

Since the most recent NEASC accreditation visit in 1999, Yale has made impressive progress on many issues, notably the continued physical improvement of campus, a change in the tenure process, development of an online course evaluation system and the internationalization of the student body and the curriculum.

Naturally, other issues have emerged over the subsequent decade. Our visiting team focused on the following:

- How to allocate financial resources in times when such resources are constrained much more than they have been in Yale's recent history.
- How best to develop the new West Campus.
- How to improve the experience of graduate students at Yale and increase their feeling of connection to the institution.
- How to improve interdisciplinary academic connections among Yale College and the University's graduate and professional schools.
- How to increase diversity, both within the faculty and among the leadership of the University.

While other issues, including those raised in the self-evaluation, are also discussed in the following report, these overarching issues merit being highlighted. Therefore, each of these will be discussed in greater detail in the report.

The NEASC delineates 11 standards to guide the evaluation of its institutions. Following is a discussion of each of those standards.

Standard One: Mission and Purpose

Yale University, some 75 years older than the United States itself, has been a leading institution of higher education in the United States during the more than 300 years of its existence. Under the leadership of President Levin, now in his seventeenth year in that role, the university has coped remarkably well with the issues that it faced during the 1990s: the need to remain at the very forefront of schools in the United States while both addressing rapid changes in the academic landscape and making the investments needed to deal with an aging physical plant. Today, the quality of its faculty and students, the renown of both the undergraduate college and its graduate and professional programs, and the impressive renovations of older buildings as well as the investments in newer structures make Yale a university to be admired.

FINAL REPORT

The university's overall mission statement clearly identifies its intention to remain one of the very best schools in the world, as it focuses on the goals of attracting and training the leaders of tomorrow while generating and disseminating knowledge. This central mission offers a broad plan for the institution in the shaping of the curriculum at the undergraduate level as well in the educational goals of its graduate and professional schools. The objectives that accompany the mission statement specify ancillary goals that provide further guidance for faculty, students and administrators, reminding all that Yale has an international role to play at the same time that it is also a force locally and regionally, that it is necessary to aim for excellence in all aspects of the institution's activities, and that it strives for inclusivity.

Appropriately for a university that includes, along with the undergraduate College, a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and a dozen professional schools, Yale has also worked to develop mission statements for each of its major academic units. The mission statements are concise and for the most part well-articulated. While a page under the university's main web site does include all the statements, their prominence both in catalogues and on the relevant web sites of the individual schools varies widely and is a matter that the schools could address in the coming years. Neither the mission statement for Yale College nor that for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences appears in the catalogues for those units of the university, though in both cases messages from the Deans of the respective areas, as well as key paragraphs near the beginning of those documents, articulate Yale's philosophy of education.

Yale has managed to maintain a strong emphasis on the teaching of undergraduates at the same time that its professional schools and its graduate programs in the arts and sciences are among the very best in the world. While the school faces new challenges in the current fiscal environment along with the ongoing need to keep moving forward in order to maintain its lofty position among American universities, an adherence to the ideals that are articulated in the mission statements of the entire university and of its component schools should serve it in good stead.

Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Planning: Planning at Yale resides with the senior officers of the University, who gather input broadly and then formulate plans. While there is no formal strategic plan, there are many component parts within the organization such as a facilities master plan, the financial equilibrium projection model and an overall academic plan. The new opportunity presented by the acquisition of the West Campus comprises a separate initiative and a new, senior-level officer of the college oversees that effort. Yale is to be commended for addressing major facilities maintenance issues in a very systematic fashion and appears to have a planning process in place so that maintenance levels of the current facilities inventory will continue to be impressive.

As acknowledged in the self-study, the challenge for Yale will be to shift gears to deal with a period of financial decline of unknown length. It is not evident how the institution will plan during the next ten years. Yale uses external reviews of academic departments for academic evaluation and might consider external reviews when there are key

FINAL REPORT

administrative vacancies at the University. This would give Yale a fresh look at some core services and could be used to support strategic cost-cutting initiatives and lead to some important and externally validated administrative efficiencies that would contribute to the necessary cost reductions. Indeed, the Standard Two chapter begins with a quote from the President identifying a goal of striving to be among the best universities at managing the enterprise.

Planning at Yale could benefit from including the academic deans in regular discussions, especially related to major initiatives.

Evaluation. All constituencies at Yale recognize the usefulness of evaluation or assessment of programs, structures, services and overall position and the need for constant questioning in order to improve services. Evaluation was not well supported by data in the self-study itself, but was very evident in additional background documents and meetings with various groups. For example, information in the E3 student forms was not very specific and did not articulate how data are being used to evaluate academic programs and student skills. However, in discussion with various campus faculty and administration, it became evident that the self-study is an incomplete story, and there is evidence of assessment activities related to student learning. Some of this evidence has not been widely shared with department chairs. Yale could more systematically articulate the assessment and evaluation efforts being done by the undergraduate college.

Development of a timeline and plan for assessing the new curriculum could be shared with department chairs and other faculty leaders. There are clearly committed faculty and administrators who embrace systematic review for improvement of learning and evaluation of curricular changes in order to improve the skills of graduates. Yale could benefit from highlighting these efforts and other institutions could benefit from learning of these efforts and approaches. Collecting a sampling of senior capstone projects would enable the development of rubrics for evaluating some specific student skills, and that information could be fed back to academic departments on a regular basis. In addition, systematic surveys of majors five years after graduation might provide valuable feedback to departments.

Some of the evidence of change at Yale was clearly stated in visiting team meetings but omitted from the self-study. For example, the Course of Study Committee review process was described in detail under Standard Two. Describing a change that has been made a result of this review process would have improved this section. Some curricular changes were clearly articulated in meetings with our team, but it also would be useful to develop an inventory of assessment activities and resulting changes to the college on an annual or continuing basis.

Yale is sitting on a vast cache of historical comparative undergraduate student satisfaction data. Academic and administrative departments could benefit from these data and they could be shared more widely without violating any consortia agreements. Indeed, "Yale by the Numbers" publicizes some of the historical satisfaction and basic undergraduate student data so that outside constituencies (students, parents, legislators)

FINAL REPORT

can easily access information about the University. Perhaps some of the self-reported student assessment data could also be added to this important effort to help make Yale a leader among universities in this area.

However, measuring graduate and professional student satisfaction has not been a priority at the University. An institutional or consortial effort in measuring satisfaction among this large population would provide some valuable assessment indicators and give the institution some baseline data.

The overall institutional assessment undertaken by the Corporation every five years is to be commended. During this uncertain financial period, this institutional assessment could be a very valuable tool for change and continue to strengthen the feeling of openness in support of the efforts of the current administration.

