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Overview of the 2015-16 Edition of the Howard Assessment Dashboard

The Howard University Assessment Dashboard: Information Fast Track, designed by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE), functions as a highly accessible source of institutional assessment data and information that are particularly focused on student learning and other developmental outcomes.

Data used for dashboard indicators are collected from a variety of sources and assessment instruments and tools. Data are also collected using internally developed instruments such as subject area final exams, senior comprehensive exams, and graduating student exit surveys. University offices such as enrollment management, the registrar and financial aid also provide student data and information; however, the information shared does not violate policies of confidentiality.

Nationally standardized instruments developed by the College Board, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and the American College Testing (ACT) Program are used to measure secondary student learning outcomes. Additionally, commercially developed surveys such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey and the Your First College Year (YFCY) Survey are administered periodically to measure a wide range of student educational experiences and related dispositions. Other data are taken from national databases such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES).
1. Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rates

It is vital for the University to continually monitor important institutional-level indicators and outcomes. Defining classes/cohorts of students is important for admissions officers, enrollment management personnel, administrators, and other key stakeholders as they plan. It is also important to assess and monitor student academic progress to occur for purposes of improvement and accountability. This section graphically presents current (AY2015-16) and longitudinal information on student enrollment, retention and graduation.

Enrollment

HU Undergraduate Student Enrollment by Gender, AY2015-16

- 33% (2331) Female
- 67% (4767) Male

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE

HU Graduate/Professional Student Enrollment by Gender, AY2015-16

- 40% (1294) Female
- 60% (1952) Male

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Howard University Undergraduate Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status, AY2015-16

92% (6514)
6% (405)
3% (179)

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE

Howard University Graduate/Professional Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status, AY2015-16

82% (2661)
11% (341)
8% (244)

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rates

Howard University Student Enrollment by Gender (All Levels), AY2015-16

- Female: 35% (3625)
- Male: 65% (6719)

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE

Howard University Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status (All Levels), AY2015-16

- United States Citizens: 89% (9175)
- Permanent Residents: 7% (746)
- Non-Resident Alien: 4% (423)

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Howard Assessment Dashboard

AY 2015-16

Howard University First-Time in College Student Enrollment by Cohort 2006 to 2015

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE

Howard University First-Time in College Student Enrollment by Gender Cohort Year 2006 to 2015

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Retention and Graduation

Howard University Undergraduate Student Retention Rates
Cohort Year 2006 to 2015

Howard University Undergraduate Student Graduation Rates
Cohort Year 2005 to 2013

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Howard University Undergraduate 4-Year Graduation Rate by Gender
Cohort Year 2004 to 2012

Howard University Undergraduate 6-Year Graduation Rate by Gender
Cohort Year 2004 to 2010

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rates

Howard University Undergraduate MALE Graduation Rates
Cohort Year 2004 to 2012

Howard University Undergraduate FEMALE Graduation Rates
Cohort Year 2004 to 2012

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar; Graph by OIAE
Note: Research Extensive institutions have an extensive research program covering many areas at a high level.
Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rates

Howard University Graduation Rates-Bachelor Degree within 6 Years and Mean Rates for Research Intensive Universities

Howard University
Research Intensive Universities

Source: Howard Univ. Registrar and IPEDS; Graph by OIAE

Howard University Graduation Rates-Bachelor Degree within 6 Years and Mean Rates for Private Not-for-Profit Four-Year or Above Institutions with Enrollment between 10,000-19,999

Howard University
Private 4-Year or above Institutions with enrollment between 10,000-19,999

Source: HU Registrar and IPEDS; Graph by OIAE

Note: Research Intensive means there's a narrowly focused, intensive research program in certain areas.
2. Student Learning Outcomes

This section provides data and information on the general education student learning outcome, quantitative reasoning. Quantitative reasoning was assessed by measuring student performance on departmental final exams designed and administered by the Department of Mathematics for College Algebra I, College Algebra II, Pre-Calculus, Calculus I, Applied Calculus, and Introduction to Statistics.

