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Dear Dr. Sibolski:

On behalf of the Board of Trustees, faculty, students, administrators, and staff of Howard University, it is my pleasure to transmit the University's 2009 Self-Study Report to the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and the members of the Middle States Evaluation Team. I wish to offer particular thanks to you and the Evaluation Team for your contributions to the process that will lead to the University's reaccreditation.

As a comprehensive examination of Howard University, this report resulted from a two-year self evaluation of the many and varied components of the institution by the Self-Study Steering and Executive Committees. These University-wide committees were composed of students, faculty, staff, administrators, and trustees. The Self-Study Report provides a transparent and comprehensive assessment of the institution over the past ten years as viewed through the lens of the Middle States' Standards and Characteristics of Excellence, and the University's mission and vision. The Report is timely because it serves as a foundation from which the University can shape the next phase of its existence with a revised mission statement and vision, strategic adjustments in its academic programs and administrative services, and approach to local, national and international service. Our goal is to advance Howard University into the ranks of the nation's top research institutions, while maintaining its historic mission and identity as a leader of the Historically Black College and University community.

As the new President of Howard, I am encouraged by the strong commitment of our Board of Trustees, faculty, students, and staff to realigning and strengthening our University’s academic programs, providing efficient administrative services, and ensuring its financial viability.

We will use the results of the Self-Study and the insights that we will gain from the Middle States Evaluation Team to build upon the things that we do well and address issues that require our attention. We look forward to the evaluation team’s November 3-6, 2009 site visit and the rich dialogue we expect to have about our history, mission, and vision, as well as your assessment of our efforts.

Sincerely,

Sidney A. Ribeau
President

Cc: Dr. Nancy Cantor
Chancellor, Syracuse University and
Chair, Howard University Middle States Evaluation Team
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Executive Summary

Howard University, as one of the nation’s leading research universities, is dedicated to educating students from diverse backgrounds at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional level, with a particular focus on African-American students. Since its founding, Howard has been open to men and women from all racial and ethnic groups. The University received its first accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools in 1921, and thereafter has had its accreditation reaffirmed by the Association at every required interval.

Howard is a unique university with a special mission that addresses national and international higher education needs that are important to the strategic interest of our nation. It is one of only two non-military colleges or universities chartered by the United States Congress and the only research university in the nation with this status. Howard was the nation’s only Historically Black College or University (HBCU) to achieve Research I status under the old Carnegie Classification system and the only institution within this group to be truly comprehensive with respect to its array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs. Howard’s unique mission focuses on academic excellence and preparing students for national and international leadership roles. Howard prepares students to be highly qualified, socially aware, and ethical individuals. As a comprehensive research university with a diverse, predominantly African-American student body and faculty, Howard contributes to the development of new knowledge that seeks to solve social and economic problems in the domestic and international arenas that particularly impact the African Diaspora.

Since its last Self-Study in 1999, the University operated largely under the leadership of its 15th President, H. Patrick Swygert (1995-2008). During this period, the University experienced several important developments that will undoubtedly be a part of President Swygert’s legacy of enhanced academic standing, an upgraded university infrastructure, academic program streamlining, unprecedented fundraising, sustained federal support, and improved community partnerships.

Sidney A. Ribeau, Ph.D., was appointed as the 16th President of Howard University in the Spring of 2008 and assumed his position in August 2008. In his 2008 Opening Convocation speech, and Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 State of the University addresses, President Ribeau articulated an expanded and evolving vision that emphasizes the following: reinforcing an environment of academic freedom; sharpening academic offerings and quality; increasing attention to graduate programs; developing a more robust research agenda with increased productivity; expanding service to the nation and the world; improving the gender balance in enrollment, retention, and graduation; increasing internationalization of academic and research activity; and diversifying and strengthening academic, public, and private sector partnerships in the United States and abroad.

President Ribeau’s vision reinforces a commitment to attracting, retaining, and supporting stellar faculty, staff, and administrators. An enhanced dedication to being a student-centered University was evidenced by the launch of the Students First Initiative, which is designed to improve the student experience at Howard. Additionally, President Ribeau has expressed a strong commitment to assessment, evaluation, and accountability in advancing the University’s mission and promoting the development of its academic programs.

During the past two years, Howard University has engaged in a decennial self-examination to assess the significant changes and continuing areas of concern since the last full reaffirmation of accreditation by the Middles States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in 1999. The find-
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Findings from this examination provide a critical point-in-time assessment of ongoing systematic efforts that have continually informed institutional decisions regarding programs, services, initiatives, and resource allocation.

The University selected the comprehensive model in the context of the 14 Middle States standards in Characteristics of Excellence as its approach to institutional Self-Study. The Self-Study examined all aspects of its programs and services, governing and supporting structures, resources, and educational outcomes in relation to the institution’s mission and goals. To supplement the 14 Standards, a section on Research was added to highlight the strategic importance that is assigned to the University’s research agenda. Additionally, this Self-Study focused on topics and concerns that were addressed in the MSCHE 2004 Periodic Review Report.

Fifteen work groups were chosen to collect and analyze data and formulate recommendations for each section of the Self-Study and submit a draft summary report. A broadly representative University Self-Study Steering Committee, consisting of the chairs of the 15 work groups, a member of the Board of Trustees, and selected faculty, staff, and students reviewed the work groups’ study designs, and ultimately their individual Self-Study reports. An Executive Committee, chaired by the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer and consisting of the Self-Study Chair, University Officers and key stakeholders, reviewed and vetted the Self-Study report prior to its transmission to the University President.

The Self-Study Report, a compendium of the salient findings and key recommendations from the University’s assessment process, includes 19 chapters: an introduction, methodology, accomplishments related to the 1999/2004 Middle States concerns (Details are included in Chapter 3), and 15 chapters representing the 14 Standards, the additional Research Emphasis section, and a conclusion. Outlined below is a brief summary, organized by the Standards, of the Self-Study findings:

**Standard 1: Mission and Goals**

In view of the changing imperatives in higher education and in the national and global climate, Howard University recently revised its mission statement to reflect a complementary mix between teaching and research, with a focus on the expectation that research must be an integral part of undergraduate, graduate, and professional education requirements. The University’s mission statement was revised to enhance the ability of the University to compete in a changing social, technological and global society. Currently, the University achieves its mission through its focus on four overarching goals, two of which are directly related to academic programs: strengthening academic programs and services, and promoting excellence in teaching and research. Goals three and four are associated with increasing private support and enhancing national and community service. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapters 4 and 5.

**Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal**

The University’s mission has driven strategic planning as is evident in Strategic Framework for Action (SFA I and II) (SFA I and II), which set the short- and long-term goals of the institution. The process of assigning resources (i.e., human, financial, physical, and technical) to projects to ensure optimization has been driven in part by SFA I and II. Despite the success of the University’s recently completed Capital Campaign, the University must raise additional resources from private, alumni and public sources to support faculty, staff, technology and infrastructure to achieve its historic mission. The University, like all higher education institutions, is facing fiscal challenges. To address its fiscal challenges and ensure that allocation of resources are aligned with its strategic academic goals, the University has developed and implemented a three pronged strategy consisting of a new budget development process, a long-term tuition and fees strategy, and an academic renewal initiative that will review and strategically align the University’s undergraduate, graduate and professional degree programs with its mission and fiscal resources. Chapters 5 and 6 contain additional details regarding Standard 2.
Standard 3: Institutional Resources

University resources are allocated to achieve University goals while meeting internal and external auditing and federal oversight requirements. During the past decade, and recently with increased concern from all segments, the University has given increased attention to the manner in which its resources are allocated and the level of involvement by faculty and other members of the University community. In the midst of the financial challenges that Howard and other institutions of higher learning face, the University continues to support priority areas and is implementing short- and long-term strategies to respond to these challenges. The short-term strategy has included a university-wide furlough and salary and hiring freezes. Among the long-term measures are a Voluntary Separation and Incentive Retirement program (VSIRP), which was completed on June 30, 2009, and an academic renewal initiative (academic program portfolio review and program prioritization), which will begin in the Fall of 2009. Technology has significantly improved instructional capabilities, student learning, and staff productivity. Although the University needs to make significant infrastructural improvements, it has made considerable improvements in its physical infrastructure. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 6.

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

Legal authority for final decision-making at Howard University is vested in its Board of Trustees and the President as delegated by the Board. The University’s governance process, as established by its Charter, By-laws, policies, and regulations, provides opportunities for appropriate input into decision-making by faculty, staff, and students.

The University has a shared governance structure, with appropriate roles for faculty, students, and staff outlined in governing handbooks, constitutions, and By-laws. Issues concerning the extent to which shared governance exists at the University have been raised and have been the subject of much discussion. President Ribeau
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has embraced the concept of a shared governance approach. In the first year of his presidency, he instituted policies and practices that increased the transparency of the University’s decision-making process and provided increased opportunities for faculty, student, and staff involvement. Increased meetings with the leadership of the Faculty Senate and the Howard University Student and Staff Associations have facilitated their involvement in decision-making. There is general agreement that the University’s Faculty Handbook, which was last changed in 1993, needs to be revised. As referenced above, the University implemented a new budget development process to improve constituent involvement in its decision-making process. Leadership involvement across the campus was also enhanced as a result of the Students First Initiative that focused on improved decision-making regarding the delivery of services to students and the University community. As noted above, the University is launching an Academic Renewal Initiative, which will include broad participation across the University, to make recommendations to the President about future academic priorities. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapters 7 and 8 of the Self-Study.

Standard 5: Administration

The University is governed under a charter from the U.S. Congress by a Board of Trustees that delegates the management of the University to the President and several University Officers. Supporting the President and University Officers are school and college academic deans, and program directors, and managers. University Officers are recruited and hired using national searches, published vacancy notices, and formal search committee interviews. In recent years, the University has implemented a number of administrative changes designed to address operational challenges and improve administrative efficiency. Details regarding this Standard are provided in Chapters 7 and 8.

Standard 6: Integrity

Howard University affirms that the main purpose of an institution of higher education is the discovery of new knowledge through scholarly teaching, research, and service to the community. In pursuit of knowledge, faculty and students must engage in scholarly activities with the highest level of integrity. Howard adheres to its various policies, rules, and regulations that assure that its internal and external relationships are characterized by integrity. The University complies with its policies concerning integrity in relationships within the University and all related entities, business units, subsidiaries and affiliated organizations. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 9.

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

In 1921, Howard conducted its first university-wide Self-Study to support its initial application for Middle States accreditation. The University was fully accredited by the MSCH and has received university-wide reaffirmation of its accreditation by MSCH since its initial accreditation. In addition to the University’s MSCH accreditation, 30 bodies currently accredit 60 academic programs at the University. School-specific assessments are conducted on a periodic basis, typically for disciplinary accreditation. An added important assessment dimension results from annual institutional reviews by the U.S. Department of Education. Since its 1999 Self-Study, Howard has increased substantially its institution-wide commitment to, and engagement in assessment activities, as reflected in its continued incorporation of assessment across all university functions. The creation of the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) in 2008 is an indicator of the University’s growing commitment to the assessment enterprise. The OIAE has developed a short and long-term strategic assessment initiative and is aggressively implementing it in collaboration with all academic and administrative segments of the University. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 10.

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention

At the core of Howard University’s mission is effective student recruitment, admission,
Executive Summary

and retention at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels. In Standard 8, the Self-Study examined the University’s central and school/college enrollment management functions. The goal of this section is to assess whether the University is recruiting, admitting, and retaining students whose interests, goals, and abilities are aligned with Howard’s mission. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 11.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Within the scope of its mission, the University provides various student services that are designed to support successful student matriculation and personal and career development. These activities include residential, recreational, academic, healthcare (including mental healthcare), spiritual and social support services. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 12.

