Comprised of the departments of Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, and Sociology and twenty-eight interdisciplinary research institutes and centers, the Division of Social Science in the Faculty of Arts and Science at Columbia University is steeped in a rich tradition of scholarly distinction. The faculty of the Division of Social Science hold the highest awards in their fields, including the MacArthur Fellowship, the Nobel Prize, the American Academy of Arts and Science Fellowship, the National Academy of Sciences Fellowship, the National Science Foundation CAREER Award, the Guggenheim Fellowship, the Bateson Prize, the Skytte Prize, and the John Bates Clark Medal.
The Social Science Initiative lays the groundwork for the preservation and expansion of this legacy of pioneering social inquiry through the recruitment and retention of the world’s best social analysts. The Social Science Initiative will also sustain and foster the transformative teaching of a new generation of extraordinary undergraduate and graduate students.

Social scientists study individuals, communities, organizations and institutions of the past and present. Bringing elements of both natural sciences and humanities research to the study of the scale and scope of the human endeavor, the social sciences uniquely bridge the University’s disciplines, departments, and schools.

The Division of Social Science spans a wide conceptual and methodological spectrum, from interpretive, humanistic analysis to hypothesis-driven, quantitative research. As such, the division plays an essential connecting role in the larger intellectual ecology of the Arts and Sciences and the University. The Social Science Initiative reflects the division’s position as a vital launching pad for campus-wide collaborations and partnerships.

This strategic, academic plan is the product of consultation with and contributions from faculty members in social science departments, centers, and institutes beginning in the 2014–2015 academic year. It offers a roadmap for the Division of Social Science that will allow its faculty and students to reach the apex of our aspirations for research and teaching over the next decade. This plan sets forth initiatives and programs that capitalize on our strengths in the analytic and interpretive social sciences and also extends these, opening up new areas of scholarly preeminence.
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The growing availability of large volumes of digital information, or data, has stimulated novel approaches to the study of social phenomena. Today, big data are being used to engage fundamental social science questions and concerns and to open up new avenues of inquiry.

The establishment of the Columbia University Data Science Institute (DSI) is an opportunity for the consolidation of and innovation in the computational social sciences, broadly conceived. Faculty in the social sciences can make unique contributions to Columbia's data science community, both by applying big data to societal questions and by helping inform deliberations about its social implications.

Computational Social Science

Computational social science considers social puzzles and complex problems and hypothesizes solutions with the use of big data. It emphasizes the value of deeper and better collaboration between social scientists and data scientists.

How can big data provide new opportunities to answer important questions about political and social life? The Center for Computational Social Science will be dedicated to the integration of digital tools and technologies into social science research. It will focus on the collection, management, and analysis of digital information, including big data, network analysis, text mining, and geospatial data. Research will engage large datasets and other forms of digital information in some of the leading problems in the social sciences. Projects may include empirical analyses of networks, peer effects, and social fabrics using newly available data; computational-linguistic studies of law, media, and politics; market design—the practical
construction of allocation mechanisms ranging from matching students with schools to spectrum auctions to voting rules; the study of inequality and poverty; analysis of municipal and state data to yield new insights about urban communities; and predictions of local-level violence and political conflict using machine learning.

To date, some big data research research suffers from two limitations: first, while drawing on powerful techniques developed by computer scientists and statisticians, it employs relatively impoverished and implausible models of human reasoning, decision-making, and action. Second, for a variety of reasons, it mostly applies its techniques to data that are best described as “digital exhaust,” namely data left behind as traces of individuals’ activities on the web and which may be of modest importance for understanding behavior. Faculty engaged in this center will engage in creating a better understanding of the craft of socially meaningful and institutionally rich actions and transactions drawing on insights from big data (rather than being beholden to the exhaust trail of online surfing and shopping).
Data and Society
The idea that modern society is becoming a “knowledge society” has a long pedigree and many illustrious prophets. Clearly, in many respects they were right: science, education, and medicine are engines of innovation and rapidly expanding sectors of the economy. Universities often anchor hubs of innovation and economic expansion facilitated by university-government-business alliances. Experts and professionals constitute a larger part of the labor force and play an ever-increasing role in government, business, and non-profits. Even more than our predecessors, our daily lives are shaped by technological innovations that owe their origins to advances in fundamental and “big science” projects.