Standard Three: Organization and Governance

The Corporation

Yale University is governed by a Charter (Charter of 1701) that has been amended by the Connecticut General Assembly and the Yale Corporation several times, most recently in 1872.

The Yale Corporation consists of a 19-member governing body, including the University president, whose governance responsibilities are enumerated in the Charter. Members of the Corporation ("Fellows") are unpaid, independent volunteers who are deeply loyal to Yale and devote significant time and effort to their responsibilities as fellows of the Corporation. They are kept informed of the major strategic issues facing the university and participate, with the administration, in deliberations about future directions. Demonstrating sufficient independence to act in the institution's best interest, they keep Yale's distinctive mission and purpose in mind as they carry out their responsibilities.

The Corporation is actively engaged both in self-assessment and in assessment of the President and university. Their regular practice of self-assessment dates back to the work of the 1993-94 Ad Hoc Committee on Trusteeship. As part of this process, the Committee on Trusteeship reviews fellows for reappointment and is also considering mid-term assessment of individual members.

The Corporation also conducts five-year assessments of the President and the institution. These have been conducted most recently in 2004 and 2009. Each assessment includes information gathered directly from extensive interviews with faculty, staff, students, alumni and others. In addition, since 1999 the Corporation has made biannual fact-finding visits to peer institutions with a particular focus on areas in which Yale hopes to make improvements. These visits have proven very helpful to the Corporation and the university administration.

In addition to the five-year reviews, the Corporation conducts annual reviews of the past year's performance, based on specific goals set by the administration the preceding fall.

FINAL REPORT

The Corporation has an appropriate committee structure that has evolved as the needs of the institution have changed. Since the last review, a standing committee of the Corporation was added to address the School of Medicine. Also, the charter for the Audit Committee has been revised to include some "best practices" learned from other institutions and corporations. These changes include expanded responsibilities for this committee as well as additional meetings that include executive sessions. The Corporation, and the relationship between the Corporation and the university administration, functions extremely well. This structure is a source of real strength for the university that is appreciated by the institution's leadership team.

Internal Management Structure

President Levin has built one of the strongest management teams in higher education. The management team has expanded since the last review and the Evaluation Team found the additions to be appropriate for an institution of Yale's size and caliber. Several of the new offices focus on one or another of the many new compliance requirements facing the modern research university. This kind of expansion is typical of research universities around the country.

An important addition to the management team was a new vice president to oversee planning and development of the West Campus. The creation of this position acknowledges the strategic importance of the West Campus to the future of the university, and in particular to its goal of strengthening the sciences at Yale. The visiting team commends the university on this addition, on the vision that it is developing for the use of the facilities and on the initial steps that have been taken to carry out that vision. The West Campus offers an extraordinary opportunity that should not be wasted on expansion-as-usual. Locating exciting, interdisciplinary efforts on the new campus, whether in cancer biology or in materials restoration and preservation, will enable the university to maximize the benefit of this windfall.

The president has a group of external advisory boards that provide guidance on general matters (The University Council) as well as on specific topics (e.g., The President's Advisory Committee on Digital Yale). There are a variety of formal governance structures internal to Yale, including the Yale College Faculty, which meets monthly, and a variety of ad hoc committees appointed for specific limited purposes.

The visiting team recommends that the administration consider giving the school deans a larger role in setting the strategic vision for the university as a whole. Many universities rely heavily on a Deans' Council, consisting of the President, Provost and school deans, for formulating university-wide academic and strategic plans. Yale may want to give this group a more active role, particularly as it embarks on ambitious interdisciplinary ventures that cut across multiple school boundaries.

Student voices are engaged centrally and by individual schools through student committees such as the Yale College Council, the Graduate Student Assembly, and the Graduate and Professional Student Senate. These leadership groups meet regularly with relevant administrators, as well as annually with members of the Corporation. In addition,

FINAL REPORT

each of the twelve undergraduate colleges has an elected student leadership group that is intimately involved in the operation of the college. Student representatives are included on most committees that deal with student issues. Finally, the president holds weekly office hours and is generally accessible to students.

Yale University has an extremely effective administrative and governance structure. The financial uncertainties of the past year provided a stress test of that structure, and the structure has so far performed exceedingly well. In many meetings with faculty, staff, and students, the visiting team witnessed very high levels of morale and genuine confidence in the leadership provided by the President and his management team in dealing with the budget crisis.

Of course, the budget crisis is not over, and future reductions may prove harder to achieve than those taken this past year. Whether the university can manage in times of relative scarcity as well as it has managed through times of plenty remains to be seen. The management team will likely have to prioritize its goals to an extent to which it is not accustomed. This may pose a greater challenge to an institution used to seemingly unlimited resources than to institutions more accustomed to making hard choices.

One goal that the visiting team believes requires more attention is diversifying the leadership of the university. The highest levels of governance would benefit from the varied perspectives that come from individuals with a diversity of backgrounds. The university is to be commended for the excellent progress that has been made on this score at the level of the college masters and administrative deans, but continued efforts are needed at higher levels as well. The following data illustrate the issue.

		-----by Level-----					
		Total	--Women--		--Minorities--		
		N	N	%	N	%	
Executive Management		41	16	39.0%	3	7.3%	
School Deans		14	4	28.6%	0	0.0%	
College Masters		12	3	25.0%	3	25.0%	
Administrative Deans		49	26	53.1%	13	26.5%	

As can be seen, at the executive management and school deans level of 55 available positions, minority individuals hold

only 3. This number seems unusually low. Such a paucity of minority individuals in the senior leadership ranks will make it harder to attract and retain outstanding minority candidates who look to see what role models may exist for them. In addition, the situation serves as a barrier for students who are also looking for role models.

Standard Four: The Academic Program

Undergraduate Education

Yale should be commended for the serious attempt to rethink its core undergraduate curriculum through the Committee on the Yale College Education (CYCE) report. A number of major improvements to the culture and curriculum emerged from that report. These include the idea of a global educational experience for all Yale College students, the concept of many freshman seminars to introduce students to faculty, the greater use of

FINAL REPORT

course evaluations and uniform standards for all required courses. In particular, the distributional requirements, with their focus on skills as well as disciplinary areas, are excellent. We particularly like the idea of "travel some further distance." This encourages the students with stronger preparation to learn more and broaden their skills and knowledge base.

The globalization effort for all Yale College students is noteworthy, especially the decision to provide the necessary financial assistance for students. The program needs to be made sustainable for the long term and should have a clear statement as to what is being accomplished by this initiative. More generally, the reintegration of students into the curriculum after they return from an overseas experience is important. Yale should reflect on how to do this in ways that align with the expected outcomes for all Yale College students.