Quantitative Reasoning: Spring 2016

In Spring 2016, the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) requested data on student performance in College Algebra I, College Algebra II, Pre-Calculus, Calculus I, Applied Calculus, and Introduction to Statistics to assess the general education learning outcome, quantitative reasoning (QR). “Competent” performance was defined as earning a competency or final examination score of at least 60%. To aid in the identification of questions that would be used to assess quantitative reasoning, committee chairs were given the general education competencies for quantitative reasoning as defined by the Mathematical Association of America (MAA). Final examination Chairs were asked to identify questions on his or her respective final examination that measured students’ ability to:

- **Quantitative Reasoning Competency 1** (QRC1): Interpret mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables, and schematics, and draw inferences from them;
- **Quantitative Reasoning Competency 2** (QRC2): Represent mathematical information symbolically, visually, numerically, and verbally;
- **Quantitative Reasoning Competency 3** (QRC3): Use arithmetical, algebraic, geometric and statistical methods to solve problems; and
- **Quantitative Reasoning Competency 4** (QRC4): Estimate and check answers to mathematical problems in order to determine reasonableness, identify alternatives, and select optimal results.

### College Algebra I

![College Algebra I: Institutional Results](image-url)
For Spring 2016, institutional results for College Algebra I show that 101 of 241 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 59 of 241 or 24% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on QRC3. Out of the 140 valid cases, 59 or 42% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on QRC3. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 48% decrease in student performance on QRC3 for valid cases in Spring 2016.

For Spring 2016, institutional results for College Algebra I show that 101 of 241 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 71 of 241 or 29% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Out of the 140 valid cases, 71 or 51% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 16% decrease in student performance on the final exam for valid cases in Spring 2016.

**College Algebra II**

For College Algebra II, student performance on QRC1, QRC2, and QRC3 improved from Fall 2014 to Spring 2016, with QRC3 showing the largest improvement (i.e., 74% increase).

---

**College Algebra I: Institutional Results**

Percent of Valid Cases Scoring 60% or Higher on the Final Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>QRC1 (N=285)</th>
<th>QRC2 (N=351)</th>
<th>QRC3 (N=197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**College Algebra II: Institutional Results**

Percent of Valid Cases Scoring 60% or Higher on the Final Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>QRC1 (N=303)</th>
<th>QRC2 (N=318)</th>
<th>QRC3 (N=123)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Spring 2016, institutional results for College Algebra II show that 58 of 181 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 60 of 181 or 33% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Out of the 123 valid cases, 60 or 49% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Compared to Spring 2014, there was a 48% increase in student performance on the final exam for valid cases in Spring 2016.

**Pre-Calculus**
For Pre-Calculus, student performance on QRC2 and QRC3 improved from Fall 2014 to Spring 2016, with QRC3 showing the largest improvement (i.e., 600% increase). Performance on QRC3 increased 3% from Spring 2014 to Spring 2016.

For Spring 2016, institutional results for Pre-Calculus show that 3 of 89 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 46 of 89 or 52% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Out of the 86 valid cases, 46 or 53% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 140% increase in student performance on the final exam for valid cases in Spring 2016. Performance on the final exam increased 2% from Spring 2014 to Spring 2016.
Calculus I

For Spring 2016, institutional results for Calculus I show that 55 of 96 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 21 of 96 or 22% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on QRC3. Out of the 41 valid cases, 21 or 51% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on QRC3. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 34% decrease in student performance on QRC3 for valid cases in Spring 2016.

For Spring 2016, institutional results for Calculus I show that 15 of 96 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 17 of 96 or 18% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Out of the 81 valid cases, 17 or 21% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 66% decrease in student performance on the final exam for valid cases in Spring 2016.
For Applied Calculus, student performance on QRC1 and QRC3 improved from Fall 2014 to Spring 2016, with QRC3 showing the largest improvement (i.e., 40% increase).