At the same time, however, the optimistic vision often failed to take into account the extent to which technological innovation can be a destabilizing force and a generator of global risks—whether through global warming or financial crises. One could say, the optimistic vision clearly failed to appreciate that the new central role of science, technology, and biomedicine requires a re-envisioning of the structures of accountability within which these operate. These intellectual projects lie at the intersection of “big data” and “science and technology studies.”

During the very same decades that passed since the first wave of “knowledge society” prognostication, something else has happened: there has been a huge growth of the field of social studies of science and technology (STS). Drawing on this intellectual tradition, faculty researchers will also take up the myriad issues of ethics and inequality that arise with the big data turn, including the politics and stakes of data science research into social problems.
This Data and Society initiative will take up the issue of what theories, assumptions, and understandings should guide the rise of computational data in scholarly research, including the attention to the epistemology of big data and the ethics that should govern its use.

Questions undertaken might include: How does this constitution of big data sets shape, inform, or constrain the questions we can answer using it? What social decisions go into the gathering and shaping of data? If data is now a coin of the realm, how might access to it (or lack thereof) and the ability to control, analyze, and manipulate it yield new inequalities?

**Historical Data Science**

Columbia has a unique opportunity to become one of the hubs for a new kind of big data historical-sociological science, a type of research that links and exploits potential synergies between the humanities, the social sciences, and computer science/engineering. Our comparative advantage will come from expanding on already ongoing research efforts.
In the last decade, large-scale historical data has become available through efforts at digitization of complex historical archives. Some of these efforts were initiated at Columbia; or Columbia faculty have been foremost in analyzing them, including the New York Philharmonic subscribers archive, the East India Company Trade Archive, the Atlantic Slave Trade archive, declassified government documents, and the archives of the New York Academy of Medicine.

These archives encompass very large data structures at an unusual level of detail. Using these data, and drawing on continuities with our already established strengths in historical social science research, we have a unique opportunity to build at Columbia a new kind of historically-situated big data science that makes meaningful choices about archives, textual analysis, etc.

This research will leverage powerful computational techniques to model these data with intense interest and concern for the tangible relations, networks, and institutions in which people are embedded and while drawing on plausible theories of reasoning, decision-making, and action-in-context. This initiative will be concerned with devising mechanism-based and culturally rich explanations, and addressing consequential questions about the determinants of individual and collective action, social change, the consequences of inequality, and the mechanisms of cultural transformation/stability.

**CROSSROADS OF KNOWLEDGE**

The modern university is in transition. As the growth of centers and institutes across the Columbia University campus in the last decade suggests, scholarly research is increasingly cross-disciplinary and focused on problems, outcomes, or other aims rather than sharing methodological allegiance to a specific disciplinary field.
This moment offers an opportunity for reflection on the structures and histories of disciplines, on the possible re-integrations of inquiry now divided into disciplines, and on divisions within disciplines. The history of, impediments to, and possibilities for “interdisciplinarity” within and beyond the social science units will be taken up explicitly. These discussions would form the core intellectual work of the Initiative on the Crossroads of Knowledge and the Future of the University.

Drawing on the strengths in cultural and organizational analysis in the social sciences, this new institute will take a “meta” perspective on the modern university, querying what we do, how we do it, and how teaching and research might be transformed through new configurations for scholarship. Insights about the future of the disciplines and the university will be addressed in faculty-led, theme-based seminars, or problem-based research projects. Seminars will consider how we deal with an issue or theme from our different methodologies or combined ones. One possible outcome of these conversations will be building capacity for new forms of collaborative social science that engage complex problems and grand challenges.