Standard 10: Faculty

Howard’s faculty members perform a variety of functions within and on behalf of the University as they strive to fulfill the University’s mission. While these functions coalesce around the core responsibilities of teaching, research, service and professional development, the level at which these tasks are accomplished and the quality of the faculty hinge on key contextual considerations. These key contextual considerations include the faculty voice in governance, faculty perceptions of their professional quality of life at Howard, how well faculty believe they impact the lives of their students, the financial benefits that they accrue, the facilities and physical environment in which they work, and the technology that is available for their support. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 13.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The University’s academic programs, many of which are over 100 years old, emanate from Howard’s mission of being a comprehensive research university. The University is also confronted with the task of responding to evolving societal needs and preparing students for leadership and service in an ever changing nation and global community. Howard addresses these challenges by providing a high quality academic experience of great breadth and depth across its five colleges (Arts and Sciences; Dentistry; Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences; Medicine; and Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences) and seven schools (Business, Communications, Divinity, Education, Graduate, Law, and Social Work). Howard’s colleges and schools have a strong tradition of academic excellence, offering undergraduate degrees in 80 disciplines, master’s degrees in 63 disciplines, Ph.D. degrees in 29 disciplines, other doctorates in four areas, first professional degree in five disciplines, and professional certification in five areas. In addition, the University offers five dual degree programs.

Over the past 10 years, 51 academic programs have been accredited. One program has not been reviewed, one program closed, and one program is seeking first-time accreditation. Between 2008 and 2009, there were 29 programs in 8 schools/colleges undergoing self-studies and external reviews for reaccreditation. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 14.

Standard 12: General Education

General Education at Howard is designed so that undergraduate students can acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in essential skills: (1) oral and written communication, (2) scientific and quantitative reasoning, (3) critical analysis and reasoning, and (4) technological competency. A Core Curriculum to advance the goals of the General Education requirements has been instituted within all undergraduate Schools and Colleges, and an aggressive strategy for assessing its outcomes is currently underway. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 15.

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

The University offers a number of related educational opportunities, which complement academic coursework, expand educational
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offerings, and enhance student learning. These include internships, honors programs, co-op programs, fieldwork, on-line instruction, integrated technology, and certificate programs, all of which adhere to academic and professional standards, and support the University’s mission. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 16.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

At the University, student learning is a fundamental and critical institutional outcome. All units at the University, directly or indirectly, function to support student learning. A comprehensive, coordinated approach to the assessment of student learning outcomes reflects the complexity required to capture the multifaceted processes. The articulation of expected student learning outcomes has emerged from the University’s mission and goals. Student learning outcomes assessment at Howard is mission-driven, student-centered, broadly defined, collaborative, and results-oriented.

The Assessment of Student Learning chapter summarizes learning outcomes assessment since the 1999 reaffirmation of accreditation by the MSCHE. In particular, this chapter provides updates on outcomes assessments related to university support systems, plans, activities, and measures. Data emerging from student learning (direct and indirect) assessments measures are highlighted. Additionally, case examples from various units are reported and recommendations are offered for strengthening the collection and use of student learning assessment data. Details regarding this Standard are found in Chapter 17.

Special Emphasis: Research

In recent years, Howard University was classified as a Research I University, and subsequently as a Doctoral-Research University-Extensive by the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education based largely on the extensiveness of its Ph.D. programs and extramurally funded research activity. In the current Carnegie classification system, Howard is categorized as a Research/High Research Activity University. Howard joins 103 RU/H private and public universities with this designation.

In Chapter 18, the Self-Study describes examples of major research activities at the University, changes in the organizational structure to advance research administration and compliance, and strategies initiated to increase the level of extramural funding for research, while reducing the barriers in infrastructure and facilities that limit research activity.

Conclusion

The 2009 Self-Study Report of Howard University has affirmed that like many other institutions throughout the United States, Howard faces a number of contemporary challenges, which include:

- Increased expectations and requirements to provide more documentation on student learning and institutional effectiveness through ongoing assessment, and to use more effectively these assessments systematically to guide program improvement.
- Increased competition from Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs) and HBCUs for the best and brightest of African-American students—Howard’s core constituency—at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional student levels.
- Graying of the professoriate, which requires the development of succession plans for the faculty—and the University’s leadership—to attract new individuals to sustain institutional core values and legacy, while bringing new ideas and perspectives to meet changing times and student needs.
- Increasing tuition rates to keep pace with the cost of education, while simultaneously increasing need-based financial aid to meet the requirements of talented students who are otherwise compromised in their ability to enroll and remain at the University.
- Evolving priorities in research funding at the national level, maintaining relevance, while increasing academic and scholarly activities; thereby requiring a possible realignment of research and academic priorities in order to increase extramural support and indirect cost recovery.
This Self-Study has provided the University with an opportunity to reflect upon and explore ways in which its mission can be more fully realized. Each chapter that discusses a Standard in this 2009 Self-Study Report offers recommendations. The following represent major recommendations that are promulgated in this Report:

- Review and assess the impact of planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal initiatives on a periodic basis.
- Align the University’s resources and budget with academic priorities resulting from program reviews and portfolio assessments.
- Establish a dedicated recruitment and retention fund to attract and retain additional nationally recognized scholars; improve the support for and retain the strongest current faculty; and promote the development and retention of the University’s young and promising faculty.
- Appoint a body of faculty, students, and staff to review the current Board-approved university-wide core competencies and to recommend strategies to schools and colleges for revising, updating and assessing curriculum to implement the competencies.
- Appoint a university-wide task force to craft a more coherent set of learning outcomes for all Howard undergraduates and a methodology for assessment.
- Revise the University’s Faculty Handbook to reflect greater compatibility with current policies and practices, as well as trends governing faculty roles and responsibilities at research universities.

This 2009 Self-Study Report provides important background information which is critical in understanding our current efforts to elevate the research agenda at the University which will provide a crucible for a robust intellectual and academic environment. Additionally, the Self-Study delineates the multifaceted approach the University has taken to sustain its historical legacy and mission to meet the needs of African American students and communities, while also positioning itself as a leader among the nation’s research universities. It also challenges the institution to continue to foster academic excellence within an environment that encourages and demands academic freedom and dialogue.

The Report outlines current shortcomings at the University and what is currently being done to remedy issues such as the imbalance in its student population between men and women, by working harder to identify, encourage and once enrolled, support young Black men in their efforts to succeed and graduate. The Report also includes information regarding the University’s plan to enhance its capacity to address disparities that exist within society, particularly in medicine, law, and education and in any other aspect of the human endeavor, where one segment of the community is lesser served than another.

While pointing out shortcomings and setting directions, the Self-Study has revealed that Howard is in compliance with the Characteristics of Excellence as defined by the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges and is eligible, therefore, for its accreditation to be reaffirmed. Further, the Self-Study has revealed that the University has made considerable progress in addressing the issues raised in the 1999 MSCHE reaffirmation of accreditation and the concerns raised in the 2004 Periodic Review Report (PRR). At the same time, the University faces significant challenges, many of which are associated with rising costs in the midst of the current domestic and global economic downturn, which have affected virtually all aspects of its operations, including faculty/staff salaries, the maintenance of physical facilities, and the academic/research infrastructure. Despite this situation, the University is poised and working actively to aggressively pursue its aspiration to climb systematically into the top echelon of research universities in the United States.

This Self-Study has provided a candid look at the progress that the University has made over the past ten years, where the institution stands today, and more importantly, where new journeys and pathways can and will lead in the future. It has also provided major findings for enhancing institutional and educational effectiveness.
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Introduction

Institutional Overview

Howard University as one of the nation’s leading research universities is dedicated to educating students from diverse backgrounds at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional level, with a particular focus on African-American students, as well as those of all other racial and ethnic groups from the United States and around the world. The University received its first accreditation from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools in 1921 and has had its accreditation reaffirmed by the Association at every required interval thereafter.

Howard is a unique university with a special mission that addresses the higher education needs of the nation and the world. It is one of only two non-military colleges or universities chartered by the United States Congress and the only research university in the nation with this status. Howard is the nation’s only Historically Black College or University (HBCU) to have achieved Research I status under the old Carnegie Classification system and the only institution within this group to be truly comprehensive with respect to its array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs. It has produced Rhodes Scholars, two in the last decade, as well as Truman, Fulbright, Marshall, and Presidential Scholars. Since its founding, Howard has been open to men and women from all racial and ethnic groups.

Among the HBCUs at the undergraduate level, Howard is a leader in many academic areas, especially research and training projects involving the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines. According to recent statistics from the National Science Foundation, Howard produces more African-American undergraduates in the science and engineering fields who later obtain the Ph.D. degree than any college or university in the United States. Howard currently awards more on-campus Ph.D. degrees to African Americans in science and engineering, as well as in several of the humanities and social science fields, than any other research university in the United States. Many of these Howard scholars are members of the nation’s professoriate. In many critical professional fields, most notably medicine, dentistry, and law, Howard continues to be, despite the elimination of traditional barriers of segregation and overt discrimination, among the nation’s largest producers of African-American degree recipients. At the same time, these graduate and professional degree programs attract both significant numbers of international students from around the world, and students from all the major racial/ethnic groups in the United States. It is safe to say, therefore, that without Howard University, the nation would experience significant barriers to its goal of achieving full participation by all citizens—particularly African Americans—in higher education and, thereby, would experience a significant diminution in the diversity of its intellectual and professional workforce that fuels the innovation, creativity and service that keeps America competitive on the global scale.

The confluence of these factors and others makes it very difficult, if not impossible, to use traditional definitions to categorize Howard within the constellation of American research universities. It is both an important HBCU undergraduate destination, especially for African Americans, while at the same time it competes with the full spectrum of the nation’s public and private research universities for extramural research dollars and for academically talented African Americans and students from all other racial/ethnic groups and from around the nation and world.

Howard’s unique mission focuses on academic excellence and preparing students for leadership roles and service in the national and global communities. In addition, Howard
Prepares students to be highly qualified, socially aware, and ethical individuals. As a comprehensive research university with a diverse, predominantly African-American student body and faculty, Howard contributes to the development of new knowledge that seeks to solve social and economic problems in the domestic and international arenas that particularly impact the African Diaspora. For example, its students and faculty are actively engaged in research dealing with such diverse topics as the treatment of cancer and HIV/AIDS; sickle-cell anemia; the genomic identification and tracking of racial disparities in various diseases; free press journalism programs around the world; global climate change; business and community development in minority communities; urban education reforms; and nanofabrication and the synthesis of nanomaterials.

In an effort to promote excellence in teaching and research, the University has developed collaborations and established strong professional peer interactions and academic linkages with other leading universities and colleges domestically and internationally. In this regard, Howard has also formed many educational partnerships with universities in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America in keeping with its mission to groom 21st-century students who will serve humankind as citizens of the world through their professional and personal pursuits. Additionally, the University has established partnerships through Memoranda of Agreement with many governmental agencies.

Howard has an impressive number of distinguished alumni which include a Nobel Laureate, Pulitzer Prize winners, U.S. governors, mayors of large U.S. cities, international opera stars, a former U.S. Supreme Court Justice, U.S. Cabinet members, presidents of numerous disciplinary societies, foreign heads of state, members of Congress, state and local elected officials, and hundreds of distinguished academicians and researchers in numerous disciplines throughout the nation and the world.