For Spring 2016, institutional result for Applied Calculus show that 9 of 57 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 36 of 57 or 63% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Out of the 48 valid cases, 36 or 75% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Compared to Fall 2014, there was a 53% increase in student performance on the final exam for valid cases in Spring 2016.
Introduction to Statistics

The Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) assessed student performance in *Introduction to Statistics* for the first time in Spring 2016. Of the four quantitative reasoning competencies, students performed better on QRC4 than on any of the other competencies. However, no student (0%) scored 60% or higher on any of the items that competency QRC2 assessed. Originally, there were 35 students enrolled in the course; however, 2 students withdrew from the course or had no score resulting in N=33 valid cases in the analysis. Of the 33 valid cases, 25 or 76% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam. Additionally, of the 35 original enrollees, 25 or 71% earned a score of 60% or higher on the final exam.
3. Institutional Surveys

Opinions and perceptions matter. How satisfied are the stakeholders? Surveys of Howard stakeholders provide information on their views of various university issues and conditions. The results of the surveys also provide valuable feedback for an array of university units and information that can inform further operational, administrative, instructional and policy improvements. We have selected a few items from each survey and presented the results here. [Note: All survey results have limitations that particularly relate to sampling and response rates. Some results herein should be interpreted with caution. Standard error information is provided.] For more results, refer to the corresponding report for certain surveys that can be found on the OIAE website: http://assessment.howard.edu. Other information can be requested.

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2014 and 2015

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collects information annually from samples of first-year and senior students about the nature and quality of their undergraduate experience. Since its inception, more than 1,000 institutions have used NSSE to measure the extent to which students engage in effective educational practices that are empirically linked with learning, personal development and other desired outcomes such as student satisfaction, persistence and graduation. NSSE Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of items (subscales) examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators (bulleted below) are organized within four themes as follows:

Theme: Academic Challenge (AC):
- Higher Order Learning
- Reflective and Integrative Learning
- Learning Strategies
- Quantitative Reasoning

Theme: Learning with Peers (LWP):
- Collaborative Learning
- Discussions with Diverse Others

Theme: Experiences with Faculty (EWF):
- Student Faculty Interaction
- Effective Teaching Practices

Theme: Campus Environment:
- Quality of Interactions
- Supportive Environment
In both years, first-year students report higher mean EI scores in Learning Strategies than in any other areas, with a decline from 2014 to 2015. Mean Engagement Indicator scores in Quantitative Reasoning are below the median (30) and lowest among the areas, but with an increase from 2014-2015. Quantitative Reasoning is of particular concern.
Engagement Indicator Scores in each EI area are very consistent across years. Mean Engagement Indicator scores in Quantitative Reasoning are lowest among the areas and remained constant from 2014 to 2015. There is a notable difference in mean EI scores across years in the area of Discussions with Diverse Others.
Engagement Indicator Mean Comparisons
for First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE
Engagement Indicator Mean Comparisons for Senior Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE

NSSE - Experiences with Faculty Theme: 2014-2015
Engagement Indicator Mean Comparisons for First-Year Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE
The following graphs focus on selected Engagement Indicators allowing for comparisons among first-year students and seniors across survey years.
Across both years, first-year students report higher mean Engagement scores on Supportive Environment than do seniors.

For each group, scores increased from 2014 to 2015.
NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Quantitative Reasoning
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE

NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Collaborative Learning
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE
NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Discussions with Diverse Others
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

First-Year
- 2014: 37.5
- 2015: 40.7

Senior
- 2014: 35.3
- 2015: 42.0

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE

NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Student-Faculty Interaction
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

First-Year
- 2014: 21.8
- 2015: 22.8

Senior
- 2014: 26.5
- 2015: 26.3

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE
Institutional Surveys

NSSE 2014-2015

NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Effective Teaching Practices
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE

NSSE 2014-2015
Indicator: Quality Interactions
Mean Comparisons for First-Year and Senior Students

Source: NSSE 2014-2015
Howard Univ. OIAE
Descriptions of Comparison Groups found in the following figures:

**Aspirants** are exemplar institutions identified by Howard Senior Administration, or similar participating institutions in 2014, including American U., Boston U., Tulane U., UMBC, Georgia Institute of Technology, and NYU Polytechnic Institute.