EXPERIMENTAL TURN

At the core, the social sciences are engaged in better understanding of the human condition past and present. The social sciences may be said to share an interest in understanding the interaction between individual choices, social interactions, and social structures. What new methods and approaches can researchers now bring to the fundamental question of what it means to be human? What methods and techniques will allow us to better understand the contexts and mechanisms that shape human behavior?
Behavioral Science and Cognitive Science

Researchers at Columbia are extending experimental social science, integrating the methods of behavioral and cognitive sciences, while hewing to core social science concerns.

Experimental methods play a more crucial role in furthering our understanding of human behavior. Inquiry into human and social behavior can involve political and voter behavior; political decision-making; survey responses and social-desirability, and decision-making, including the new perspectives opened by neuroeconomics. Drawing also on social psychology and neuroscience in the study of social behavior, this research aims to create more realistic and reliable theoretical and empirical models of individual choice, with the constitution of social networks and the design of institutions (e.g. market design, school choice, politics) in mind.

At the cutting-edge of the “experimental turn” in the social sciences, this initiative will bolster expertise in lab, field, and natural experiments. It will deliver insights into the kinds of interventions, policies, or institutions that cause people to participate in politics or into the role that religions, nationalism, ideas about race, ideologies, and other constructs play in shaping human behavior.

UNDERSTANDING INEQUALITY

The study of inequality includes economic inequality and political inequality; consequences of growing inequality; and the policy options to best address the inequities in our society—from the gender pay gap and the achievement gap to growing income
inequality and the growing class gap. The study of inequality also deals with the related questions of mobility and opportunity in American society—topics of great concern to both the general public and policy debates.

A research initiative built around this set of questions will allow us to address the policy implications of social science research and to offer solutions to some of the most pressing problems of our time. This multidisciplinary initiative on inequality and policy will effectively draw on the collective strength of our social science faculty.

Much of the increase of economic inequality in the United States and other developed countries in the last 30 years resulted from higher returns to human capital investments, especially in the upper part of the income distribution. But more deeply, the distribution of economic outcomes such as income or wealth reflects a complex and dynamic interaction of skills, technology, institutions, and policies. A pluridisciplinary effort of social scientists to better understand these interconnections is crucial to inform policy responses.

**Vulnerability and Risk**

Social science research must respond to some of society’s most pressing needs and challenges, pursuing excellence in the service of our global public. Risk and vulnerability are pressing social issues. What is the difference between vulnerability and risk, between ordinary risk and immeasurable uncertainty? Individuals face uncertainty in many aspects of life, such as employment status, health, and the duration of life itself. The uncertainties are both unintended and by design, with different social groups being more or less vulnerable to them.
The U.S., for example, is in a sustained period of rising inequality, stagnant middle class incomes, and low social mobility. A large share of the population remains vulnerable, when measured along multiple dimensions including poverty, long-term unemployment, childhood and adolescent cognitive and behavioral development, fragile families, disadvantaged neighborhoods, criminal justice, and health.

Societies are confronted with the possibility of political, security, and financial crises. Technological innovation can be a destabilizing force and a generator of global risks—whether through global warming or financial crisis. A more globalized world can be a mixed blessing in this regard. It allows for risk sharing—the effects of idiosyncratic, country-specific risks can be dampened by mutual insurance. At the same time, a more globalized world creates new sources of risk.

Disturbances, economic or political (upheavals, wars, etc.) can spill from one society into another. Systemic risk affects all countries at once and while uninsurable, it may be preventable through appropriate prudential policy and financial regulation. This initiative on vulnerability and risk will provide support for the social sciences to develop creative approaches to these emerging issues and to bring insights to the next generation of policy tools to manage risk and vulnerability. This initiative will also look at how communities, organizations and institutions have sought to reframe debates about inequality and confront the challenges presented by economic inequality and environmental vulnerability.
The Social Contract for the 21st Century