The University library system, typifying Howard’s commitment to research, contains more than two million volumes and is a member of the Association of Research Libraries. Among the system’s many resources are the state-of-the-art, Louis Stokes Health Science Library and the Law Library, both of which opened in 2001. In addition, the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, one of the world’s largest and most comprehensive research collections dedicated to documenting the history and culture of people of African descent throughout the world, is a unique university asset.

The University has an array of media outlets that address the educational, social, economic, and informational needs of the academic and wider communities. Its radio station, WHUR-FM, and television station, WHUT-TV, a PBS affiliate, serve the Washington metropolitan area and beyond. Each provides training laboratories that assist in preparing students for professional broadcasting and other careers.

Location and Characteristics

The University’s main campus is located in Washington, DC, within five miles of the United States Capitol and consists of more than 57 buildings on more than 89 acres of land. It also maintains a 22-acre West Campus in upper Northwest Washington, which houses the Law School; a 22-acre campus in Northeast Washington, home to the Divinity School; and a 108-acre Beltsville, Maryland research campus, which houses a major atmospheric science research facility. The 248 licensed-bed university hospital (Howard University Hospital) provides services for a significant segment of the Washington, DC metropolitan community, in addition to providing a clinical setting for training physicians, nurses, and other healthcare providers.

The University’s mission and goals are achieved through a diverse faculty, which for Fall 2008 consisted of 1,064 full- and 456 part-time faculty and approximately 3,869 full- and part-time staff. Among the faculty, 86% have earned the highest degree in their discipline.

Howard’s total enrollment for AY 2008-2009 was 11,227: 8,638 full- and 2,589 part-time students from virtually every state in the Union, the District of Columbia, and 67 countries. Of the total, 33% were graduate and professional students. In its 12 colleges and schools, the University offers a full array of undergraduate degrees in 80 dis-
Introduction

Since its founding in 1867 by Major General Oliver Otis Howard, a Civil War hero and Commissioner of the Freedmen’s Bureau, Howard has awarded more than 100,000 degrees and certificates in the professions, the arts, the natural and social sciences, and the humanities. In the 2008 graduating class, the University conferred 2,324 degrees, including 924 graduate and professional degrees.

Institutional Aspirations

While there is great debate within the academic community as to the validity of rankings of universities by various popular publications, Howard, nonetheless, generally competes favorably compared to the nation’s major research universities. Under the old Carnegie classification system for universities, Howard was classified as a Research I university. Under the current Carnegie classification system, revised in 2005, Howard is classified in the top overall category for research universities with medical schools, specifically Comprehensive Doctoral with Medical/Veterinary Schools, alongside 78 of the nation’s leading research universities. In this 2005 Carnegie classification, Howard was listed in the second research grouping among research universities, High Research Activity. Further, in the 2009 U.S. News and World Report rankings, the University ranked 102 out of 240 universities that achieved “National Universities Rankings” stature. This same publication ranked Howard 36th among the Top 50 “Best Value” National Research Universities when both quality and cost factors were considered.

Important Recent Developments

The Swygert Legacy

Since the last Self-Study in 1999, the University has operated largely under the leadership of its 15th President, H. Patrick Swygert (1995-2008). During this period, the University experienced several important developments that will undoubtedly be a part of President Swygert’s legacy of enhanced academic standing, upgraded university infrastructure, academic program streamlining, unprecedented fundraising, and improved community partnerships.

Specifically, under President Swygert’s leadership, the Strategic Framework for Action I, and the Strategic Framework for Action II were developed and a significant
number of the goals mentioned in these strategic plans were implemented, which were responsible for guiding many of the recent academic, research, and student support enhancements at the University. To undergird these plans, a successful Capital Campaign was launched in 2004 that exceeded its goal of $250 million. Other major accomplishments during the Swygert presidency included increased financial support for undergraduate and graduate students, increased opportunities for students interested in international affairs, several capital improvements, upgraded technological infrastructure, and new learning and research laboratories in the natural sciences.

To broaden its research mission, a new building (Howard University Research Building I or HURB1) was created in 2005. New research centers were established, including the National Center for Atmospheric Sciences (NCAS), funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the General Clinical Research Center (GCRC), funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

To enhance teaching and learning and the assessment thereof, with a strong emphasis on faculty development, the University created a Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA) in 2003. The University also opened a new Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) in 2008. The OIAE coordinates university-wide assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness and provides a mechanism for communicating data derived from such assessments to academic units as well as offices responsible for University planning and budgeting.

**The Ribeau Vision**

Sidney A. Ribeau, Ph.D. was appointed as the 16th President of Howard University in the Spring of 2008 and began leadership of the institution in August 2008. In the 2008 Opening Convocation, Fall 2008 State of the University, and Spring 2009 State of the University Addresses, President Ribeau articulated an expanded and evolving vision for Howard that emphasizes the following:

- sharpening academic offerings and quality;
- increasing attention to graduate programs;
- developing a more robust research agenda and increased productivity;
- expanding service to the nation and the world;
- improving the gender balance in enrollment, retention, and graduation;
- increasing internationalization of academic and research activity; and
- diversifying and strengthening academic, public, and private sector partnerships in the United States and abroad.

The vision reinforces a commitment to attracting, retaining, and supporting stellar faculty, staff, and administrators. An enhanced dedication to being a student-centered university is evidenced by the launch of the Students First Campaign, which is designed to improve the student experience at Howard. Additionally, President Ribeau has expressed a strong commitment to assessment, evaluation, and accountability in advancing the University’s mission and promoting development of its academic programs.

President Ribeau’s vision promotes the aforementioned aspiration of advancing Howard University to be included as one of the nation’s top 50 leading research universities as defined by the indicators promulgated by such bodies as the Association of American Universities and the National Research Council. To accomplish this goal, the President has outlined an agenda that embraces increased interdisciplinary study, new models of teaching and learning, and streamlined academic offerings. The reconfiguring and realignment of academic offerings, with a focus on the STEM disciplines, is a cornerstone of this strategic vision and will require identifying niche academic areas and aligning the University’s budgetary allocations and priorities to pursue these goals. To this end, the University is currently engaged in a transparent process of engaging the faculty, the academic leadership, a select commission consisting of internal and external members, and the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees in these efforts. Also characteristic of this effort is the creation of a new bud-
get process that includes the formation of a university-wide budget committee (Budget Advisory Committee—BAC) headed by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer. BAC is charged with the responsibility of reviewing all aspects of the University’s budget and making recommendations to the President on capital and expenditure priorities and measures of accountability.

About the 2009 Self-Study

This current Self-Study was shaped by the comprehensive model as defined by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*. Because the University was in a period of transition that involved the appointment of a new president, the comprehensive model was the most appropriate. The comprehensive model approach enabled the University to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the policies and practices that undergird its systems and operations. The approach was particularly beneficial to the University and its new leadership during a period of transition.

In addition to the 14 Standards articulated under the MSCHE *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, the University conducted a thorough and focused look at its research enterprise as an important aspect of the Self-Study. Specifically, Howard sought to examine its infrastructure for supporting extramurally funded research; the reward system for faculty to conduct research and obtain grants and contracts that fund research; the allocation of funds to support faculty and student research; and the extent to which research is an integral part of the academic experience for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. Because of Howard’s Carnegie classification and its aspirations as described above, it was a propitious time for the University to conduct a thorough and extensive assessment of its research enterprise.

The Self-Study was conducted also within the context of concerns identified by the MSCHE in the 1999 site visit report. These concerns included the need to revisit the University’s mission; to formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness and student learning; to develop a better balance between full deliberation on policy issues and timely adoption and implementation of policy; to expand and deepen its research program; and to continue taking steps to assure future financial security.

Further, the Self-Study process was
mindful of the MSCHE response to the University’s 2004 Periodic Review Report. Specifically, it addressed the need to assess the alignment and integration of its undergraduate, graduate, and professional academic programs to meet its traditional mission of providing high quality academic programs, while reorganizing its academic priorities to become a major research university. It also concentrated on the expectation that the University must implement its plans to establish a university-wide comprehensive program for assessing institutional effectiveness and student learning. Similarly, the current Self-Study sought to assess the extent to which the University’s infrastructure for research had been strengthened and barriers to faculty research productivity had been eliminated or mitigated. The University has addressed these concerns and others in a variety of ways including:

- the successful completion of the aforementioned Strategic Framework for Action I (SFAI) and the substantial completion of Strategic Framework for Action II (SF A II);
- the establishment of a cabinet level Vice President for Research and Compliance;
- the opening of the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CETLA);
- the creation of an Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE);
- the adoption of a University-wide core curriculum for undergraduate students; and
- the creation of an internal funding mechanism to promote faculty engagement in assessment and teaching effectiveness through the Fund for Academic Excellence.

Finally, this study was conducted within the context of national and global trends and realities that affect Howard and all institutions of higher education. These trends and realities include the current domestic and global economic downturn that is occurring in the midst of rising costs and declining financial support for higher education from the public and private sectors. These downward trends have impacted endowments, operating budgets, the availability of scholarships, and the ability of many students and their families to pay for a higher education. Also considered within this Self-Study were such realities as the increased competition from “for profit” and on-line universities, globalization of higher education, and more competition for African-American students and faculty from the full spectrum of American higher education. The emergence of the millennium student, rapid and costly technological advances, new approaches to teaching and learning, and assessment of core institutional planning and priorities also provided a critical context for this Self-Study.

As a result of the Self-Study process, the Faculty, administrators, staff, and students committed significant amounts of time and energy to examine the University. Reports were prepared; data collected and analyzed; and recommendations advanced—all of which are used to reflect upon the progress of the institution and to inform its planning far into the future. In the sections of this summary status report that follow, major findings and recommendations regarding the 14 Standards for Accreditation as described in the guidelines of MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, and resulting from a thorough and focused look at Howard's research enterprise, are described and summarized. Finally, recommendations for Howard’s future enhancement are made.
Self-Study Goals and Objectives

The Self-Study was designed to examine Howard’s continued progress in meeting the Characteristics of Excellence standards as defined by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) and to document its eligibility to have its accreditation reaffirmed. The University’s governing board, administrative leadership, faculty, students, and university community will use the results to further advance the University’s mission as a national research university of the first rank that is competitive with its peer and aspirational institutions, and to achieve its stated goals and objectives.

In addition to the reaffirmation of accreditation, the ultimate goal of this Self-Study was to produce a living document that provides a “snapshot” of the University for its relevant stakeholders to assist in defining and securing Howard’s future within the context of its past and current standing.

Self-Study Leadership and Staff

The University President has provided overall leadership of the Self-Study process with significant support from the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences and their respective staffs. The Self-Study process began under the leadership of President H. Patrick Swygert, who retired from the University on June 30, 2008, and has continued under the leadership of Sidney A. Ribeau, Ph.D., the University’s new president who began his duties in August 2008. President Ribeau continued the Self-Study process with the existing protocol.

Orlando L. Taylor, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, chaired the current Self-Study process from its inception. Dr. Taylor is a national leader in graduate education and within the discipline of communication. He served as Chair of the MSCHE University-wide Self-Study Committee in 1987–1989.

Steering and Executive Committees

Consistent with MSCHE guidelines, a Steering Committee and an Executive Committee provided critical input to the Self-Study process, including the review and approval of the final Self-Study Report submitted to the University President for approval and submission to MSCHE.