**HBCUs** are those six such institutions participating in 2014, including Delaware State U., Dillard U., Fisk U., North Carolina Central U., Tennessee State U. and Univ. of Maryland Eastern Shore.
Note: Percentages in this figure represent those responding that the emphasis was “very much” or “quite a bit.”
Percentages of First-year Students Who Say They Were Often Required to Reach Conclusions from Numerical Analyses

Howard N=272

Source: NSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE

---

Percentages of Seniors Who Say They Were Often Required to Reach Conclusions from Numerical Analyses

Howard N=254

Source: NSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
Percentages of First-year Students Who Say They Were Often Required to Evaluate Conclusions of Others Based on Numerical Information

- Howard: 36%
- Aspirants: 41%
- HBCUs: 40%

Source: NSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
Howard N=267

Percentages of Seniors Who Say They Were Often Required to Evaluate Conclusions of Others Based on Numerical Information

- Howard: 40%
- Aspirants: 51%
- HBCUs: 52%

Source: NSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
Howard N=253
Note: Percentages in this figure represent those responding that the emphasis was “very much” or “quite a bit.”
Note: Percentages in this figure represent those responding that the emphasis was “very much” or “quite a bit.”
Institutional Surveys

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) 2014

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) complements the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). FSSE measures faculty members’ expectations of student engagement in educational practices. It also collects information about how faculty members spend their time on professorial activities, such as teaching and scholarship, and the types of learning experiences their institutions emphasize. In 2014, six hundred fifty-three (653) lower and upper division Howard faculty members who only taught undergraduate students were invited to participate in the FSSE and 159 faculty members responded by fully completing the survey, a response rate of 27%. Sampling Error (+/- 6%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSSE 2014 Item</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Faculty Responding Very Much or Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Faculty N</th>
<th>Students Responding Very Much or Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Student N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations</td>
<td>LD*</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD*</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: LD is Lower Division and UD is Upper Division

*Lower Division (LD) courses are taken mostly by first-year and sophomore students. Upper Division (UD) courses are taken mostly by junior and senior students.

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014 (Howard Univ. OIAE)
Percentages of Faculty Who Report Emphasizing, and Students Who Report: **Applying facts, theories or methods to practical problems**

![Bar Chart]

Percentages of Faculty Who Report Emphasizing, and Students Who Report: **Combining Ideas from Different Courses When Completing Assignments**

![Bar Chart]

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
Percentages of Faculty Who Report Emphasizing, and Students Who Report: **Summarizing Learning from Class or Course Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Faculty on FSSE</th>
<th>Students on NSSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE

Percentages of Faculty Who Report the Importance that Howard Increase Emphasis on **Students Spending Significant Amounts of Time Studying**, and of Students Reporting Perception of that Emphasis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Faculty on FSSE</th>
<th>Students on NSSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
Percentages of Faculty Encouraging, and Students Reporting: Asking Other Students for Help in Understanding Course Material

- Lower Division:
  - Faculty on FSSE: 56%
  - Students on NSSE: 69%

- Upper Division:
  - Faculty on FSSE: 61%
  - Students on NSSE: 56%

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE

Percentage of Faculty and Students Reporting that They Have Discussed the Students' Academic Performance During AY 2014

- Lower Division:
  - Faculty on FSSE: 90%
  - Students on NSSE: 37%

- Upper Division:
  - Faculty on FSSE: 92%
  - Students on NSSE: 39%

Source: NSSE, FSSE 2014
Howard Univ. OIAE
In 2014, within the Lower Division, 74% of faculty respondents hold Doctoral degrees and 24% hold Master’s degrees. In the Upper Division, 75% of faculty respondents hold Doctoral degrees and 17% hold Master’s.

*Note: Support defined as recreation, health care, counseling, etc. (Student Affairs Areas)
Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey 2016

The 2012 Howard University Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey (GSES) is administered annually to prospective candidates for graduation who are enrolled in all of the University’s undergraduate programs. The primary purpose of the survey is twofold: (1) to obtain information about students’ satisfaction with a range of academic and co-academic experiences during their matriculation at the University, and (2) to inquire about their plans for the future. The survey is administered by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) through a web-based format with the assistance and cooperation of key staff in the various schools and colleges. In 2016, there were 1,259 respondents to the Undergraduate GSES.