Perhaps no idea had greater sway over modern life than the social contract. It sought to both reify and reconcile two contradictory concepts. The first was “the individual” – its sacredness as a concept, and the celebration of the consequential freedoms, rights, and self-expression. The second was “society” – the conceit that we have obligations to others that may supersede our individual interests, and we must be attuned to the collective good, or, the good of others. The social contract is a balance of two competing notions: respect for personhood and the good of the collective. Negotiating this balance was one of the great political and social projects of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Yet the social contract was not without its challenges – scholars and activists pointed to the ways in which its principles were gendered and raced, and its success often contingent on social exclusion (some were never part of the “collective,” or their moral standing as free individuals was undermined). The social contract emerged within a particular constellation of forces – bourgeois transformations and the rise of nation-states – that are unraveling. Today we occupy a different world, where the national boundaries of community are more flexible, where elites are more dominant (the rise of the bourgeois seems to be over, and elite dominance more prominent), and where countries not tied to the cultural legacy of the liberal social contract (China, India, Middle East) are rising in power. The world has changed, and our task is to understand it.

The Social Contract for the 21st Century Project has deep empirical and theoretical implications. Processes that work on a global scale mean that our commitments to the “community” might not end at a territorial boundary. The global flow of goods, people, and pollution means reconceptualizing our scale of analysis. Theoretically, we might
also challenge the basic constitutive units of analysis – individuals and groups.

Conceptualizing the social contract for the 21st century also means generating new political and economic institutions and cultural frameworks. Our basic mechanisms of alleviating inequality – those of social (re)distribution – are premised on the idea of a shared political, cultural, and social community. Yet as political communities have diversified, commitments to redistribution have declined. Elites have shifted their frames of reference; the basic political, economic, social, and cultural conditions that supported a social safety net have eroded. The consequences of this great transformation, and what will take its place, should be the subject of our empirical and conceptual attention.

This is a grand project. It requires rigorous empirical work capable of understanding relations at both a small and massive scale; it requires new theoretical orientations that move beyond the individual and the community to think more seriously about interconnections; it is global in scope and attuned to how we might answer the challenges of inequality, one of the most pressing issues of the day. It cannot do so if it relies upon the exclusionary logics of many liberal communities. Yet this project if taken head on, promises to both reorient how we do social science, and, how we understand and shape our world.

**URBANISMS AND ENVIRONMENTS**

Columbia's location in one of the world’s most exciting and innovative city creates a unique opportunity for social scientists to develop fundamental new insights regarding phenomena such as the development of “smarter cities,” residential segregation, urban renewal, housing policy, immigration, and international trade.
Social interactions are shaped in fundamental ways by their location in space. Some people are born into thriving, highly diverse metropolises, others into areas of urban decay, and yet others into villages and rural setting. These people will face vastly different opportunities for social interaction and mobility. Space is significant for shaping social interactions and fundamental social processes. For example, geography shapes access to resources, including transportation hubs and water, and conflict over space may foment wars.

Studying how space shapes these outcomes is a crucial challenge that has become especially exciting at this time given the vast new sources of data created by the recent digital revolution. There is an opportunity to collaborate with city agencies to gain access to data (population health, vital records, etc.), for example, and to help model it and derive insights about lived experience. Tools of spatial social science, such as geocoding and GIS technology, can help us to better understand political conflict and social interaction.

This *Urbanisms and Environments Initiative* would help provide the resources needed for social scientists at Columbia to capitalize on this opportunity. Columbia is well positioned to form directed and collaborative research on the city and its environs and on the new geographies of urban, rural, and suburban space.

**Immigration and Diversity in a Global City**

New York City offers a unique opportunity for understanding the assimilation of new immigrants and the profound ways in which immigration has shaped our society. At the same time, the current immigration experience also has global ramifications—from transnational social networks that connect migrants and non-migrants to the influx of transnational capital that infuses many important entrepreneurship and economic development projects in immigrant communities across the city.
Furthermore, the study of immigration is interdisciplinary in its nature: political scientists study the political incorporation and our civic, multi-ethnic future; economists ask about the relationship between immigration and wages of natives and the connection between rising income inequality and rising immigration; historians examine the current wave of migration in relation to the previous waves of immigrants; and anthropologists study many migrant-sending societies. We will have the opportunity to contribute to new knowledge that will inform how our society negotiates this new diversity as well as illuminate its global reach and origins.