The Steering Committee consisted of a broad range of individuals from the University community, specifically the chairs of the 15 Work Groups, as well as faculty, administrators, staff, and students nominated by various faculty, student, and staff stakeholder groups and units of the University. Additionally, the Chair of the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees also served on the Steering Committee, assuring broad engagement of the Board of Trustees in the Self-Study process.

The Executive Committee, which was chaired by the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer, consisted of all members of the President’s cabinet in addition to representatives from the Student Association, the Faculty Senate, and the Staff Association. The Committee was responsible for reviewing and providing input from senior level administrators and student, faculty, and staff leaders into the Self-Study process. This Executive Committee advised the President on the progress of the Self-Study and made recommendations for presidential interventions when needed. It also advised the President on possible implications of Self-Study findings for university planning and institutional renewal.

Work Groups

Fifteen Work Groups were established to conduct the work of the Self-Study—one
Work Group for each of the 14 standards of accreditation provided by MSChE and one additional Work Group on Research. The Research Work Group was formed, in part, because of issues raised by MSChE in 1999, and because of the University’s commitment to significantly raise its research productivity and the extramural funds required to support research.

To ensure that each Work Group represented students, faculty, staff, and administrators from across the University community, nominations were sought and received for Work Group membership from various stakeholders and leaders: the Faculty Senate; the senior administrative officers of the University; the deans of the schools and colleges; the directors of academic support units; the leadership of the University’s staff organization; and the leadership of the University’s student body. Volunteers were also solicited throughout the University to submit their names and areas of interest for membership consideration.

From this pool of candidates, staffs from the Office of the Provost and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School populated the work groups in accordance with stated interests, experiences, and expertise of the nominees and volunteers. All nominees and volunteers were subsequently selected and assigned to a Work Group, resulting in approximately 7–10 persons per Work Group.

Each Work Group was required to establish key study questions for consideration, to review existing data from various university sources on the subject area of its focus, to review assessment data generated by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation obtained specifically for the Self-Study, and to make recommendations to guide future institutional planning.

Board of Trustees Engagement

Because the Self-Study process was central to several interests and initiatives of the Board of Trustees, e.g., the Long Range Financial Planning Committee and the Academic Portfolio Initiative, the Chair of the Board’s Academic Excellence Committee was designated to work directly with the Self-Study process and to serve as a member of the Steering and Executive Committees. Other Board members, including the entire Academic Excellence Committee, were available for participation and engagement in the Self-Study Process as required.

Self-Study Office Staff

A staff was hired to provide administrative and coordinating support for the development of the Self-Study. The staff consists of a coordinator, an administrative assistant, a data analyst, two technical writers, a Web designer, and a special events manager.

Other University Assessment and Accreditation Initiatives

Several other assessment and accreditation activities within Howard’s schools, colleges, and departments were conducted concurrently with this Self-Study process. These included an annual institutional review by the U.S. Department of Education and professional society accreditation efforts in the schools of Law; Business; and Education; and the Colleges of Medicine; Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science; and Dentistry. Where appropriate, the MSChE Self-Study process considered and utilized the results from these rigorous assessment efforts. Four other assessment related activities are also being conducted concurrently with the MSChE Self-Study, each of which informed, as appropriate, the current exercise. These activities are outlined below.

- The Academic Excellence Initiative—An initiative of the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Provost designed to provide assessments and recommendations required to align the departmental and programmatic offerings of the schools and colleges with strategic objectives and financial resources.
- The Long Range Financial Planning Committee—A special committee of the Board of Trustees charged with recommending a strategy for aligning the University’s budget with its mission and goals, and with ascertaining evolving trends in higher education and the society at large that affect Howard
University's present and future status as a national research university with a predominantly African-American student body.

- Presidential Select Commission on Academic Renewal—A Commission appointed by the President to review and make recommendations for adjustments to the University’s academic programs.
- Assessment of Administrative Processes Initiative—An initiative designed to improve and optimize service delivery.

Self-Study Methodology

The University selected the comprehensive model as defined in the MSCHE guidelines, *Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, for its institutional Self-Study. This model examines all aspects of programs and services, governing and supporting structures, resources, and educational outcomes in relation to Howard’s mission and goals.

Data for the study were collected from interviews with university administrators, student focus groups, annual reports of schools/colleges and administrative units, accreditation reports of schools/colleges, periodic reports from schools/colleges and administrative units, assessment plans, and four Self-Study surveys.

Four survey questionnaires were designed—one for each of the four stakeholder groups: Howard University Self-Study 2008 Student Survey, Howard University Self-Study 2008 Faculty Survey, Howard University Self-Study 2008 Senior Administrator Survey, and Howard University Self-Study 2008 Staff Survey. Items in 15 topic areas were distributed to the four stakeholder groups. All questionnaires consisted of both closed-ended and open-ended items. The items that eventually appeared on the questionnaires came from four sources: (1) research questions in the Howard University Self-Study Design that were generated by the Working Groups; (2) items from the 1998 Self-Study questionnaires; (3) new items suggested by the Steering Committee members, and (4) new items suggested by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (see Supporting Document 2.1).
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The surveys were made available to all students, faculty, senior and mid-level administrators, and staff. Rather than sampling each population, a census was conducted to assess perceptions of the programs, resources, facilities, and services of the University. Potential respondents were contacted via web-based and paper-based formats.

The student sample consisted of a total of 652 respondents—undergraduate (81%), graduate (15.3%), and professional (3.7%) students. In addition, 73.2% of the student respondents were female and 26.8% were male. The faculty sample consisted of 150 respondents. The distribution across faculty ranks was: Professor (32.7%), Associate Professor (36%), Assistant Professor (20%), Lecturer (4.7%), and Instructor (6.7%). In addition, 55.3% of the faculty respondents were female and 44.7% were males. Most respondents in the senior and mid-level administrators’ category were Directors with Faculty positions or Chairpersons (40.3%), followed by Deans or Associate/Assistant Deans (25.45%). The remaining administrators were senior level ranging from senior vice president to associate provost (34.25%). There were 50.7% males, 37.3% females, and 11.9% of the respondents did not report their gender. Among the staff respondents, 35.9% held a supervisory position, 68.1% were female, and 45.7% of them have been employed at Howard University for more than 16 years (see Supporting Document 2.2).

Communications with the University Community

The Office of the University-Wide Self-Study implemented several measures to communicate with the Howard community to ensure that the Self-Study process was interactive, transparent, and collaborative. Through use of the Howard University e-mail system, periodic updates on Self-Study activities, and milestones were provided to the university community. A Web site was created specifically for the Self-Study. Additionally, Executive Committee, Steering Committee, and Work Group members had access to draft documents through a password-protected Web site, which provided these committees a forum to comment and share their work.

The Self-Study design, draft reports, and initial draft final report have been distributed to and vetted by the University Community via the Web site and in a series of Town Hall meetings. The final Self-Study document was discussed and subsequently approved by the Steering and Executive Committees prior to submission to President Ribeau for final review, approval, and transmission to the MSCHE.

Supporting Documents

2.1 2008 Self-Study Survey Instruments
2.2 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
Accomplishments Relative to the 1999/2004 MSCHE Concerns
Accomplishments Relative to the 1999/2004 MSCHE Concerns

Introduction

While it involved a comprehensive analysis of the University over the past two years, this Self-Study process also included a review of concerns identified by the MSCHE in the 1999 site visit report. These concerns included the need to revisit the University’s mission; to formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness and student learning; to develop a better balance between full deliberation on policy issues and timely adoption and implementation of policy; to expand and deepen its research program; and to continue taking steps to assure future financial security.

Further, the Self-Study process was mindful of the MSCHE response to the University’s 2004 Periodic Review Report. Specifically, it addressed the need to assess the alignment and integration of its undergraduate, graduate, and professional academic programs to meet its traditional mission of providing high quality academic programs, while reorganizing its academic priorities to become a major research university. It focused also on the expectation that the University must implement its plans to establish a university-wide comprehensive program for assessing institutional effectiveness and student learning. Similarly, the current Self-Study sought to assess the extent to which the University’s research infrastructure had been strengthened and barriers to faculty research productivity eliminated or mitigated. As stated in Chapter one, the University has addressed these concerns and others in a variety of ways including:

- the successful completion of the aforementioned Strategic Framework for Action I (SFAI) and the substantial completion of Strategic Framework for Action II (SFA II);
- the establishment of a cabinet level Vice President for Research and Compliance;
- the opening of the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CETLA);
- the creation of an Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE);
- the adoption of a University-wide core curriculum for undergraduate students; and
- the creation of an internal funding mechanism to promote faculty engagement in assessment and teaching effectiveness through the Fund for Academic Excellence.

Accomplishments related to the five MSCHE concerns that emerged following the 1999 reaccreditation process and the 2004 Periodic Review Report are detailed as follows:

Concern #1: The University must closely review its mission in light of changing times, specifically the nature of the undergraduate student body sought and the mix between the undergraduate and graduate/professional studies.

The Self-Study Work Group on the University Mission was assigned the specific task of reviewing the University’s mission and charged with the responsibility for making recommendations for refinements for Board of Trustees’ consideration. The Board received these recommendations and approved a refined Mission Statement at its June 2009 Executive Committee meeting. The refined mission statement reaffirms Howard’s mission as a research university and its commitment to pursuing students of exceptional quality and potential, as well as a commitment to research, globalization, and service. The Board approved revised Mission Statement states:

Howard University, a culturally diverse, comprehensive, research intensive and historically Black private university, provides an educational experience of exceptional quality at the undergraduate, gradu-
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The issue of the University’s mix of undergraduate to graduate/professional students continues to be a subject of considerable attention at the University. The institution has reaffirmed its commitment to realigning its academic program priorities, enrollment management strategies, and supporting budgets in such a way as to bring its enrollment ratio of undergraduate students to graduate/professional students in line with that of many other private research universities, i.e., approximately 40% undergraduate and 60% graduate/professional. A detailed portfolio assessment and academic program review process is underway at the University. The strategic goal of the program review effort is to adjust the University’s academic programs and align them with its mission and strategic vision, goals and objectives. The recently developed Provost-led Budget Advisory Committee facilitates the alignment of fiscal resources with the University’s mission and strategic goals. A Board of Trustees Ad Hoc Committee on Long Range Financial Planning has already rendered a report which proposes strategies for realigning the University’s budget to meet the needs of its academic priorities and mission.

Additionally, a university-wide effort is underway to address gender imbalance in the student body, with a particular focus on the declining presence of African-American males (currently only approximately 36% (Fall 2008) of the student body).

A Select Commission on Academic Renewal, chaired by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, will be appointed by the President by September, 2009. Among its responsibilities will be a review of the organization of the University’s academic structure within the context of the University’s mission, academic priorities, and fiscal resources. In making such recommendations to the President, the Commission will collect and consider such data as required to make thoughtful decisions. For a fuller discussion of the responsibilities of the Select Commission and other initiatives that have been underway at the University to enhance the academic enterprise at the University, see Chapter 5—Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal.

Concern #2: The University must formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness, including clear quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning.

Concern #2: The University must formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness, including clear quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning.

Considerable attention and progress has been made since 1999 to address issues of assessment of institutional effectiveness and of student learning. These issues were the focus of Work Groups 7 and 14 in the current Self-Study. In general, the assessment work was greatly enhanced by the creation of a new Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE), currently housed in the Office of the Provost, and three university assessment committees: Committees on College/School Assessment (CSAC), Student Quality of Life (SQL), and the University Community Experience (UCE). The OIAE has developed a university-wide assessment and evaluation plan.