![Howard Undergraduate GSES Respondents by Gender](source: HU Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE)

![Howard Undergraduate GSES Respondents by Citizenship Status](source: HU Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE)
Note: First Generation students are defined as those whose parents do not hold a baccalaureate degree.

The pie charts provide key demographic information on the survey respondents. Included in these charts are gender, citizenship status, first-time student status, first-generation status, and full-time and part-time status. A chart reporting whether or not the respondents would recommend Howard to a prospective student is included.
While at Howard University, you were employed primarily:

- Full-time Off Campus: 12%
- Part-time Off Campus: 60%
- Full-time On Campus: 5%
- Part-time On Campus: 23%

N= 907

Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

12.8% of the respondents worked full time, 66.9% worked part time, and 20.4% never worked. (on or off campus)

Approximately 70.1% of the respondents reported a GPA of 3.00 or higher.

GPA Distribution for Undergraduate Respondents

- 3.70-4.00: 16%
- 3.30-3.69: 30%
- 3.00-3.29: 28%
- 2.70-2.99: 17%
- 2.30-2.69: 7%
- 2.00-2.29: 2%
- 1.70-1.99: 2%
- Not Applicable: 0%

N= 1244

Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Please indicate the primary way you plan to give back to Howard as an alumna/alumnus

- Making Financial Contributions: 49%
- Recruiting New Students: 20%
- Fundraising: 4%
- Volunteering: 18%
- Other: 10%

N= 862
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Overall Quality of the Educational Experience

- Very Satisfied: 19%
- Satisfied: 65%
- Dissatisfied: 13%
- Very Dissatisfied: 2%
- Don't Know: 1%
- N/A: 0%

N= 1206
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Customer Service in Administrative Offices of Your School or College

N= 1204
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Faculty Professionalism

N= 1203
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Level of Intellectual Stimulation in Courses

N= 1192
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Your Preparation for Employment in Your Major

N= 1142
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
### Rate the level of satisfaction with the following Knowledge and Skill Development: (N =1182)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate leadership</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of ethics</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of African American culture</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of critical thinking and analysis skills</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work skill development</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of interpersonal skills</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of life skills (e.g., prioritization, time management, etc.)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in oral communication</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in written communication</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the humanities (languages, history, philosophy, literature, arts)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the social sciences</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>*Rank (Satisfied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of African culture</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of American Culture</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural knowledge</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skill development</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of contributions of the African Diaspora to your major field of study</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information literacy skills development</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about personal health and nutrition</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of global policies and issues</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the physical sciences</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in computer applications</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of mathematics</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**iLab and Campus Computer Laboratories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1166  
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**Condition of University Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1161  
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Graduation Clearance Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1143
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Provision of or Access to Institutional Assessment Information (e.g., survey results, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 1206
Source: Howard Univ. Undergraduate Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
## Rate the level of satisfaction with the following Student Support Offices: (N=1161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Support</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Don’t Know (%)</th>
<th>N/A (%)</th>
<th>Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Admissions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Registrar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Student Life and Activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Career Services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Service Center</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Accounts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Career Services in your school or college</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following Student Support Offices: (N=1161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Enrollment Management</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Service</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Residence Life</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Financial Services (Other than Office of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of International Student Services</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Financial Aid</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE

The table above shows the levels of overall student satisfaction with the student support offices. The offices are listed in descending order based on their satisfaction ratings which are the combined percentages of respondents who were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied.”. Due to large amounts of respondents who selected “Don’t Know” or “N/A” regarding some of the offices, it may be best to consider results which exclude those respondents. *Therefore, rankings of the units and satisfaction percentages are listed in the last column of the table. These percentages were calculated having made that adjustment. The percentages of satisfaction ratings computed are listed in the parentheses.
Graduate and Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey 2016

The Howard University Graduate and Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey (GSES) is administered annually to prospective candidates for graduation enrolled in all graduate/professional programs. The primary purpose of the survey is to obtain information about students’ satisfaction with a range of academic and co-academic experiences during their matriculation and to inquire about their plans for the future. The survey was administered by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) through a web-based format. In 2016, there were 660 respondents. More detailed information can be obtained from the Howard 2016 Graduate/Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey Report (HU-OIAE, 2016).