New Urban and Suburban Geographies

Intellectual engagement with cities clearly is one of the Arts and Sciences’ strengths, with urbanists to be found on the faculty of virtually every social science unit. As recently as ten years ago, some scholars had declared cities to be “dead,” referring both to the fiscally moribund state in which many cities languished, and to the study of cities as an intellectual enterprise. That clearly has been proven untrue, especially as cities have become attractive again to young professionals (from the U.S. and abroad), working in the knowledge and information sector, among others,
and as escalating energy prices highlighted the sustainability of cities over sprawling suburbs. Cities are also enjoying a renaissance in social science scholarship.

If poor and working-class black and Latino urbanites found themselves marooned in center cities as capital flight produced suburban growth, the return of capital to metropolitan cores presents the challenge of rising costs of living for people who may not be able to avail themselves of the new urban economic opportunity. Further, in the 1970s and afterward, many nonwhite suburbs emerged, populated by upwardly mobile middle- and working-class African Americans and Latinos. Amidst more-or-less regular waves of economic contraction, many of these suburbs declined. The older formulation of “urban economic isolation” threatens to turn on its head.

Harlem

For more than 300 hundred years, New York City’s Harlem community has been a microcosm of social and demographic change. From the arrival to Harlem of Dutch explorers, who displaced other indigenous groups to the recent gentrification of Harlem. This initiative proposes a scholarly engagement with Harlem that engages residents as research collaborators, as partners in the production of knowledge about a important urban community. Moreover, too little specific information is known about the demographic changes in Harlem and their impact, including those in which Columbia is playing a part, on these communities.

New York City currently is home to one of the largest African and Caribbean populations in the United States. Many of them live in here in Harlem, where they and their first- and second-generation U.S.-born progeny have formed communities of shared cultural identification, economic fortunes, political agendas, and social networks. With 116th Street called Little Senegal, Harlem

THEMES AND INITIATIVES
is a transnational neighborhood. Given its geographic location in Harlem, Columbia has a unique opportunity to work closely with the communities here. Collaborative projects would involve the Institute for Research on African American Studies, the Institute of African Studies and faculty in social science departments, including anthropology, sociology, and political science on new theorizing on post-1965 immigration and the African diaspora.

COMPARATIVE DEMOCRACIES

This initiative, the Center on Comparative Democracies will draw together historical and contemporary research and theoretical and policy concerns regarding democracy, justice, and ethics. The comparative here is meant to offer analytical leverage via consideration across temporalities, regions, constitutions and theories of governance, and research methodologies. Research would consider the role of traditional values—religious or secular—in the project of democracy and consider how the transformation of
values create a demand for democratization. These projects might also consider the history of international institutions from the League of Nations to the European Union to CARICOM and the effect of this historically and in the present on human rights and democracy. Do core principles of political legitimacy, such as democracy, equality, respect for individual rights and the rule of law need to be reformulated in the light of new forms of transnational authority?

This research will also engage questions of the constraints and possibilities for liberty in democracies, considering intersections with religion, policy, and leadership. Considering recent social movements and health epidemics, there might be dedicated inquiry into when citizens accept or oppose international intervention in their domestic politics. Other questions that might be addressed include: How can one explain the (not infrequent) cases in which certain groups (e.g. women) got the right to be elected before they got the right to vote? What are conditions that make it most difficult for democracy to redress inequality?

Alternatives to Liberal Democracy

These questions are especially relevant as various forms of hybrid regimes that mix democratic and non-democratic elements are now the most common form of government. These regimes vary widely—from established one-party regimes in China and Malaysia, to more personalist regimes in Russia and Turkey, to more theocratic regimes in Iran and Saudi Arabia—but together they continue to offer ongoing alternatives to liberal democracy.