In the course of the visit, we found that Yale College had two committees that helped to assess existing courses, approve new courses and in one case, recommend that majors be shut down. These committees are the Course of Study committee and the Committee on Majors (a result of the last NEASC review). These committees have reviewed majors and courses in majors and set up feedback loops for the majors based on findings from student surveys. Yale's committee structure thus pays admirably close attention to the undergraduate curriculum.

As the reforms suggested in the CYCE progress, there are a number of areas for continued review and growth. The first is with respect to the use of teaching evaluations in systematic improvement of the quality of teaching in the majors. The online course evaluation system has proven its value for faculty and students. We believe that the course evaluations would be more useful if they were related to the expected learning outcomes for each course.

There are many good institutional claims for student achievement. However, the validating information lacks any substantive quantitative measures. This should be corrected.

The second area is the proliferation of majors. This was noted in the last full NEASC review. Yale has set up a Committee on Majors. However, it appears that only one major has been shut down, and it had only one student a year in it. Given that Yale has some 75 majors, many of which are very small, Yale College needs to act more aggressively in examining how cost-effective it is to maintain a large number of very small majors. In addition to cost effectiveness, it is worth examining whether the best learning occurs in very small units.

The third area that has been identified by both the self-study and by the students is effective advising. This is a recurring issue at many research universities – and at many liberal arts colleges as well. Students say repeatedly that they want better advising and mentoring and more interaction with faculty. On the other side, the faculty incentive and reward structure does not contain either "carrots or sticks" to encourage faculty to be

FINAL REPORT

deeply involved in a substantive mentoring role with students. Faculty in FAS receive residential college appointments to allow them to interact with students but we heard that the distribution of faculty interaction with students (through the social aspect of meals) was bimodally distributed. This is probably the small group who have high involvement with the undergraduates and the larger group of faculty who have little involvement. Yale might consider setting a leadership example among similar research universities by exploring how to incentivize faculty to mentor undergraduates. Such a scheme might be built around faculty research interests.

The fourth area is the freshman seminars. These arose from the CYCE report and are an exceptionally good idea. However, we heard many implementation issues that need to be addressed. These include resource allocations for faculty (both inside and outside FAS) to participate. In addition, it was reported that faculty teaching the seminars find them to be more work than other kinds of teaching. Such impediments tend to de-motivate faculty from participating. Since effective seminars can and should be a key initial part of the experience for Yale College students, it is imperative that the departments develop the right allocation and motivation scheme for faculty to participate in this exciting opportunity for students.

The fifth area is integration of writing into the science and engineering majors. Yale has an excellent writing requirement. Many courses have received the WR designation. All students have to take at least two WR distributional courses and they often take more than the required two classes. However there is no specific incentive for departments to participate and offer WR courses. Students in the sciences and engineering are shortchanged by not having enough WR courses in their majors. The appropriate integration of writing into their majors would reflect the professional lives that they are likely to lead once they graduate.

For the Yale College distributional requirements, the Science Council and Quantitative Reasoning Councils are good entities to vet the subjects. The self-study does indicate that there are problems with the QR subjects that need to be addressed. In terms of assessment, there should be some specific data on the courses approved or rejected and on how the councils assess courses. In particular, it would seem that the QR courses could be specifically assessed.

The Quantitative Reasoning requirement also is a good idea. It is hard to argue with the notion that leaders in the 21st century need to have a good quantitative sense. The QR requirement is also based around the "further distance travelled" idea, so that those who enter Yale with a stronger background are expected to do more advanced work. This leads to a large number of QR courses. The QR council vets all these courses, which ensures that all deal substantively with quantitative issues. This imposes a desirable level of uniformity on them. However, Yale does not have a minimum quantitative reasoning standard. This is surprising. It would be expected that a Yale graduating student should have at least a specific level of QR competency that can be expressed in a way similar to what is done with language skills.

FINAL REPORT

So far only one class has graduated under the CYCE requirements. When enough data can be accumulated, Yale College should rigorously assess, perhaps through a portfolio approach, whether the skills of critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, writing and language have reached some minimum standard. Yale will have to define this minimum standard.

Yale has many excellent professional schools. The use of more of their outstanding faculty and intellectual horsepower in the undergraduate program would substantially strengthen the offerings in Yale College. Given the interest in the arts among the students in Yale College, a clear strategic advantage for Yale lies in the closer integration of the various schools in the arts with the offerings in Yale College. This would be a combination that would be hard to beat at any other major institution.

Graduate education

The aspirational message of A. Whitney Griswold, President of Yale, 1950-1963, on the purpose of a liberal arts education and the importance of developing "the intellectual and spiritual powers in individuals before they enter upon their chosen careers" and the values of "intelligence, resourcefulness, judgment and character" is clearly evident across most undergraduate and graduate programs at the University. With regard to graduate education, the students are divided between those enrolled in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and those that are taking part in a course of study in one of twelve professional schools. In the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences 54 departments and programs offer the PhD degree. Of the 2,700 graduate arts and sciences students in 2008-2009, some 2,300 are in the doctoral programs with the remainder in master's programs.

The application process for candidates to GSAS is extremely competitive (acceptance rates have varied from between 1 in 5.5 to 1 in 9) and the Graduate School has an international reputation in a range of fields. The University has recently evaluated the success of each doctoral program in guiding students from coursework to independent research. According to the University's self-study this process has helped enhance communication between students and faculty and in some cases has even led to structural reorganizations of qualifying examinations and workshops. This evaluation, called the "2-4 Project" may lead in the future to a full review of the doctoral programs in a manner akin to the CYCE review of the College. Such greater re-examination of the PhD programs in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences would likely provide a positive contribution to the Graduate School experience.

It is important to acknowledge that we witnessed a significant discrepancy between the extraordinary commitment to the shaping of the overall experience of undergraduates and the university's attention to the graduate student experience, particularly outside the classroom, library and laboratory. One key factor is the visible difference in the quality of care and support provided by the house system for the undergraduates and the lack of comparable resources for graduate students. For example, we were surprised to discover that graduate students did not have automatic access to university dining facilities on weekends. It would be valuable for the university to pay greater attention to innovative

FINAL REPORT

ways in which the whole graduate school experience can be enhanced at Yale. Improvements of facilities as well as the provision of new spaces for social and intellectual interaction for graduate and undergraduate students would clearly be appreciated and embraced by all students.

Graduate housing, specifically housing for students with families, needs particular attention. The members of the committee were informed of the favorable rental terms in New Haven but it seems many students would benefit from greater support by the university in helping them secure superior quality, safe and better-managed housing. This could also become a mechanism for improving the urban fabric of the areas near campus.