Note: First Generation refers to those students whose parents do not hold a baccalaureate degree.
The pie charts above provide key demographic information on the survey respondents. Included in these charts are gender, citizenship status, first-time student status, first-generation status, full-time and part-time status, and classification by degree. In addition, a chart reporting whether or not the respondents will recommend Howard to a prospective student and a chart reporting whether or not the respondents lived on campus are included.
While at Howard University, you were employed primarily:

- Full-time Off Campus: 26%
- Part-time Off Campus: 40%
- Full-time On Campus: 7%
- Part-time On Campus: 27%

N= 361

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Of the 361 respondents who were employed while at HU, 33% worked full time, and 67% worked part time on or off-campus.

Cumulative GPAs of 3.0 and above were reported by 85%.

GPA Distribution for Graduate and Professional Respondents

- 3.70-4.00: 32%
- 3.30-3.69: 34%
- 3.00-3.29: 19%
- 2.70-2.99: 4%
- 2.30-2.69: 2%
- Not Applicable: 9%

N= 562

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Please indicate the primary way you plan to give back to Howard University as an Alumna/Alumnus

- Making Financial Contributions: 52%
- Recruiting New Students: 20%
- Fundraising: 3%
- Volunteering: 21%
- Other: 4%
- No Plan to Contribute: 26%

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Overall quality of the educational experience

- Very Satisfied: 26%
- Satisfied: 59%
- Dissatisfied: 12%
- Very Dissatisfied: 1%
- Don’t Know: 1%
- N/A: 1%

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Customer Service in Administrative Offices in Your School or College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Faculty professionalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Level of intellectual stimulation in courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Your preparation for employment in your major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with Knowledge and Skill Development: (N=562)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking and analysis skills development</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of ethics</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on interpersonal skills</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate leadership</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on life skills (e.g., prioritization, time management, etc.)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work skill development</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural knowledge</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Experiences in verbal communication</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE
# Rate the level of satisfaction with Knowledge and Skill Development: (N=562)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research skill development</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Experiences in written communication</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced information literacy/facility development (i.e., library skills)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of global policies and issues</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of contributions of the African Diaspora to your major field of study</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Experiences in computer applications</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Access to Wireless Internet Connection on Campus

Very Satisfied: 10%
Satisfied: 38%
Dissatisfied: 28%
Very Dissatisfied: 22%
Don't Know: 1%
N/A: 2%

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
ILab and Campus Computer Laboratories

Very Satisfied: 15%
Satisfied: 49%
Dissatisfied: 13%
Very Dissatisfied: 5%
Don't Know: 11%
N/A: 15%

N= 562
Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Condition of University libraries**

- Very Satisfied: 5.0%
- Satisfied: 27.0%
- Dissatisfied: 14.0%
- Very Dissatisfied: 10.0%
- Don't Know: 16.0%
- N/A: 27.0%

N= 562

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

---

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Opportunity for students to formally assess academic programs**

- Very Satisfied: 19%
- Satisfied: 53%
- Dissatisfied: 18%
- Very Dissatisfied: 6%
- Don't Know: 3%
- N/A: 1%

N= 562

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Provision of or Access to Institutional Assessment Information (e.g., Survey Results, etc.)