In addition, considerable attention to academic assessments and assessment of student learning has taken place within the colleges required to seek disciplinary accreditation (e.g., law, medicine, dentistry, education, engineering, communication, business), as well as assessments conducted on a periodic basis by the Graduate School and the College of Arts and Sciences. Other accomplishments that have occurred in this area include:

- The University developed and implemented Strategic Framework for Action I and II:
Center for Excellence, Teaching Learning, and Assessment (CETLA) and
Assessment and review of all graduate programs.
The Office of University Communication developed and administered a survey in 2004 to incorporate alumni into the University’s outcomes assessment initiative.
The Library System established an assessment plan.
A Task Force was organized in 2001 to facilitate and galvanize the development and institutionalization of the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OAIE).
OAIE has proposed development (with faculty input) of templates and a process for completing or updating an annual assessment.
An assessment program for each academic and non-academic unit has been designed and is being implemented.
The College of Arts and Sciences has developed a protocol for the systematic review of its academic programs that includes a student development assessment component and has resulted in the evaluation of the College’s 20 academic units.
The OAIE Committee arranged for in-service learning, modeling, and coaching to help units assess their effectiveness in achieving institutional goals.
The Graduate School conducted periodic reviews of each of its master’s and doctoral degree programs through self-studies and analyses. The exercise resulted in the “Future of Graduate Education at Howard University” that rendered recommendations for future benchmarking and strategic planning for graduate programs.

Concern #3: The University should develop a better balance between full deliberation on policy issues and a timely adoption and implementation of policy.

Since the 1999 Self-Study, the University has taken a number of actions to assure that its policies, upon promulgation, are well communicated to the community and implemented in a timely manner. Specifically, the responsibilities of the former position of Vice President for Governmental Affairs have been expanded into a Senior Vice President for Strategic Planning, Operations, External Affairs & Chief Technology Officer. This University officer is responsible for assuring that policies related to external affairs, including those associated with the Federal government, is linked to the institution’s
strategic planning process. Additionally, that technology is used in the most effective manner to communicate these and other policies effectively within the academic community.

Second, under President Ribeau’s leadership, a new position, Vice President for Presidential Initiatives, was created to assure that policies and initiatives emanating from the Office of the President are effectively implemented in a timely manner and that the University’s resources are properly aligned to implement such policies and initiatives.

Finally, an Executive Assistant to the President has been appointed to assure coordination between the academic leadership of the University with academic support units and with the Office of the President. These three individuals and their offices, working together as a team, provide an institutional infrastructure for assuring that policies have been promulgated by various sources within the University, including Board of Trustees policies are carried out in an efficient and timely manner.

Concern #4: The University should expand and deepen its research program.

Attention to the University’s extramural research enterprise has received major attention from the University since the 1999 Self-Study. In addition to creating a cabinet level officer (Vice President for Research and Compliance) to provide leadership and administrative support for the research enterprise, this Self-Study process included a special Work Group to examine issues related to research at the University.

In addition, several other important developments in the research arena have occurred since the last reaffirmation of accreditation. They include:

- In 2006, the University engaged a consulting group to assist with the implementation of the approved research organizational structure. The consulting group also assisted in the development and implementation of new policies and procedures for research administration.
- A 13-member Faculty Research Advisory Council was formed.
- A faculty-driven research think tank was established to address barriers to research at the University and to explore the feasibility of establishing certain niche areas in which to prioritize research activity. The Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines generally have received the greatest degree of support for research priority.
- A series of strategic meetings with faculty members with large-scale sponsored research projects was convened to review pre- and post-award administrative practices that impede the efficient processing of research grants and contracts.
- All internal faculty research programs and funding streams have been consolidated to establish a new university-wide faculty research fund of approximately $4 million. This program provides seed funding for junior and senior faculty research in separate competitions, matching funds for selected extramural efforts, and funding for undergraduate and graduate student research activity. Interdisciplinary research is encouraged.
- A variable salary component was established to reward faculty for obtaining extramural awards.
- A faculty recognition program to showcase and honor faculty researchers was established.
- After a thorough review, the Graduate School recommended a new and more liberalized policy governing Graduate Faculty membership eligibility.

As stated in Chapter 18—Research, the University has completely overhauled its research infrastructure in recent years culminating in the appointment of a cabinet level officer to provide stewardship of research administration and compliance. Moreover, the University has instituted compensation models to increase the reward system for faculty actively engaged in extramurally-funded research activity. Most recently, a Provost-led budget advisory committee recommended and received presidential and Board approval to enrich the University’s budget for FY 2010, specifically to enhance the University’s research infrastructure.
Concern #5: The University should continue to take steps to assure future financial stability.

The Board of Trustees has taken actions to assure the University’s future financial stability. Some of them have been taken in the wake of the current national economic downturn. Other measures have been taken independently of this situation in an effort to assure fiscal prudence and to assure the financial health of the University.

The Federal appropriation to the University over the past five years has averaged approximately $230 million per year. The University’s enrollment has remained relatively stable. Tuition rates have risen modestly in recent years. Efforts have now been made to bring tuition rates up to levels comparable to other research universities without excluding students from its core constituency. Thus, tuition rates for the next three years will increase for undergraduates, graduate, and professional students. Over time, tuition rates are expected to approach market value for the Washington metropolitan area, with the caveat that more need-based financial aid will be made available to preserve and enhance student access.

In 2007, the University concluded a successful Capital Campaign which raised approximately $276 million. The value of Howard’s endowment on June 30, 2007, when the Self-Study process was initiated, was $523.7 million. The University’s endowment now stands at less than $500 million due to the national economic situation.

A voluntary staff separation and retirement package was completed which will allow the University to overhaul its workforce in view of current costs and strategic objectives. Likewise, a number of fiscal and human resource management controls have been put into place. New technology-based solutions, specifically the PeopleSoft Suite, have been introduced to enhance fiscal management.

Other accomplishments that contribute to the University’s financial stability include:

- Establishment of a coordinated campus-wide donor solicitation approach, a strengthened alumni database and revamped efforts related to donor relations and stewardship. As a consequence, the rate of alumni giving has increased steadily over the years.
Continued exploration of ways to reduce operating costs, such as a comprehensive review of the University’s employee benefits package to ensure efficiencies and enhance employee options, and the installation of more modern and efficient mechanical systems in campus buildings.

Implementation of consistent and effective cost control measures has resulted in Howard’s rate of increases for operating expenditures tracking lower than national averages.

Development of five-year fiscal projections to facilitate long-term strategic planning and decision-making.

Funding allocations made following the blueprint laid out in Strategic Framework for Action I and II and several of the recommendations pertaining to repairs and maintenance (#29) and building renovations (#30) found in the 1999 Self-Study.

Completed a number of the capital projects identified in SFA I and II, funded from a variety of sources. The two new state-of-art libraries for Health Sciences and Law were federally funded. The Howard University Television network was also supported by federal funding. Planning funds for the new Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Center (ISE) and the Charter Middle School in Science and Mathematics, have also been provided through Federal appropriations. The University’s charter school initiative is designed to model for the region and nation best practices in urban school education.

Developed and implemented a Faculty performance salary program to encourage more extramural research funding. Strategies that were developed to continue the progress made and to evaluate its effectiveness in addressing the 1999 Self-Study Concerns as well as those of the 2004 Periodic Review Report are addressed further in each chapter corresponding to a MSCHE Standard in this 2009 Self-Study Report.
4 Mission and Goals
Mission and Goals

MSCHE Standard 1

The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Introduction

The University’s mission defines the character, scope, and values of the institution. The University’s goals are consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education and articulate how the institution aims to achieve the stated mission. This Standard addresses the University’s mission and goals in light of changing societal demands, institutional aspirations, and universal imperatives. The goals and objectives have been closely aligned with the University’s mission. The official mission statement is guided by the core principles of teaching, research, and service. The previous mission quoted below described the institution’s central aim as approved and adopted in 1989 by the Board of Trustees.

Mission Statement

Howard University is a comprehensive, research-oriented, historically Black private University providing an educational experience of exceptional quality to students of high academic potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities to promising Black students. Further, the University is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who are, through their teaching and research, committed to the development of distinguished and compassionate graduates and to the quest for solutions to human and social problems in the United States and throughout the world.

Howard University’s mission statement is readily accessible, widely publicized, and generally embraced by students, staff, faculty, and administrators. The mission is the foundation for institutional effectiveness and assessment. This mission has driven strategic planning, as is evident in Howard’s Strategic Framework for Action I and II (SFA I and II), which set the short- and long-term goals of the institution and established the criteria for assessing institutional effectiveness (see Chapter 5 for discussion on strategic planning). Additionally, the mission guides all activities such as recruitment and admissions, marketing, curriculum proposals evaluation, and the creation of new majors or programs. In addition to the mission, the University vision statement, adopted in 1995, concisely states its purpose:

Howard University is a comprehensive research university, unique and irreplaceable, defined by its core values, the excellence of all its activities in instruction, research, and service, and by its enduring commitment to educating youth, African Americans and other people of color in particular, for leadership and service to our nation and the global community.

In 2007, the University’s Board and leadership reevaluated the mission statement to assess its continued relevance given changing societal demands and the dynamic environment in which the University functions. After careful consideration and reflection, the Board reaffirmed the mission statement maintaining that it was still relevant and appropriate in view of the changing times. This sentiment is reflected in findings from recent attitudinal studies of the University’s primary stakeholders. Results from the 2008 Self-Study surveys
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indicated that the vast majority of students (84%), faculty (77%), senior administrators (78%), and staff (78%) feel that this emphasis accurately captures where the University wants to be and wishes to be perceived in the 21st century vision for the institution (see Supporting Document 4.1).

However, in view of the changing imperatives in higher education and in the national and global climate, the mission of the University was revisited in 2009. The review suggested that slight changes be incorporated in the current mission statement to place more emphasis on a complementary mix between teaching and research, with a focus on the expectation that research must be an integral part of the undergraduate, graduate, and professional education requirements at a research university such as Howard. Additionally, the review suggested that explicit mention could be made of a commitment to attracting, retaining, and sustaining a cadre of faculty who, through teaching and research, are committed to the development of motivated and compassionate graduates and the quest for solutions to human and societal problems in the United States and throughout the world. Another suggestion was that the mission reflects an adaptation to changing requirements and opportunities in an increasingly technological and global society. Drawing upon the insights and recommendations, the University made the following refinement to the Mission Statement, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in June 2009:

Howard University, a culturally diverse, comprehensive, research intensive and historically Black private university, provides an educational experience of exceptional quality at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels to students of high academic standing and potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities for promising Black students.

The University has been successful in providing an educational experience of exceptional quality to students of high academic potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities for promising Black students.

Fulfilling the Mission

The achievement of the University’s mission is evidenced in many aspects of campus-wide activities. The following are samples of such activities as they relate to the various dimensions of the mission. Global racial disparities in educational access and opportunities highlight the critical need for Howard to remain among the institutions taking the lead in providing educational opportunities to persons of color. As a Historically Black University, Howard is particularly committed to providing a quality education to students of African descent from throughout the world. While the University is sensitive to the issues of diversity and the reality of the international character of its student population, faculty, and staff, the University community decided to disregard any retreat from an emphasis on Black students, which would represent a shift in the University’s long-standing commitment.

The University has been successful in providing an educational experience of exceptional quality to students of high academic potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities for promising Black students. The results from the 2008 Self-Study surveys revealed that this emphasis is strongly supported by students (89%), faculty (85%), senior administrators (87%) and staff (86%) (see Supporting Document 4.1).