In addition to the need for better physical and environmental conditions for graduate education we were also made aware of the desire for further discussions on how to develop a more effective and dynamic system of mentoring. This needs to be a system based on shared expectations of both advisee and advisor. The issue of mentoring goes hand in hand with the recognition of the importance and the availability of more opportunities for teaching. There seemed to be a common concern among the students that the time they are allocated at present for teaching is too little and less than that at other comparable institutions. A related issue is the desire for six years of financial support in order to assist in launching a successful career. While the current fiscal crisis might make it prohibitive to allocate additional resources to financial support for graduate students, mentoring and teaching provide two important and less costly areas worthy of serious consideration.

Graduate students also would welcome additional opportunities for collaboration and connectivity across the disciplines. The students perceive the current organization of the doctoral programs as too fragmented and cited as an example of the kind of opportunities they would like to see expanded a program that provides a monthly event enabling research students to present their work to a diverse audience. The enthusiasm for collaboration also reflects a concern about the impact of increasing specialization and the desire to place greater emphasis on cross-disciplinary practices.

There was a distinct lack of representation from the professional schools – many of which are among the very best in the nation if not the world – during the visit. The University has every reason to be proud of its professional schools. In particular, it is important to recognize the prominence of those schools dedicated to the arts, the law school and the school of medicine. The School of Engineering and Applied Science as well as the School of Forestry and Environmental Studies offer significant opportunities for addressing issues of major global importance in the years to come. Perhaps the only anomaly in terms of international standing among the professional schools is the School of Management, which despite improvements over the years, still lags behind Schools in other peer institutions. The prospect of a world-class home for the school, plus the attention by the University administration and the Corporation, would help improve the standing of the school.

FINAL REPORT

Greater inter-departmental collaboration within the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences would be valuable; it would be equally productive to have such collaborations between the Graduate School and the professional schools. The University might also encourage greater interaction and communication among the various deans and members of the faculty. Such efforts to explore new domains of interest and research across the disciplines and schools would be enhanced by having additional full-time and tenured faculty in the professional schools.

Standard Five: Faculty

Yale seeks to recruit and retain faculty members whose scholarly work meets the highest standards of quality and — for the faculty of FAS — who share a commitment to teaching undergraduate as well as graduate students. Many of Yale's faculties and departments rank among the best in the U.S. and progress has been made since the last review in improving the quality of others. The most notable improvements are due both to the willingness of departments and their chairs to work hard to identify and recruit excellent colleagues and to the capacity of the University to support them by providing both positions and resources.

The size of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has grown dramatically in the last decade. Excluding those holding research appointments, the faculty has grown by about 16 percent during a period when total undergraduate and graduate student enrollment was essentially flat. The student/faculty ratio, by headcount, including both ladder and non-ladder faculty, appears to have dropped from roughly 9.0 to 7.5 (or from 11.0 to 9.6, excluding non-ladder faculty). These staffing levels make possible an extraordinarily rich learning environment for Yale students.

The present financial constraints suggest that faculty growth on this scale is unlikely to continue. Indeed, in some scenarios a reduction in faculty size cannot be ruled out. This poses an administrative challenge that has not existed in the same form in earlier years. Under these changed circumstances it will be important for the provost and deans to be sure that the mechanisms for reaching and communicating decisions regarding the allocation of faculty positions among and within departments are as transparent as reasonably possible.

From what we could observe, faculty morale appears to be very good, notwithstanding the deteriorated financial environment. There is a high level of commitment to the institution. We were impressed by the leadership roles taken by members of the faculty in critical aspects of the academic program, such as the restructuring of the appointment and tenure procedures, on-going assessment of major programs and the deployment of a system of student course evaluation (all areas where the previous accreditation team identified potential for improvement).

The most substantial change in FAS procedures in the last decade has been adoption of the "FASTAP" recommendations for structuring the system of appointment and tenure. These changes bring Yale's procedures closer to those found at most peer institutions.

FINAL REPORT

Tenure procedures are now clearer and better understood and anxiety among untenured faculty members seems to have been reduced. Indeed, every faculty member with whom we spoke was happy with the new system. We also suspect that these changes will make Yale more competitive in recruiting people to the untenured ranks. So far, the changes appear to be an unambiguous success. Nevertheless, as members of the faculty and academic administration recognize, the new procedures will need monitoring to insure that the changes do not inadvertently lead to an erosion of Yale's tenure standards and that the aspirations for improved mentoring of untenured faculty – so far unevenly implemented – are fully realized across the faculty.

As in 1999, the 2009 self-study expresses concern about Yale's record in meeting its goals for the recruitment and retention of women and members of underrepresented minorities. While there has been clear progress across the University and within the FAS, that progress has been uneven. The self-study notes, for example, that whereas, overall, the representation of women and minorities at Yale is similar to that at peer institutions, Yale ranks last in the percentage of women in the biological sciences in both nontenured and tenured ranks.

Our experience in our own institutions is that the effective recruitment and retention of women (in disciplines in which they are underrepresented) and underrepresented minorities requires a combination of strategies. Nothing is more important, of course, than the energetic commitment of department chairs and their colleagues. This commitment is more likely to be mobilized when it is clear to all that the university's most senior leadership, beginning with its trustees, give priority to the institution's diversity goals and when resources for recruitment of targets of opportunity and for faculty retention are protected. We commend President Levin for making clear his personal commitment to enhancing the diversity of the faculty and trust that this will be reflected in the University's strategic goals.

Another important element of an effective recruitment and retention strategy—though one whose benefits would be valuable to all—is the adoption of measures aimed at helping faculty (and staff) attain a healthy work-life balance. The adoption of changes in parental leave policy has been a constructive step. We heard particular concern expressed about the lack of accessible, affordable infant and childcare. The University might explore the extent to which this is a problem and consider whether more energetic measures might be taken in response.

Finally, we observe that the 2006-07 survey on faculty satisfaction indicated significant disparities between men and women and majority and minority untenured faculty members. These are particularly troubling as they relate to perceptions of barriers to advancement at Yale, whose culture can appear from some perspectives to be difficult to engage. The changes in the tenure process together with the improvement of mentoring for untenured faculty may go some way towards addressing these disparities. We do not, however, share the confidence that they will be sufficient. It is possible that deeper and more subtle aspects of Yale faculty and administrative culture may also play a role. As the self-study observes, University-wide climate change may be needed. No doubt such

FINAL REPORT

change will take time, but it will not occur without the continuing sympathetic attention and encouragement of the faculty and administrative leadership.

As at other universities, Yale asks graduate students to serve as assistants in instruction, and in a small and decreasing number of cases, asks them to teach small introductory classes or seminars. On the whole, however, Yale expects credit-bearing courses to be taught by faculty members and historically has resisted investing independent academic authority in graduate students. As the self-study indicates, questions have arisen about the wisdom of this policy.