- Very Satisfied: 13%
- Satisfied: 43%
- Dissatisfied: 21%
- Very Dissatisfied: 7%
- Don't Know: 10%
- N/A: 5%

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Overall condition of University buildings

- Very Satisfied: 5%
- Satisfied: 35%
- Dissatisfied: 34%
- Very Dissatisfied: 19%
- Don't Know: 3%
- N/A: 4%

Source: Howard Univ. Graduate/Professional Exit Survey 2016, OIAE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Office</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Admissions</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Student Health Service Center</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Student Accounts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Financial Aid (in school/college)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Enrollment Management</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security (Police)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Financial Aid (main campus)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Financial Services (other than Office of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/ Placement Services in your college or school (Not institutional office)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Life</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Service</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU Office of Career Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Office of International Student Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Services (in school/college)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE
The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) - Freshman Survey collects information at entry that provides a comprehensive profile of incoming students, what they are like before they experience college. Sections of the CIRP survey ask questions about academic preparedness, expectations of college, student values and goals, and concerns about financing college. The Your First College Year Survey (YFCY) is a parallel survey to the CIRP and is designed to examine changes that may have taken place in students during their first year of matriculation. Data are matched for students who completed both instruments.

In the title of each graph, “High” represents students who scored one-half standard deviation or more above the mean of 55.
CIRP Constructs are complex and multifaceted. To measure broad underlying areas more precisely, Item Response Theory (IRT) is used to combine individual survey items into global measures that capture these areas. The Habits of Mind Construct combines the following items among others:

* Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others

* Support your opinions with a logical argument

*Seek alternative solutions to a problem

* Evaluate the quality or reliability of information you received

* Explore topics on your own, even though it was not required for a class

* Seek feedback on your academic work

Note: The items are listed in the order of weight they carry in forming the construct, with the most important contributor coming first. [For more detailed information: www.heri.ucla.edu/about-cirp/]

The graphs above indicate that greater proportions of Howard students recorded higher Habits of Mind Construct (HMC) scores on both surveys than did those of each comparison group. All students’ HMC scores declined from CIRP to YFCY. Howard students’ Social Agency Construct (SAC) scores were greater than those of each comparison group. Howard students and those from each comparison group registered increased SAC scores across CIRP and YFCY surveys.
The pattern of differences between CIRP and YFCY construct scores indicate that at Howard and other HBCUs students tend to indicate declines in their self-perceptions related to academic areas, but indicate gains in perceptions relating to social areas.
Howard University Alumni Outcomes Assessment Project 2013

The Howard University (HU) Office of Institutional Assessment & Evaluation (OIAE), along with the HU Department of Alumni Relations (HUDAR) within the Office of Development and Alumni Relations (ODAR) planned and implemented the Howard University Alumni Outcomes Assessment Project 2013, which included focus group interviews and a rather comprehensive survey. The primary purpose of this project was to provide University community stakeholders with useful assessment information from alumni on student learning and developmental outcomes, levels of student satisfaction with many aspects of the HU experience (academic and co-academic), various ratings of the University, employment/career outcomes and status, and particular areas germane to alumni relations, such as giving. Due to the generational representativeness of the respondent pool, data on many survey items were broken down by Birth Decade Cohorts. The complete Howard University Alumni Outcomes Assessment Project: Perspectives Along the Path to Truth and Service, Final Report 2013 report can be found on the website of the Howard University Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation. [http://assessment.howard.edu]
Nearly all alumni attribute major or moderate impact to their Howard University experience relating to their development of certain key life skills and dispositions such as self-competence and self-confidence.
Levels of Impact on Sense of Self Confidence Attributed to the Howard University Experience by Alumni [by Birth Decade Cohort]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Decade Cohorts</th>
<th>Major Impact (%</th>
<th>Moderate Impact (%)</th>
<th>Minor Impact (%)</th>
<th>No Impact (%)</th>
<th>Not Important to Me (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990s (n=12)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s (n=202)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s (n=350)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s (n=390)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s (n=380)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s (n=286)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s or before (n=89)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=1709
Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013
Levels of Impact on Selected Mission-centric Student Development Outcomes Ascribed by Alumni to the Howard University Experience

- Appreciating cultural/ethnic differences domestically (n=1698)
  - 61% Major Impact
  - 27% Moderate Impact
  - 9% Minor Impact
  - 4% No Impact