According to the National Science Foundation, Howard is the largest producer of African-American undergraduate students who later get a Ph.D. in science and engineering fields (see Supporting Document 4.2). Additionally, Howard ranks as the highest producer of African-American on-campus science and engineering doctoral degrees nationally, indicating outstanding performance in the graduate enterprise, a central university goal. Increasing the graduate and professional student population continues to be a priority as the University has taken preliminary steps to align its budget with academic priorities with the appointment of an ad hoc committee to the Board of Trustees in 2007. The impact of these relevant initiatives is still evolving.
At the undergraduate level, the University has been successful in attracting an increasing number of highly qualified undergraduate students. During the past ten years, Howard University’s high school SATC and ACT scores, High School GPA, and percent of students in the top 10% of their high school class have remained consistently high as depicted in Table 4.1.

Another example of Howard successfully attracting an increasing number of highly qualified undergraduate students is evident in the number of its scholars. During the last decade, the University has produced 2 Rhodes Scholars, 1 Marshall Scholar, 2 Truman Scholars, 10 Presidential Scholars, 19 Fulbright Scholars, 1 Luard Scholar, and 10 Pickering Fellows. Also, there were 239 National Achievement Scholars enrolled during the academic year 2007-2008 (see Supporting Documents 4.3, 4.4, and 4.5).

The University’s goal of attracting and sustaining an outstanding cadre of faculty is exemplified by the large number of faculty members who received commendation in a number of national organizations including the National Association for the Advancement of Science, the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Engineering, and American Academy of Nurses. In addition, a number of faculty have received awards such as the Carnegie Scholar, Fulbright Ambassador, Fulbright Senior Specialist, Fulbright Fellow, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellow, and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute’s 20 Best Scholars in Academia (see Supporting Document 4.3).

In fulfilling the mission of developing compassionate graduates, the University through its Office of the Dean of the Chapel and other campus organizations has participated in a number of humanitarian, social, political, and other activities throughout the years. The Office of the Chapel established Alternative Spring Break (ASB) in 1994, where students participate in a number of projects during the Spring recess. ASB is a service-learning experience in which students use their gifts and skills to meet the needs of target communities and the world at large. In 2006, in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, 250 students answered the call to serve through the ASB program in New Orleans, LA. This number increased dramatically to 500 students in 2007 and 550 students in 2008 (see Supporting Documents 4.6 and 4.7). Due to the resounding successes of ASB in New Orleans, during the 2009 Spring recess with approximately 300 students, ASB expanded its outreach program to the Washington metropolitan area, New Orleans, Chicago, and Detroit. Additionally, during the 2007, 2008, and 2009 Spring breaks, members of the Howard Chapter of Engineers Without Borders devoted their time to assist with projects in Egypt, Panama, Central America, Kenya, and Brazil (see Supporting Documents 4.8 and 4.9).

As a leading Historically Black University, Howard has expanded its influence in the national and global arena through its academic partnerships with universities abroad. In the past several years, the University has created and expanded domestic and international partnerships with universities in North America, South America, Asia, Africa, and Europe that facilitate research, faculty and student mobility and international cooperation (see Supporting Document 4.10).
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University Goals

Building on the achievements of the 1996 Strategic Framework for Action I (SFA I) (see Supporting Document 4.11), the University embarked on the Strategic Framework for Action II (SFA II) in 2000 under the leadership and direction of President Swygert. In March 2000, an e-mail was distributed to all university faculty members outlining the SFA II development process. The University community was encouraged to submit ideas and proposal for incorporation into SFA II in April of 2000 to the Office of University Research and Planning. During the Board of Trustees Fall Retreat in September 2000, the Board reviewed and approved the goals of SFA II. For strategic continuity, SFA II was developed around the same four overarching goals as SFA I. Of the four goals, two are directly related to academic programs: (1) strengthening academic programs and services and (2) promoting excellence in teaching and research. Goals three and four are associated with, increasing private support and enhancing national and community service (see Supporting Document 4.12). In Chapter 5, some of the achievements with respect to the four strategic goals are highlighted.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The University’s legacy, reflected in its mission, retains salience for the University community. The foci remain on providing an exceptional educational experience to students of both high achievement and potential, with special attention to Black students. The research emphasis articulated in the mission and goals continues to be strengthened by faculty productivity and increased attention to expanding and deepening the research enterprise. The dedication of faculty to the development of compassionate graduates and a focus on human and social problems also ground the Howard experience. The mission has driven strategic planning, as is evident in SFA I and II. Currently, the University is achieving its mission through four overarching goals: (1) strengthening academic programs and services; (2) promoting excellence in teaching and research; (3) increasing private support; and (4) enhancing national and community service. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from this Standard:

Findings

1. While the University’s mission and other foundational documents are regularly revisited, there has been no established timetable for reviewing the University’s mission statement.
2. The mission statement did not explicitly address the international character or commitments of the University.
3. The mission statement focused more on students of high academic potential and less on students with academic achievement.
4. The mission statement was not strong in its commitment to research and graduate/professional education.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Institutionalize a policy to review the University’s mission at least every five years.
2. Continue to recruit and retain highly qualified students and faculty to further the overall university mission inclusive of the commitment to expand its international character, its commitment to recruit students with high potential, and its commitment to expand research and graduate/professional education.

Supporting Documents

4.1 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
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4.5 Three Howard Seniors Awarded Fulbright Scholarships
4.6 Alternative Spring Break Summary
4.7 Howard University’s WHUR 96.3 FM “A Helping Hand” Radiothon
4.8 Engineers Without Borders—HU Improve Lives in Kenya, Brazil
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4.11 Strategic Framework for Action I
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Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal

Introduction

Howard has made progress in enhancing university planning, resource allocation, and advancing institutional renewal through two strategic plans. However, the University has experienced some fluctuations in funding streams that have impacted the University’s planning and resource allocation process. As a private research university, partially funded with an annual Congressional appropriation administered by the U.S. Department of Education, the planning and resource allocation processes at the institution are partially affected by the Federal appropriation. This section focuses on the University’s planning and resource allocation processes that are intended to advance the mission and ensure that the institution continues to improve performance.

Institutional Planning

The planning process at the University involves the entire institution and is conducted through various mechanisms. General direction for the planning and improvement processes is derived from the Board’s focus areas, which then are emphasized in the President’s annual target areas for the University. At the beginning of each academic year, schools and colleges typically hold annual retreats or designated meetings to discuss and review their plans for the upcoming year. Additionally, at the end of the fiscal year each school/college and unit/department produces an annual report of the progress made towards achieving goals, inclusive of future plans.

Over the past decade, the University has demonstrated commitment to institutional renewal through a concerted strategic planning process, which provided for wide constituent participation. To prepare its last institutional plan, SFA II, a 30-member University Advisory Committee (UAC), comprised of 25 faculty members drawn from all the schools and colleges, two students, and three administrative staff, was appointed in September 2000 and given the charge by then President Swygert. UAC formed taskforces in four strategic areas: (1) strengthening academic programs and services; (2) promoting excellence in teaching and research; (3) increasing private support; and (4) enhancing national and community service. These four areas broadly guide the University and its units in their planning, resource allocation, and educational activities. In November 2000, UAC submitted its Report to the President. The President’s preliminary and revised drafts of SFA II were distributed electronically to the University community in January and February of 2001 for comments. During April 2000, Town Hall meetings were scheduled for all university stakeholders (faculty, students, staff, and alumni). The SFA II summary of comments was presented to the Board for review and possible incorporation into the final document. Adopted by the Board of Trustees in June 2001, SFA II focused on 31 objectives organized under the four aforementioned overarching goals (see Supporting Document 5.1).

The University’s strategic goals and related areas of emphasis provided the context for each unit to establish and pursue its own individual goals and objectives. In SFA II, there is no one-to-one correspondence between goals or objectives and elements of the mission; rather, all or most elements of the mission guide every objective in the strategic

MSCHE Standard 2

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.
plan. To implement SEA II, many academic and administrative units, in response to self-assessments, developed and carried out strategic plans.

With the Federal appropriation remaining flat for the last six years and current expenses increasing by 4.8% and revenues by 2.5% annually, achievement of the strategic goals has been difficult. However, forward movement has occurred on a number of critical projects considered beneficial to its success. Although most SEA I objectives have been achieved, as summarized in SEA II (June, 2001) (see Supporting Document 5.1) and SEA II Year 5 Status Report (April, 2007) (see Supporting Document 5.2), several on-going projects remain. Examples illustrative of accomplishments in the four main goals are as follows:

**Goal I: Strengthening Academic Programs and Services**

In an effort to provide students with an excellent learning environment that embodies and reflects the vast explosion of knowledge, the interconnectedness of traditional academic disciplines and the integration of teaching and research, the University identified 13 objectives to fulfill Goal I. Only a few objectives are highlighted herein with regard to this goal. Significant efforts have been made in terms of using an electronic communication method to enhance education at the institution. The University’s progress toward digitizing essential information and building the requisite infrastructure to facilitate asynchronous education (Objective 10) is noteworthy. Founders Library has created a continually expanding digitized reserve course collection that serves all academic departments, except Law and Health Sciences, which have their own digital libraries. Prior to 2004, there was no digitized course reserve collection. Presently, about 300 course-required readings are digitized and available to students via the Internet. In the past two years, more instructors have linked to digital course reading materials from their Blackboard course sites, thus making the material more directly accessible to their students.

Major progress has also occurred in providing access to computing resources for all students. University residence halls were upgraded with high-quality access to voice, data, and video communications (Objective 7). Students were provided high-bandwidth switches and wired access ports to the University data network to ensure access to multimedia presentations for both classroom and distance education applications. Additionally, the University enhanced its campus-wide wireless capacity (Objective 9). The Middle School of Mathematics and Science, established at Howard in 2004, is the prototype for information technology at the University. Wireless access is now available in the Carnegie Building, Blackburn Lab, all residence halls, the Technology Center, the School of Business, the two new digital libraries, and key conference rooms in the Administration Building, Howard University Hospital, Howard Center, the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science, and the College of Medicine. Wireless capacity has been extended to the School of Law and to key College of Dentistry facilities.

Additionally, significant progress has been made in establishing additional public and private strategic partnerships (Objective 3). Congressional and foundation funding has been maintained for a University-U.S. State Department program (the Rangel Fellows) to increase minority participation in the Foreign Service. Former Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice confirmed in a letter to...
President Swygert her continued support of these recruiting initiatives. With the recent selection of twenty (20) 2009 Rangel Fellows, 81 current or past Rangel Fellows have either entered the Foreign Service or are in the process of doing so (see Supporting Document 5.3). Also significant, Kauffman Foundation funding supports the promotion of entrepreneurial education throughout the University. Several other partnerships have been created recently with public and private organizations, a few of which are described herein. The College of Dentistry in association with the D.C. Dental Society and the American Dental Association, held for D.C. children its 7th annual “Give Kids a Smile Day” (see Supporting Document 5.4).

In July 2008, the Division of Pharmacy, College of Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences, through its partnership with CVS Pharmacy, launched its new, state-of-the-art Pharmacy Practice Laboratory where students hone their skills in a practice setting, learning how to dispense medication, counsel patients and utilize the latest technology found in many pharmacies (see Supporting Document 5.5). In April 2008, the American Association of Advertising Agencies initiated a partnership with the John H. Johnson School of Communications. This new partnership established a comprehensive center to address challenges, eliminate barriers, and identify opportunities to achieve a more diverse and inclusive advertising industry workforce at middle to senior management levels (see Supporting Document 5.6). Also in 2008, Bingham McCutchen, LLP launched at the Howard University School of Law its IL Diversity Fellowship program, the most recent example of Bingham’s commitment to recruiting, retaining, and advancing lawyers who will contribute to the diversity of the firm and the legal profession (see Supporting Document 5.7).