Many illiberal regimes have adopted innovative strategies to gain legitimacy at home and abroad. They have proven remarkably adept at incorporating and subverting liberal democratic practices and institutions, such as elections, political parties, and legislatures; employing sophisticated media and information strategies; constructing new narratives of national greatness; creating new social identities, and in
some cases, overseeing strong economic performance that has significantly increased standards of living.

Illiberal regimes are not only important global players; they also present an implicit and often explicit challenge to liberal democratic forms of government—a challenge that strikes just as established liberal democracies are experiencing an erosion of democratic norms and practices that few thought possible even a decade ago.

Understanding the dynamics of these illiberal regimes and the way that they resemble and differ from liberal democracies should be high on our research agenda. Over the last decade scholars have made some progress. Rather than treating these regimes as a residual category of “non-democracy,” scholars have usefully explored how different types of illiberal regimes—one-party, military, and personalist—rise and fall in different ways, pursue different economic strategies, and adopt different media strategies. In addition, scholars have explored how and why these illiberal regimes create new forms of political representation that have aspects in common with liberal democratic regimes.
Yet, many questions remain. In what way are these illiberal regimes similar to and different from their predecessors? After all, illiberal regimes have historically been far more common than liberal democracies and many contemporary illiberal regimes use historical narratives to legitimize their form of rule.

How do liberal and illiberal practices travel across space and time? There is much evidence that illiberal regimes borrow practices from each other, but we know little about how and when this occurs. A related issue is the spread of illiberal practices to established liberal democracies such as India, the United States, Hungary, Poland, and elsewhere.

How does the lived experience of ordinary citizens differ in liberal democracies and illiberal regimes? Rather than treating citizens of illiberal regimes as passive subjects, scholars have provided much evidence that they provide important bases of popular support for the illiberal project. From ethnographic accounts and public opinion studies, we can learn far more about the lived experience of citizens in these illiberal regimes.

Finally, illiberal regimes display tremendous variation in economic performance and the quality of governance. Some have grown quickly, while others have not, but the roots of this great divergence in performance is not well understood.

With its rich area-study institutes, global outlook, and longstanding commitment to gathering various forms of empirical data on the world around us Columbia is uniquely situated to address these questions.
IDENTITY, COMMUNITY, AND DIFFERENCE

As social beings, humans identify with groups; identities are both fundamental to the human condition, and often malleable, shifting, and contested. How do the identities we hold and the differences among us shape everything from international and national politics and economics to systems of justice, to our everyday lived lives in our families and workplaces? How do identities and differences shape inequality, and how do inequalities shape identities? How are conflicts of interest among different communities resolved and what are the implications of this for violence, stability, justice, democracy, etc? These issues and questions are important on scales from the very local to the global, and can be studied both in the contemporary world and across history.

Race, Ethnicity, and Indigeneity

Studies of race, ethnicity, and indigeneity have fostered (1) interdisciplinary curriculum (2) combination of academic, cultural, and community projects and (3) a sensitivity to the connections between the local and the global. Too often “global” is considered as “other than domestic.”

Justice and Ethics

Columbia’s expansion into Harlem presents the opportunity for meaningful engagement with the community regarding forms of justice and the pursuit thereof. Most prominently, criminal justice has been a site of contestation, negotiation, and, occasionally, collaboration between law enforcement and residents.

This is not, of course, to imply that the current monopoly criminal justice holds on discussions and policy surrounding “justice” is entirely appropriate. In comparison to criminal justice, public discourse on restorative justice, environmental justice, and sexual justice, just to name a few, is not nearly
as robust. Columbia’s Center for Justice has begun to take a role in advancing alternative explorations, and we will accelerate this work.