The policy question is plainly a matter for the faculty so we simply offer three observations and a suggestion. First, as a general matter, the faculty's commitment to teaching undergraduates is among Yale's great and distinctive institutional strengths. No sympathetic observer would advise the University to take steps that would compromise this commitment. Second, however, it is a mistake to regard the teaching role of graduate students simply as a form of support for the undergraduate curriculum; in many disciplines it can be, and in most institutions it is, an important aspect of graduate education. (Indeed, new Ph.D.s can be at a disadvantage in the academic job market if they lack a track record as teachers.) Third, the availability of graduate students with interests in developing a teaching portfolio may afford an opportunity to enrich the curriculum and increase opportunities for undergraduates to learn in small, intensive settings.

These observations plainly pose a dilemma, but the University's own experience suggests that there are solutions involving formats of instruction that afford graduate students some independent teaching experience while retaining faculty oversight. These include, for example, seminars offered by graduate student instructors working with faculty mentors and courses taught jointly by a faculty member and a graduate student (as in the pilot program initiated this year). We note with approval that the University has monitored the success of these efforts and suggest that with proper oversight it would serve the educational interests of both graduate students and undergraduates to continue and perhaps expand them.

We conclude with three brief observations on other topics. First, the self-study devotes attention to the role of non-ladder faculty (lectors and lecturers as well as visitors) in the FAS. The subject is significant because nearly 40 percent of undergraduate enrollments take place in courses taught by non-ladder faculty and because the rate of growth of non-ladder faculty in the last decade actually exceeds that of ladder faculty. Faculty and some administrators with whom we talked believed that most students taught by non-ladder faculty were in language courses. In fact, fewer than one-third of enrollments in courses taught by non-ladder faculty are in language courses; nearly one-half are in other courses in the humanities and social sciences. Student course evaluation data suggest that satisfaction with the teaching of lecturers and lectors is about on a par with that of ladder faculty (though satisfaction with visitors is lower). In circumstances in which there is confidence that the faculty's educational objectives can be met by assigning courses to non-ladder faculty, we see no reason to demur. We commend the University for taking

FINAL REPORT

steps to improve professional support for lecturers and lectors and to clarify their status within departments and the faculty as a whole. We hope that with the cooperation of representatives of these groups these efforts will continue.

Second, the self-study also calls attention to the changing age distribution of the FAS, one indication of which is the tripling of the number of faculty members above age 70 since 1999. With the changed financial climate, this number is likely to continue to increase. The faculty handbook lists several retirement incentive plans, but these appear to have been formulated before mandatory retirement was eliminated more than 15 years ago. We agree that it would be wise to reconsider these incentive plans in the vastly changed context of 2009.

Finally, we heard faculty observe that it can seem unnecessarily difficult to discover and obtain information about various policies of the institution. Information tends to be dispersed and sometimes seems to be presented in ways that suit the needs of the providers rather than the users. We note in this connection that the edition of the *Yale University Faculty Handbook* that was provided to us is dated 2002. (The online edition appears to be identical.) Its Introduction states, "The *Handbook* will be revised and updated annually." This edition is seriously out-of-date; it does not, for example, include the changes in tenure procedures enacted in 2007 (though these procedures can be found elsewhere, for those who know to look for them). We were shown a draft of a revised handbook, so far unpublished. In the absence of individual employment contracts, faculty members will reasonably look to the handbook as the most comprehensive statement of their terms of appointment. In addition, courts typically treat faculty handbooks as having contractual force, so there is an institutional interest in keeping them up to date. We recommend that the revision of the handbook be completed and published quickly and revised editions issued regularly. It appears that publication of a new version online is imminent.

Standard Six: Students

The Yale University mission states that the institution will create, preserve and disseminate knowledge to students from across the nation and around the world. In the last 10 years Yale College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the post-baccalaureate professional schools have generally experienced a consistent increase in applications for admission and subsequent strong yields. The University boasts strong retention and graduation rates among the College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the post-baccalaureate professional schools. The University is represented by students from all 50 states and approximately 70 countries.

Admissions

Yale College admits a diverse and highly qualified undergraduate student body. Its significant increase in applications, from approximately 12,000 applications to approximately 26,000 applications in the last decade, has led to concerns about the decrease in its admit rate from 18.3 percent [2000] to 8.6 percent [2012]. The Admissions Office expresses unease about presenting the institution as accessible while being realistic about its extreme selectivity. The selectivity of the College may offer challenges

FINAL REPORT

in preparedness for college work by students graduating from less rigorous high schools. Need-blind admissions and generous financial aid policies should support continued access. Given the number of highly qualified undergraduate applicants, Yale College has been exploring a possible increase in the undergraduate enrollment. The development of two additional residential colleges would increase the undergraduate student population by approximately 800 students.

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the post-baccalaureate professional schools have also experienced an increase in applicants. These programs currently enroll a significant proportion of the University's international student population, adding to the university culture and experience. Among the graduate Arts and Sciences student population, 71 percent of those enrolled are preparing to earn doctorate degrees, and each of those candidates is financially fully supported for five years.

Retention and Graduation

The retention rates at Yale College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the post-baccalaureate professional schools continue to be excellent with rates ranging between 94 percent and 100 percent. The data for undergraduate students of color present an area of challenge, with a disproportionate number of those students having lower retention rates, 3 to 5 percentage points lower than that of white/non-Hispanic. Such a disparity is not unusual among peer institutions, but it is troubling nonetheless and needs continued attention. The retention and graduation rates offer one valuable assessment of the institution. An informed understanding of why students stay or leave could clearly define new programs and services at the institution. It can be seen in both the enrolled student survey and the alumni survey that current and former students maintain high satisfaction with their degree and experience with 89 percent of currently enrolled students recommending Yale and 92 percent of alumni at least generally satisfied with their education.

Student Services

In the last decade the College has renovated and refurbished ten of the twelve residential colleges, with the final two renovations planned for 2009-2010 and 2010-2011. It should be noted that in an effort to complete these renovations efficiently with minimal negative impact on student learning, Yale built a swing space to house the students during the renovation year. The College acknowledges that it should also address the need for additional student organization space with smart technology. These renovations have presented a differential in the quality and quantity of graduate housing and services, when compared to what is offered for undergraduate students.

The graduate student housing is only able to accommodate approximately 20 percent of its student population, versus 88 percent of the undergraduate students of Yale. Also, its quality stands in contrast to that of the undergraduate colleges. Limited graduate housing may have an impact on the graduate school's ability to recruit the most highly qualified students from across the nation and around the world. The graduate student population shared some level of dissatisfaction with the overall graduate experience, including: limited access to the undergraduate colleges; the quality and affordability of housing;

FINAL REPORT

teaching opportunities and training; weekend meal plans and healthcare options. The graduate and professional student life experience should be further reviewed and addressed.