In March 2007, former President Swygert and Mrs. Festina S. Bakwena, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Botswana, signed a Memorandum of Understanding outlining Howard’s commitment to support the new Botswana International University of Science and Technology (see Supporting Document 5.8). The Partners for the Advancement of Collaborative Engineering Education (PACE) selected Howard in 2004 for its academic partnership, under which the University received an in-kind contribution of software and other technology, including computer based product management, engineering, design and manufacturing software, as well as hardware and training (see Supporting Document 5.9).

**Goal II: Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Research**

Efforts to increase the number of endowed chairs at the University to promote excellence in teaching and research (Objective 17) are encouraging. Gift-established chairs have been established in Architecture, Business, Medicine, and Arts and Sciences. An initial gift from United Technologies established an Endowed Professorship, which will rotate between Mechanical Engineering and Business. Two endowed chairs are in place or in progress in the School of Business—the KPMG endowed chair in Accounting has been filled and the John E. Jacobs chair is in progress. Both the James Silcott Chair of Architecture and the David and Lucile Packard Professor of Materials Science were filled. Additionally, $12.8 million from the Howard University Capital Campaign has been designated to establish 13 endowed chairs. In March 2008, former Board CEO and Chairman of Time Warner Inc., was appointed first holder of the Gwendolyn S. and Colbert I. King Endowed Chair in Public Policy for the period, March 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009. This chair is intended to encourage highly accomplished individuals to come to Howard to share their experiences with students (see Supporting Document 5.10).

Faculty excellence is denoted by the increase in membership in the National Academies and other professional recognitions for outstanding scholarship and leadership (Objective 20) (see Supporting Document 5.11). Dr. Renee Jenkins, former Chair of the Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, became the first African-American President of the American Academy of Pediatrics for the 2007-2008 year. In December 2008, Leo E. Rouse, D.D.S., Dean of the College of Dentistry, was selected by the American Dental Education Association (ADEA) to serve on the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA), the accrediting body for all dental education programs in the United States. Also in January 2009,
Dean Rouse was honored as the recipient of a 2009 American Dental Education Association (ADEA) Presidential Citation, which recognizes individuals and institutions that have significantly contributed to the ADEA mission to provide leadership in the dental education community to address issues influencing education, research, and the delivery of oral health care (see Supporting Document 5.12). Senior Vice President for Health Sciences, Donald E. Wilson, M.D., M.A.C.P., received the Association of American Medical Colleges’ (AAMC) most prestigious award—the Abraham Flexner Award for distinguished service to medical education in November 2008 (see Supporting Document 5.13). Dr. Winston Anderson, a professor of Biology, was listed among the 20 best scientists in academia by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, which awarded him $1 million to help transform his innovative ideas into action (see Supporting Document 5.11).

Relevant initiatives to create new interdisciplinary research groups are underway in several schools and colleges (Objectives 19). These include the Keck Center for the Design of Nanoscale Materials for Molecular Recognition and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) National Center for Atmospheric Sciences (NCAS). Other important interdisciplinary research groups include human genome, environmental science, neuroscience, and material science as well as computational biology and high performance computing. Interdisciplinary research groups have also been formed between researchers in the School of Law and their counterparts in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Education. Additionally, an Interdisciplinary Graduate Environmental Studies Program has been approved by the Graduate Faculty and is undergoing further review. All schools and colleges are collaborating under the umbrella of the Institute for Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Innovation made possible by the grant from the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.

**Goal III: Increasing Private Support**

A major component of the SFIA II was the Capital Campaign (Objective 25), which addressed the need to increase and diversify university revenues. To that end, the "Campaign for Howard was launched in 2002 with the goal of raising $250 million over a five-year period. The Campaign ended March 2008 with gifts, pledges, and planned gifts totaling $276 million, which exceeded the initial Campaign goal by 10% (see Supporting Document 5.14). This accomplishment represents the largest successful fund-raising endeavor ever achieved by an institution primarily serving African Americans. Outlined are major dimensions of the Campaign that made it an important development in the history of Howard University.

- Alumni participation was increased from 12% at the start of the Campaign to 17%. The national average participation rate is 12.4%.
- Alumni gifts to the Campaign represented, at 32%, the second largest category of contributors; again higher than the national average of 27.5% for such campaigns.
- Howard was the first university whose primary focus is to serve the educational needs of African Americans to launch and successfully complete a Capital Campaign of this magnitude.

Figure 5.1 illustrates the distribution of contributions to the Campaign. The Capital Campaign supports the University endowment, ensuring the long-term financial viability of the University. Additionally, it has funded several efforts to enhance institutional effectiveness in the area of student learning:
■ $187,000 established 8 Lectureships;
■ $2.5 million created 4 Professorships;
■ $12.8 million initiated 13 Endowed Chairs;
■ $91.5 million produced 293 Named Scholarships; and
■ $97 million established and enhanced hundreds of funds supporting individual schools and colleges.

Table 5.1 shows a detailed analysis of the breakout between restricted and unrestricted gifts that were received during the Capital Campaign. As is the case with most capital campaigns, contributions to Howard’s Capital Campaign came in the form of gifts, pledges, planned gifts and gifts in-kind.

**Goal IV: Enhancing National and Community Service**

The University has a long tradition of commitment to national and community service. Each year, the Office of University Research and Planning, in association with the Howard University Community Association, publishes a booklet that identifies the many city and community activities engaged in by University faculty, staff, students, alumni, and retirees (see Supporting Document 5.15). One example is the LeDroit Park Initiative. Over a decade ago, Howard consciously decided to use its assets, capabilities, and influence to revitalize the adjoining neighborhood. With strong support from the Fannie Mae Foundation and the District of Columbia Government, and considerable community input, the University developed a plan for the 151-block area within a 1-mile radius of the main campus. The LeDroit Park Initiative was regarded as an opportunity to demonstrate to the nation’s capital that urban neighborhoods can be turned around, and that sustainable, balanced, comprehensive revitalization can be accomplished.

Phase I of the LeDroit Park Initiative was completed under SF4 I. Phase II of the LeDroit Park Initiative (Objective 29) was to convert 29 of the areas boarded-up properties and 17 vacant lots in the area into homeownership opportunities, thereby providing a catalyst for neighborhood-wide revitalization. Today, 45 homes have been constructed and rehabilitated; their owners are University employees, municipal firefighters and police officers, DC public school teachers, and area community members. Infrastructure improvements were made in Phase III, including street resurfacing, new street lighting, brickling of sidewalks, tree planting and traffic calming measures undertaken by the City, supplemented by $5 million in federal grants awarded to the University.

The American Institute of Architects recognized the LeDroit Park Initiative with its 2002 Community Design Award and its 2003 Honor Award for Outstanding Regional and Urban Design. The Washington Post hailed the plan as “the most significant redevelopment proposal to be unveiled in the District since the master plan for the revitalization of Pennsylvania Avenue was approved 23 years ago” and urged the City to “endorse the Howard initiative as a prototype for revitalization of other neighborhoods.” The success of this project has been cited as key to Fannie Mae’s decisions to invest $1 billion in District of Columbia neighborhoods, and replicate the program at more than 15 universities nationwide.

National and community service was exemplified through the development of a National Digital Network to support urban education (Objective 30). The University designed a National Digital Network that was used to distribute events of the White House Conference for Helping America’s Youth, held on Howard’s campus, over the Internet and via satellite to participating partner-universities. Nineteen flagship universities representing 18

| Gifts Pledges Planned Gifts Gifts In Kind Totals |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Restricted**  | $87,284,310     | $76,653,831     | $30,096,443     | $41,000,000     | $235,034,584    |
| **Unrestricted**| 6,877,349       | 29,272,813      | 4,865,263       | 0               | 41,015,424      |
| **TOTAL**       | $94,161,659     | $105,926,644    | $34,961,706     | $41,000,000     | $276,050,009    |

*Source: Office of University Advancement*
states participated, with each able to convert video streams sent from Howard into desired format(s) for their campuses. Furthermore, the partner-universities were to provide comments, feedback, and inquiries via Conference e-mail servers based at Howard.

Other Planning and Improvement Activities/Efforts

Other planning and improvement activities at Howard include:

- The Academic Excellence Initiative—An initiative of the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Office of the Provost designed to provide assessments and recommendations required to align the departmental and programmatic offerings of the schools and colleges with strategic objectives and financial resources.

- The Long Range Financial Planning Committee—A special committee of the Board of Trustees charged with recommending a strategy for aligning the University’s budget with its mission and goals, and with ascertaining evolving trends in higher education and the society at large that affect Howard University’s present and future status as a national research university with a predominantly African-American student body.

- Presidential Select Commission on Academic Renewal—A Commission appointed by President Ribeau to review during the 2009-2010 academic year and make recommendations for adjustments to the University’s academic programs.

- Assessment of Administrative Processes Initiative—An initiative designed to improve and optimize service delivery.

- Students First Campaign—A multi-phase initiative launched in Spring 2009 designed to integrate the “student-centered learning concept” throughout all facets of the University in order to improve the overall “student experience” at Howard University.

- Howard University African-American Male Initiative—A long-term effort that seeks to increase the number of first-time-in-college African-American male students at Howard University in undergraduate programs.

- Faculty Performance Evaluation System—An on-going evaluation that seeks to improve the existing faculty performance evaluation process.

- Performance Evaluation Program (PEP)—An on-going evaluation system that seeks to improve staff performance. The Office of Human Capital Management recently restructured the PEP.

- Customer Service Training—A university-wide initiative to provide employees with customer service training with the aim of transforming the workforce culture to one that is customer-centered, placing priority on delivering outstanding service and leadership to all stakeholders, especially the students.

Additionally, individual departments/units have been actively engaged in planning and improvement activities that are clearly communicated to their constituents with outcomes incorporated in the assessment of these various departments/units. Such plans are as follows:

- Office of the Internal Auditor’s Fiscal Year 2008 Audit Plan—Approved by the President and the Board of Trustees’ Audit and Legal Committee Chairperson in October 2007. This plan emphasized assessment of the status of corrective actions that the University and Hospital Offices agreed to take in response to internal and external audit reports and federal agreements. Moreover, the plan directs audits into areas where the University’s and Hospital’s assets and resources are exposed to risk of theft, mismanagement, or misappropriation (see Supporting Document 5.16).

- Howard University Libraries Strategic Plan for the Main Library Group (Revised August 2007)—A detailed description of the library’s goals and strategic direction for the next five years as well as performance indicators for each strategic direction (see Supporting Document 5.17).

- 2008 Enrollment Management Strategic Plan—A five-year enrollment plan developed to provide a systematic evaluation of the current enrollment situation and to design strategies to achieve enrollment missions with each of the schools and colleges (see Supporting Document 5.18).
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Resource Allocation

At Howard, the process of assigning resources (i.e., human, financial, physical, and technical) to projects to ensure their optimal use is driven by the SF&I II and the availability of funds. The university’s formal budget development process for the University typically begins annually in November by convening the Tuition and Rates Advisory Committee (TRAC). However, the existing tuition recommendation process was identified for improvement and modified during AY 2008-2009.