Other initiatives under this umbrella might include funding for existing centers and institutes, or for initiatives to bring together existing centers and institutes (e.g. IRWGS, IRAAS, regional institutes, etc.), or even the creation of a meta-institutional structure (e.g., a federation) that combines and expands some existing centers and institutes. Columbia’s various departments, centers, and institutes might form a cluster of action-oriented engaged research in partnership with various locally-based organizations (the Correctional Association of New York, the Harlem Defenders, West Harlem Environmental Action, Sustainable South Bronx, etc.).
Continuing to attract and inspire the world’s best undergraduate and graduate students will require innovative approaches to teaching and learning. Technical resources for developing new teaching tools and skills are critically important. At the same time, faculty learn with students and from each other. The creative connections that arise when faculty are able to teach collaboratively also bring dynamism and fresh perspective to the classroom. (The new “Computing in Context” program shared between the Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering is a case in point. But combinations of creative teaching and research that combine more traditional teaching with media practice or theory, the digital arts, translation or cross fields within or between departments should also be explored.)

However, the cost of co-teaching (i.e., the “loss” of a class) serves as a disincentive. *Pedagogical Innovation Fellowships* from the Arts and Sciences would help bear the “cost” of co-teaching for departments while fostering collaborative teaching, lowering the barrier to teaching social science across departments or schools, and enabling experimentation with new methods and curriculum in the classroom.

*Pedagogical Innovation Fellowships* could also support collaborative teaching between Columbia and peer institutions. Shifting interests and budgetary constraints may mean that some of the fields that are crucial to the liberal arts tradition may also be some of the smallest and/or least resourced fields. *Pedagogical Innovation Fellowships* could be used to contribute to resources for the teaching of small, cherished fields or methods. Important subfields can be sustained by combining resources with other universities following the model of support used for “less commonly taught languages”—use of virtual and face-to-face...
consortium teaching, shared technologies, methodologies or datasets, etc. Blended and hybrid teaching in this case could be used to help to create not only new classroom dynamics, but also to coalesce a critical mass of scholars and scholarship around smaller fields or uncommon methods.

**INTERDISCIPLINARY HIRE**

Pedagogical experimentation and innovation should also be supported with prestigious faculty chairs earmarked for renowned faculty whose research and teaching crosses division or schools.

Support and foster interdisciplinary research by hiring exceptional interdisciplinary senior faculty who are nominated by at least two departments and whose work engages a crucial theme, problem, or idea.

**GLOBAL SOCIETY OF FELLows**

Partly modeled on Columbia’s endowed successful Society of Fellows program, this effort, the **Global Society of Fellows**, would aim to bring many of the best postdoctoral fellows in the world to Columbia. Fellows would be assigned to and housed within the Arts and Sciences’ many vibrant centers and institutes, and particularly the regional and other institutes which place global concerns at the center of their work. Fellows would help to shape intellectual life at their respective centers and institutes and would also participate in a weekly seminar and other programming.

Expanding the scope and scale of the current International Network to Expand Regional and Collaborative Teaching (or INTERACT) program, fellows would teach in the Global Core curriculum and would also be encouraged to organize programs at the Global Centers. The program would be geared toward a transnational, post-area studies paradigm and would thus serve as vehicle for rethinking and re-organizing research and teaching. By supporting in-residence
fellowships for extraordinary international postdoctoral students, we will enhance research and incubate collaboration.

**COLUMBIA GRADUATE FELLOWS PROGRAM**

Over the next decade, the social sciences will endow fellowships for ten percent of its graduate students. This will allow Columbia to attract the best and most diverse group of students, many of whom receive multiple, competitive offers, and to compete with peer institutions (Yale, Harvard) that are beginning to offer six years of funding to doctoral students, increasing our research competitiveness.

**COLUMBIA UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS**

In collaboration with Columbia College, this plan will expand research opportunities and endow summer research fellowships as an initial step toward providing opportunities for all students interested in participating in research as part of their undergraduate experience.

**UNDERGRADUATE CIVIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE GLOBAL CITY**

Provide service and experimental learning for both undergraduate and graduate students by supporting projects that are contributing to research and learning (e.g., students going out into the city and collecting data; students working with community-based organizations, students engaging in public service in Upper Manhattan/Bronx schools and prisons etc.). Deeply engage students in the practices of research and service and allow them to contribute to the research project while taking advantage of our location in New York City.
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