- Appreciating cultural/ethnic differences globally (n=1692)
  - 58% Major Impact
  - 26% Moderate Impact
  - 11% Minor Impact
  - 4% No Impact

- Appreciating the humanities (n=1694)
  - 45% Major Impact
  - 30% Moderate Impact
  - 18% Minor Impact
  - 7% No Impact

- Having historical awareness (n=1685)
  - 63% Major Impact
  - 26% Moderate Impact
  - 9% Minor Impact
  - 2% No Impact

- Wanting to discover solutions to human problems domestically (n=1687)
  - 38% Major Impact
  - 36% Moderate Impact
  - 17% Minor Impact
  - 8% No Impact

- Wanting to discover solutions to human problems internationally (n=1684)
  - 27% Major Impact
  - 32% Moderate Impact
  - 26% Minor Impact
  - 13% No Impact

Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013
### Levels of Impact on Appreciation of Domestic Cultural/Ethnic Differences Attributed to their Howard University Experience by Alumni [by Birth Decade Cohort]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Decade Cohorts</th>
<th>Major Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Minor Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
<th>Not Important to Me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990s (n=12)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s (n=200)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s (n=345)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s (n=386)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s (n=377)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s (n=289)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s or before (n=89)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013*
Levels of Impact on Appreciation of Global Cultural/Ethnic Differences Attributed to their Howard University Experience by Alumni [by Birth Decade Cohort]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Decade Cohorts</th>
<th>Major impact</th>
<th>Moderate impact</th>
<th>Minor impact</th>
<th>Not important to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990s (n=12)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s (n=200)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s (n=344)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s (n=383)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s (n=376)</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s (n=288)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s or before (n=89)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Respondents

N=1692

Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013
Very substantial proportions of alumni attribute their development of key professional skills to their Howard University education and training.
Levels of Impact on Development of Effective Written Communication Skills Ascribed to their HU Experience by Alumni [by Birth Decade Cohort]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth Decade Cohort</th>
<th>Major Impact</th>
<th>Moderate Impact</th>
<th>Minor Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990s (n=11)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s (n=200)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s (n=346)</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s (n=388)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950s (n=378)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940s (n=288)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930s or before (n=88)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=1699

Percentage of Respondents

Major Impact | Moderate Impact | Minor Impact | No Impact | Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013
Many critical academic conditions and Student Affairs activities and supports at Howard University are rated satisfactorily by large majorities of alumni. Several areas/functions are in need of more development or improvement.
Howard University Alumni Satisfaction with Key Areas of Student Affairs during Matriculation

- Sense of Individual belonging on campus (N=1694)
  - Very Satisfied: 43%
  - Satisfied: 37%
  - Neutral: 13%
  - Dissatisfied: 3%

- Opportunities for student involvement in campus activities (N=1691)
  - Very Satisfied: 48%
  - Satisfied: 34%
  - Neutral: 12%
  - Dissatisfied: 2%

- Cultural and/or other diversity in student body (N=1689)
  - Very Satisfied: 47%
  - Satisfied: 37%
  - Neutral: 11%
  - Dissatisfied: 2%

- Opportunities for student-faculty interaction outside of class (N=1687)
  - Very Satisfied: 22%
  - Satisfied: 28%
  - Neutral: 33%
  - Dissatisfied: 10%

- Cultural/arts programs (including guest speakers) (N=1682)
  - Very Satisfied: 44%
  - Satisfied: 35%
  - Neutral: 16%
  - Dissatisfied: 2%

Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013

Howard University Alumni Satisfaction with the Course of Their Primary Career Thus Far

- Very Satisfied: 37%
- Generally Satisfied: 43%
- Ambivalent/Uncertain: 5%
- Generally Dissatisfied: 4%
- Very Dissatisfied: 2%
- Not Applicable: 5%

N=1801

Data: Howard Univ. Alumni Survey 2013
Practically all alumni responding would recommend Howard to others, with nearly three quarters of them doing so without reservation.
Nearly two thirds of alumni indicate the willingness to serve Howard through financial gifts, and a substantial number are willing to make personal presentations to students. Many alumni are willing to serve in more than one way.
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