The student services programs of the institution have recognized the need to offer diverse programs meeting the needs of the diverse student body. First generation students and students graduating from less rigorous high school programs may benefit from a preparation program to assist in their acclimation to Yale. As the diversity of the University has shifted, it has responded by supporting and/or creating such support systems as: the International Center, Center for International Experiences, the Intercultural Affairs Council, the President's Minority Advisory Council, the Diversity and Inclusion Office, the Graduate and Professional Student Center, the Cultural Centers, the Office of International Affairs and the McDougal Center. Each of the many offices supporting the student services of the University has clearly benefited by its connection through the self-study process and would continue to strengthen its services through ongoing cooperation. With an institutional desire to continue to meet students needs for support, assessment driven decisions will be useful in developing new ideas, particularly when there may not be new monies available. The concept of shared resources and services that would support all University students has tested well in a few areas, including the Chaplaincy and LGBTQ support services, and may offer opportunities in a variety of other areas, including event planning and health education.

The 2003 CYCE Report offers substantial information to assist in the planning decisions of Yale College. Systematic view of such services may offer intentional cooperation and centralization of services, providing a financially sustainable approach to the consistent and integral understanding of Yale's learning outcomes. For example the attention and development of the advising system could present opportunities for a comprehensive understanding of both academic and co-curricular development opportunities, most importantly the freshman experience. Student understanding of the mission and purposes of the institution is critical to helping Yale adhere to both the spirit and intent of internationalization of the University. Such a comprehensive report for the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and the post-baccalaureate professional schools may offer similar opportunities in terms of short and long-term planning for the graduate student population of the University. Student input and fiscal responsibility remain vital to systemic development.

During the last decade Yale has made significant improvements in creating a website that offers standard, true and consistent information that is readily available to the prospective and current University communities. Admissions, financial aid, support services, policies and grievance procedures are clear and easily attained. It will remain important for the faculty and staff supporting these functions to remain participatory in their learning communities in an effort to help them understand and develop best practices. While developing more on-line support systems can offer consistent service, special attention should continue to be given to the creation of these systems, since the quality and effectiveness of on-line services versus in-person services and their results could differ significantly. On-line support does not come without costs for infrastructure, support and

FINAL REPORT

student development, although technology offers a pertinent and valuable collaborative resource for the University. Special attention should continue to be given to consistent delivery on information on-line versus print.

Thorough systems of assessment and review will continue to keep Yale University a leader in creating, preserving and disseminating knowledge. The last decade has shown intentional development in such assessment opportunities. CYCE is a strong example, and other areas of the University could benefit from like reviews.

Standard Seven: Library and Other Information Resources

Yale University's library and museum collections are extensive and rich, providing extraordinary resources in traditional and digital formats. Many steps have already been taken to increase access to the Yale library holdings such as making online library records available for older print materials. Museums have made major strides in improving access to their collections and providing spaces for teaching. Great collections bring with them significant responsibilities for preservation and conservation and Yale has demonstrated notable stewardship of its collections. The plans for the West Campus include a shared preservation and conservation facility for art objects and library collections. If this facility can provide ample housing for museum objects in an environmentally sound central space and allow for browsing, Yale will be a leader among universities in making their art collections more accessible for teaching and research.

Establishing the Office of Digital Assets and Infrastructure (ODAI) within the Provost's Office is an intriguing and novel approach to ensure that digital objects will be accessible through a robust and user-friendly repository regardless of where the physical objects are located. Since ODAI was founded only a year ago, it is too early to assess its success, but the concept and goals are worthy ones.

The Information Technology Services (ITS) section of the self-study clearly presents the progress made and lists the major near-term challenges as improving internet access uniformly across campus and increasing the support of high end computing. The libraries and ITS seem to work closely together and provide some joint services such as the Collaborative Learning Center in the Bass Library.

The libraries have completed several major renovations that appear to be well received by undergraduate students. Inevitably, due to heavy use of library spaces and changing patterns of use, library renovations will continue. From visiting some of the renovated spaces, it is clear that the library is focused on user needs and is responsive to them. The library has also been innovative in devising ways to teach undergraduates to use information resources and providing personal contacts with library staff.

As the information universe changes almost daily, it will be a challenge for both ITS and the library to collaborate in ways that leverage their capabilities and maximize opportunities for better service. For information technology and libraries, the challenge is to stay abreast, and even ahead of, user expectations while making strategic decisions about what to stop doing. These decisions will be difficult to make, but are essential. It is

FINAL REPORT

likely that the investment in digital collections will soon surpass the investment in print materials.

In the future, the Yale Library (and perhaps ITS and the museums) will benefit from additional collaborations that extend beyond the boundaries of Yale. Such collaborations exist now, but will be critical in the future when institutions can do things collectively that they cannot do individually.

Like other research libraries, Yale should develop new assessment measures that are aimed at measuring effectiveness rather than the traditional metrics such as volumes purchased, expenditures and amount of materials checked out.

Standard Eight: Physical and Technological Resources

Over the past decade, Yale has invested approximately \$2.9 billion in the campus in the form of both major renovation projects as well as new construction. The transformation in the quality of the campus buildings over the period, from the near completed renovation of the existing twelve residential colleges to new and renovated research facilities, offices and classrooms (including the necessary technology used in modern classrooms) has been remarkable. Approximately 65% of existing facilities are either new construction or have undergone major renovation in the last ten years. Funding for these renovations came from a combination of operating revenue, philanthropy, and debt. Operating budgets have adequately provided for ongoing maintenance of existing facilities. In addition, Yale instituted a capital replacement charge (CRC) in the operating budget that now provides approximately \$200 million per year for renovation and building system replacement.

In addition to the construction and renovation projects, in 2007 Yale took advantage of the opportunity to purchase the former Bayer HealthCare complex in West Haven, Connecticut (West Campus). This 136-acre complex includes 1.6 million gross square feet (GSF) in twenty buildings consisting of fully equipped research space (500,000 GSF), offices (350,000 GSF), and warehouse and support facilities (750,000 GSF). This purchase provides Yale with opportunities for future expansion of research, off-site storage, and exhibition space when fully developed.

Planned continuation of renovation and new construction on the Yale campus over the next decade is just as impressive. The capital plan calls for an additional \$2 billion over the next five years that includes the construction of two new residential colleges intended to house an additional 700 undergraduates, significant investment in undergraduate science facilities, continued upgrade of office and classroom space, and utilization of the West campus facilities. However, Yale has not been immune to the impact of the significant downturn in financial markets experienced in 2008 and as a result, the planning for continued facility upgrades and new construction has been altered to reflect this new reality. Only projects that had already been started in 2008 are under way, while all other projects have been put on hold until economic conditions improve and funding sources are clear and fully secured. Yale has adjusted its capital plan to reflect the new

FINAL REPORT

economic reality and has eliminated or indefinitely postponed a significant amount of capital funding from its original plan.

Yale now has to prioritize the use of diminished capital dollars resulting from the economic downturn. In the last decade, Yale had the resources to complete all the planned projects; in the next decade and beyond, although Yale continues to be a very financially strong institution, more difficult choices will need to be made when deciding which projects go forward. As funding becomes available, a review of the current list of capital projects should take place to re-confirm the priority of each project. The decisions on which projects go forward and the timing of those projects need to be clearly articulated and justified in light of the university mission.

The two residential colleges are intended to extend the first-class Yale undergraduate experience to an expanded student body. This project would involve adding not only these buildings, but also sufficient faculty to maintain the existing learning environment and the staff and ancillary facilities to provide the same living environment as the current undergraduates experience. Yale must be careful to move forward on that project only when the resources to accomplish the entire goal are available, not just when the money for the buildings is raised.

As plans for the West Campus develop, how that area should be integrated into the overall needs of main campus science facilities must be carefully considered. In financially difficult times, it is easy to cut back on routine maintenance and repair funding and CRC funding to help balance budgets. These funds can contribute to major projects and/or provide the needed capital to complete the smaller, more modest projects that enhance the campus and reduce the need for large-scale renovation in the future. The temptation for false economy must be avoided in order to preserve the well maintained campus of today.

Standard Nine: Financial Resources

Over the past decade, Yale's financial resources have grown significantly. Net assets increased from \$8.0 billion on June 30, 1999 to \$17.4 billion on June 30, 2009. Operating revenue grew from \$1.2 billion to \$2.6 billion over the same period. The Yale endowment grew from \$7.2 billion to \$16.1 billion and the annual distribution from the Yale endowment to fund operations increased from \$253.0 million to \$1.1 billion over the same ten-year period. The \$1.1 billion endowment distribution now represents 45% of operating revenue while in 1999 it represented only 22%. The investment performance of the endowment, while impacted by the economic decline in recent years, has been superior over the period, contributing greatly to the increase in financial resources. These additional resources allowed Yale to institute a number of initiatives including an increase in the size of the faculty and staff, enhanced financial aid policies, and renovation and additions to campus facilities. The figures included above are impressive as stated, and even more so in that they incorporate the significant economic downturn of 2008.

FINAL REPORT

As noted elsewhere in this report, Yale has not been immune to the impact of the significant downturn in financial markets experienced in 2008. In addition to the adjustments made to the capital plan discussed in Standard 8 of this report, Yale immediately began a review of the operating budget for fiscal year 2010 and the projected budgets that followed in order to reduce expenditures. Yale's ten-year financial equilibrium projection model, which integrates the operating and capital budgets, provides a framework for planning future expenditures. These projections showed that the spending rate from the endowment necessary to maintain the current level of expenditures would increase to unsustainable levels unless significant reductions were made.

The fiscal year 2010 budget reflects spending reductions of approximately 7.5 percent that were more or less spread across all budget units of the university. This allowed the endowment distribution to remain relatively flat from the prior year, but more work needs to be done. A budget gap of approximately \$150 million remains for fiscal year 2011 and beyond. As with facilities, setting operating budget priorities in a period of contracted resources will be a challenge for Yale. It is important that the necessary further reductions be done in a way that is sustainable over the long term by examining and perhaps eliminating programs, instituting efficiencies across the university, and consolidating processes where possible. This is not something that Yale has had to do in the recent past given the expanding resources of the past decade but it is critical now to ensure the continued financial strength of the university.

The \$1.1 billion endowment distribution needed for the operating budget requires a significant level of liquidity in the Yale endowment. The asset allocation and investment strategy currently favored by Yale, including the significant forward commitments to fund private equity and other alternative asset investments, does not result in a highly liquid portfolio. While Yale was able to provide that needed liquidity for operations over the past year, it is clear that liquidity will be a continuing challenge for the foreseeable future. We recommend that the Yale Investment Office review the university's investment strategy and asset allocation with particular emphasis on that continuing need for liquidity.

In spite of the economic downturn, the financial strength of Yale is verified by two external measures. The audited financial statements have consistently included an unqualified audit opinion and the management letter has indicated no significant control weaknesses. Yale has maintained the highest ratings from Moody's Investor Services and Standard and Poor's throughout the period.

FINAL REPORT

Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

Yale is moving in a timely manner to provide an increasing amount of information on the web while reducing its investment in print publications. It provides nearly exhaustive information through its website and is striving to increase transparency so that information can be found readily.

One example of its initiatives is the forthcoming "Yale by the Numbers." This data compilation and interactive financial aid component focuses on the undergraduate program of Yale College and provides ample data to prospective students, parents, the Yale community, and the general public in an accessible and user friendly way. It is due to be made public in late 2009 or early 2010 and it would benefit from a pre-release usability study with students to identify what might be missing or difficult to understand.

Keeping web information current, accurate, and easily accessible is always a work in progress and Yale's challenges are no different than those at other institutions. The individuals involved seem to have a serious commitment to continual improvement and to working collaboratively.

The Yale School of Medicine has completed the first phase of a local faculty database to consolidate a variety of information ranging from basic directory and biographical and data to CVs and research interests. The database is designed to require minimal effort on the part of individual faculty members and appears to be a success. If it is generalizable, it might be of great value to the rest of the campus and to other universities.

Providing institutional data on the web is a task that by definition is never completed, and it is difficult to draw the line between what is required and what is desirable. Yale has done a good job of avoiding excessive data but could make it easier for users to find key information. All public websites benefit from occasional usability tests and Yale's site would be helped by such feedback.

Standard Eleven: Integrity

President Levin has clearly imparted to the Yale University community that the success and reputation of the institution and fulfillment of its mission will depend on each member acting ethically, honestly and with integrity. Yale University must maintain this standard in order to preserve its commitment to being an institution that will create, preserve and disseminate knowledge in the context of its role as a leading national and international institution.

In this regard, Yale University has responded to the fundamental changes that are occurring in the world, including globalization, technological advances, and regulatory and fiscal laws and policies. Program developments include: the Standards for Business Conduct; Working Globally: Legal Considerations; a number of supportive grievance procedures; increased learning and support of student regulations and policies; and the creation of the Offices of Academic Integrity and Research Administration. While offering intentional language and support, the University recognizes the need for additional clarity and wider dissemination of the information. The regular reviews of the

FINAL REPORT

University's conflict of interest policies and public disclosures demonstrate effort in assessment and development.

The Admissions Office for Yale College is committed to fair and trustworthy dissemination of information and review of applications for admission to the College, and has achieved impressive efficiencies in technology in reviewing applications. The Admissions Committee is open to faculty and dean participation. The Admissions Office recognizes that benchmarking with other admissions offices that have similar application and yield rates may provide valuable insight regarding further efficiencies that it has not yet utilized.

The Standards of Business Conduct was reissued in 2008 and has integrated additional pertinent information, including resources for support and a multiplicity of reporting mechanisms. In addition, the federal review of the University's grant accounting has provided a renewed interest and responsibility inherent in University conduct. There is an expectation by the University that it will follow up with the creation of a Code of Academic Conduct to support its mission of creating, preserving and disseminating knowledge. The General Counsel's Office and a variety of compliance officers have been involved in overseeing the quality of staff training and in assessing the effectiveness of these and like practices and procedures.

Undergraduate student involvement in understanding their role in institutional integrity has been documented by the University through the thoroughness of Undergraduate Regulations and the procedures of the Executive Committee and the Committee on Honors and Academic Standing. Particular attention is given in the residential colleges to community living in the world of academe, including broad dissemination of information about the role of integrity at Yale.

Continuing to pay attention to copyright and its consequences on freedom of expression is important, through modeling appropriate behaviors and by finding such opportunities in their teaching for such modeling. The University believes that support of these efforts is critical, and it is moving forward with additional education on policies and trainings, as noted in the both the self-study and our meeting with Steering Committees for Mission and Integrity.

The University is encouraged to continue its efforts to recruit and maintain women and minorities within the faculty and staff of the University. The difference in retention rates may call for a systemic review of the Faculty and Staff Climate survey results, as well as of the policies and procedures for grievances, particularly sexual harassment and non-discrimination. Continued efforts to create a consistently supportive environment for women and minority faculty, staff and students would be beneficial to the University.

The research community at the University has taken steps to promote a culture of compliance and integrity. The University convenes a University Research Compliance Committee, a Training Management System, the Interdisciplinary Bioethics Project, an Office of Research Administration and continued programs for animal care and human

FINAL REPORT

subject's research. Through these, and various other measures, the University recognizes its need for a comprehensive policy for handling conflicts of interest. In addition, it anticipates the development of formal training programs in research integrity and scientific misconduct. The Office of the General Counsel, Office for Research Compliance, the University's Conflict of Interest Office and the Office for Research Administration will need to work cooperatively to ensure the effectiveness of these programs.

With assessment projects like the compliance assessment program, an effective and productive system will benefit the University. The YaleNext initiative offers an opportunity to integrate compliance and integrity further within the research arena. The policy and training programs should be reviewed at the time of the five-year evaluation.

FINAL REPORT

Institutional Effectiveness Summary

Overall, Yale assesses its institutional effectiveness very well. As noted above, the University has made significant strides since its last accreditation, particularly in gauging academic effectiveness through the online course evaluation system that has been developed. The institution's measures to develop effective assessment systems in other non-academic areas are also worth noting. As suggested previously, it is important to review these assessment programs regularly in order to ensure their continued relevance and accuracy.

Summary; Institutional Strengths and Concerns

Yale University is a remarkable institution. By any standard, it ranks as one of the great universities in the world. Key institutional strengths became readily apparent during the visit of the accreditation team. Among those strengths are:

- A faculty made up of outstanding scholars and teachers, many of whom are leaders in their respective fields.
- Students at all levels who are accomplished and intellectually curious and determined to become leaders in society.
- An administration of exemplary leaders who are passionate about their University and committed to its advancement.
- A campus that is both graceful and impressive.
- Significant financial resources, which, while pressured by the recent economic downturn, continue to provide a strong underpinning for the University's academic endeavors.

At the same time, Yale faces the following issues:

- How to allocate financial resources in times when such resources are constrained much more than they have been in Yale's recent history.
- How best to develop the new West Campus.
- How to improve the experience of graduate students at Yale and increase their feeling of connection to the institution.
- How to improve interdisciplinary academic connections among Yale College and the University's graduate and professional schools.
- How to increase diversity, both within the faculty and among the leadership of the University.

None of these concerns is insurmountable. In fact, given Yale's leadership, institutional resources and determination to succeed, the accrediting team is confident that these challenges will be met successfully. But it will be important for the University to address these issues in the coming years. By doing so, Yale will be able to maintain its historic position as a leader in American higher education.

COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
New England Association of Schools and College
Preface Page

Date form completed: September 2, 2009

Name of Institution: Yale University

1. **History** Year chartered or authorized 1701

Year first degrees awarded 1702

2. **Type of control:** ☐ State ☐ City ☐ Other; specify: _____
 ☒ Private, not-for-profit ☐ Religious Group; specify: _____
 ☐ Proprietary ☐ Other; specify: _____

3. **Degree level:**
☐ Associate ☒ Baccalaureate ☒ Masters ☒ Professional ☒ Doctorate

4. **Enrollment in Degree Programs** (Use figures from fall semester of most recent year):

	Full-time	Part-time	FTE	Retention ^a	Graduation ^b	# Degrees ^c
Associate	na	na	na	na	na	na
Baccalaureate	5,254	23	5,265.5	99%	96%	1,319
Graduate & Professional	6,044	124	6,106	na	na	1,751

(a) full-time 1st to 2nd year

(b) 3 or 6 year graduation rate

(c) no. of degrees awarded most recent year

5. **Number of current faculty (tenured track):** Full time 2,216 Part-time 618 FTE: 2,525

6. **Current fund data for most recently completed fiscal year:** (Specify year: FY 2008)
(Double click in any cell to enter spreadsheet. Enter dollars in millions; e.g., \$1,456,200 = \$1.456)

Revenues

Tuition
Gov't Appropriations
Gifts/Grants/Endowment
Auxiliary Enterprises
Other
Total

\$245.242
\$0.000
\$1,522.843
\$0.000
\$579.415
\$2,347.500

Expenditures

Instruction
Research
General
Auxiliary Enterprises
Other
Total

\$663.297
\$415.093
\$881.210
\$0.000
\$354.850
\$2,314.450

7. **Number of off-campus locations:** none

In-state _____ Other U.S. _____ International _____ Total _____

8. **Number of degrees and certificates offered electronically:** none

Programs offered entirely on-line 0 Programs offered 50-99% on-line 0

9. **Is instruction offered through a contractual relationship?**

☒ No ☐ Yes; specify program(s): _____

10. **Accreditation history:**

Candidacy: None Initial accreditation: December 1929 Last comprehensive evaluation: Fall 1999
Last Commission action: Accepted the fifth-year report submitted. Date: November 5, 2004

11. **Other characteristics:**