Old Tuition Process

Previously, the TRAC, chaired by the Office of Financial Analysis and Budget Director, was comprised of the school and college deans, student leaders, and representatives from the Office of the Provost, Enrollment Management, Student Affairs, and the Office of Financial Analysis and Budget (OFAB). The TRAC carefully considered information on a number of important factors impacting tuition, including national trends, competitors’ data, and enrollment and financial aid data. The Committee made recommendations for changes in tuition, housing, meal plans, and other student fees to the CFO. The CFO then recommended a tuition and rates schedule to the President for approval and presentation to the Board of Trustees.

New Tuition Strategy

The tuition determination process is not viewed as an isolated decision; rather, it is considered integral to the comprehensive reform underway at all levels and thus is synchronous with the University’s new budget process and initiatives to improve services, control costs, increase efficiency, and make transparent its use of resources. In the Fall of 2008, a new TRAC that is chaired by the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer and includes deans, enrollment management staff, and student leaders was convened to develop a 5-year tuition strategy. The principles of the new strategy were as follows:

- Planning Horizon—multi-year approach leads to predictability which is desirable for all constituencies;
- Competitors—Howard’s tuition should not be lower than tuitions at other premier HBCUs; for non-HBCUs, Howard should over time move into alignment with other Research 1 private universities and/or “out of state” tuition for public universities, as Howard draws from a national pool and it needs comparable resources to provide a high quality education while providing substantial financial aid to enable access;
- Preserve Access—access to a Howard education must be preserved; this goal is most properly measured by the number of well-qualified students able to attend Howard regardless of their family’s financial situation; increased tuition rates partnered with increased need-based aid will open access more productively and effectively than low tuition rates; and
- The Need—premier education like the one received by Howard students comes at a price; increased tuition will help fund academic program, research, and infrastructure improvements for current and future Howard students.

Table 5.2: Howard University Approved and Projected Tuition Rates for AY 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>AY2009-10</th>
<th>AY2010-11</th>
<th>AY2011-12</th>
<th>AY2012-13</th>
<th>AY2013-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Program</td>
<td>$14,205</td>
<td>$15,270</td>
<td>$17,100</td>
<td>$19,150</td>
<td>$21,450</td>
<td>$24,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Programs</td>
<td>17,385</td>
<td>19,125</td>
<td>21,995</td>
<td>25,295</td>
<td>29,090</td>
<td>33,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA Program</td>
<td>17,385</td>
<td>22,950</td>
<td>24,195</td>
<td>27,495</td>
<td>31,290</td>
<td>35,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Divinity</td>
<td>15,650</td>
<td>16,435</td>
<td>17,665</td>
<td>18,990</td>
<td>20,415</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>22,415</td>
<td>23,535</td>
<td>25,420</td>
<td>27,960</td>
<td>30,755</td>
<td>34,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>24,225</td>
<td>26,165</td>
<td>28,780</td>
<td>32,235</td>
<td>37,070</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>30,015</td>
<td>32,415</td>
<td>35,010</td>
<td>37,810</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Pharmacy</td>
<td>19,765</td>
<td>20,755</td>
<td>22,415</td>
<td>24,210</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of the Provost
Consequently, the TRAC recommended a series of aggressive tuition rate increases over the next five years. The Board endorsed the strategy and approved the five year tuition plan and authorized implementation of the rates for the next two years (AY's 2009-10 and 2010-11) at the January 2009 meeting. Table 5.2 shows the approved and projected tuition rates for academic years 2009 through academic year 2013.

**Previous Budget Process**

In the past, the allocation of fiscal resources began each year in late January with a budget call from the President to all divisions. At the same time, the Budget Task Force, chaired by the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer (CFO)/Treasurer, served as an advisory group to the President, convened to discuss broad issues and concerns facing the University. After all budgets were submitted, the Office of Financial Analysis and Budget analyzed the submissions and prepared a summary report. The President and the Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer held budget hearings in early April with Deans and key executives to review budget submissions in light of university priorities and parameters established at the beginning of the budgeting process. Based on the allocation decisions, the Office of Financial Analysis and Budget prepared a university-wide operating budget for submission to the President and the Board. The Board approved the budget at its June meeting.

During the 1999-2008 period, a number of improvements were observed in the budget development process resulting from establishment of a Budget Task Force and the inclusion of various stakeholders. One area of continuing concern was the minimal involvement of the entire campus, most especially the Faculty, in the budget development process. To address this concern, President Ribeau implemented a new budget process, which operates within the existing governance structure and explicitly recognizes the faculty’s role in shared governance.

**New Budget Process**

The budget development process is now designed to engage the entire University community and improve transparency and openness. It reflects the belief that the budget, while financial, derives from the operating and investment plans of the University and reflects its aspirations and priorities. In the Spring of 2009, a new budget process was established with the appointment of a Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) which is chaired by the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer and consists of two individuals from each constituent group: faculty, staff, and students, plus at-large members, including the Faculty Senate. For continuity, BAC members serve staggered terms. In the new budget process, the CFO integrates the University’s mandatory spending requirements, plans and requests from Academic Affairs, Health Sciences, and other Divisions into a 5-year draft budget. The draft multi-year budget is then used as the starting point for BAC deliberations. BAC examines all areas of the proposed budget, paying particular attention to areas that are most easily changed, and makes recommendations to the President reflecting their best judgment on how to advance the University towards its agreed vision. To continually improve the process, BAC also recommends improvements to the budget process for use in following years. In keeping with the governance documents, the Faculty Senate additionally develops budget recommendations and submits these to the President. The President then submits the budget recommendations to the Board of Trustees for approval. The President distributes the approved budget and explanatory materials to the University community.

**New Capital Budget Planning Process**

In addition to implementing a new budget development process, the University in 2008 proposed the development of a capital budgeting process which will unify and coordinate capital and infrastructure planning. For the first time, budgets for capital long-term projects will be separate and distinguishable from normal University operating budgets. Since University capital planning involves large fixed capital investments and building projects that take years to complete, creating assets that will remain in service over many decades, long term and strategic approaches are essential.

The new process uses a Capital Planning Council (parallel to the Budget Advisory Committee previously described) to assemble, assess and prioritize capital funding...
requests and maximize the alignment of capital funds to University priorities. Drawing input from academic units, physical facilities, health sciences planning, information technology, real estate operations and the CFO’s areas, the Council will recommend to the President, capital expenditure plans for 2, 5, and 10 year planning horizons. Although evolving needs and priorities will undoubtedly cause plans to change over time, a need for broad engagement with the campus is essential to determine capital requirements and allocation priorities, which will inform decisions that university leadership makes about which projects move forward and at what pace.

Assessment of Resource Allocation

Notwithstanding the success of the recently concluded Capital Campaign, the findings from the 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment showed that the participants’ perceptions of limited resources (financial, facility, and technology) signify a challenge for the organization and its leaders (see Supporting Document 5.21). Concerns about the availability and allocation of resources were expressed by the majority of the participants in both interviews and surveys. There was a strong belief that additional resources were needed to compete for and retain talent and to support the work of leaders and distinguished faculty. In recent years, the lack of alignment between the elements of the strategic vision and the allocation of resources has hindered the University’s ability to achieve its goals of preeminence. President Ribeau’s plans and initiatives are explicitly designed to achieve this alignment.

Institutional Renewal

The Students First Campaign (SFC) is an example of institutional renewal. In January 2009, President Ribeau launched the Students First Campaign, which is a multi-phase presidential initiative designed to integrate student-centeredness throughout all facets of the University to improve the overall “student experience” at Howard (see Supporting Document 5.19). The first Phase of SFC, led by SFC Steering committee, focused on eight target areas: (1) advising, (2) admissions, (3) cashiers, (4) financial aid, (5) records, (6) residence life, (7) student accounts, and (8) student life & activities. Each area, through a process called “Ford Rapids,” identified problem areas and generated recommendations for improvement. The facilitators, along with the responsible administrators, narrowed further the specific changes and actions that will be implemented in Fall 2009 (see Supporting Document 5.20).

Other examples of institutional renewal at Howard are Human Capital Management (HCM) initiatives; specifically, HCM reorganization and Customer Service training. In May 2008, the Office of Human Capital Management retained outside consultants to assist in the restructuring of the Office of Total Compensation (OTC), which stemmed from the 2007 assessment of the functions and services of OTC. This restructuring was based on recommendations that the functions of compensation and performance management, benefits and pension administration, and benefits counseling and retirement services should be separated in an effort to provide targeted customer service to the employees, retirees, and vendors. To that end, OTC was reorganized to eliminate the long wait for responses to issues concerning compensation, benefits and retirements, and to speed the provision of vendor information.

In the Fall 2008 State of the University Address, President Ribeau indicated that
Howard’s workforce culture needed to be transformed into one that was customer-centered. A charge was given to the Office of Human Capital Management to lead a university-wide initiative to provide customer service training with Cabinet-level leadership. Beginning in April 2009, the Professional Development and Leadership Academy implemented two courses intended to position the University’s workforce to implement cutting edge strategies for “customer-centric” service. The first course, “Impact 21: Five-Star Service for the 21st Century,” is a prerequisite for a new Certificate Program in Customer Service Essentials and Student Service Excellence. The second course, “Bolstering the Climate for WeCUI (Welcome, Comfortable, Understood, and Important),” provides strategies for ensuring that the workplace operates in a manner conducive to the delivery of what the service-quality education program labels “five-star service.”

Other institutional renewal efforts such as the Faculty Performance Evaluation System (discussed in detail in Chapter 13—Faculty) and Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) are on-going. More than five years ago, the University decided that PeopleSoft would be the University’s ERP application system. In July 2007, the Human Resource Management module was implemented and five financial modules were implemented during July 2008: (1) General Ledger, (2) Asset Management (Fixed Assets), (3) Purchasing, (4) Grants Management, and (5) Accounts Payable.

Academic Renewal

Like all dynamic institutions, Howard intends to assess its current state and future developmental trajectory in light of the dramatic changes that have occurred in the nation and the world over the past generation and the influences those changes have made on higher education. At the University, a combination of incremental growth in academic programs over the years and incremental budgeting to support this growth has led to circumstances in which many of the University’s 181 degree programs are perceived to be seriously under-funded. Presently, programs compete for a share of a pool of resources insufficient to develop and support niche programs of the highest quality that are deserving of national recognition. The root cause of this may lie in the perception that the University supports far too many academic programs across too broad a spectrum.

The University also faces other challenges that may affect the development of academic programs. These include: an aging faculty and staff; a physical plant so deteriorated that it may inhibit attracting nationally recognized faculty, research leaders, and students. Many of Howard’s academic and research facilities urgently need replacement, repair or modernization; and salaries are not always as uniformly competitive with peer or aspirant institutions.

The remedy to these challenges, according to President Ribeau, lies in a highly targeted process of re-budgeting resources to assure the national reputation and growth of programs that best align with the University’s mission and its future. The President intends for the Academic Renewal Process to produce recommendations which identify programs that will yield resources as well as programs that will benefit from the reallocation of resources. The evaluation of programs will be data-driven and occur at a fine level of detail—specifically at the level of individual degree programs, rather than at the departmental or school/college levels.

Academic Renewal Process

The President will appoint a Select Commission on Academic Renewal to guide the Academic Renewal Process (program review and portfolio assessment) and undertake the review in Fall 2009. Members of the Commission will serve as citizens of the entire University, rather than as representatives of a constituent group. They will function in sub-committees that will look respectively at graduate/professional programs, graduate research programs, and undergraduate programs. Over the next 12 months, the Select Commission on Academic Renewal, in collaboration with the academic leadership, will develop detailed recommendations whereby over the succeeding three years the financial resources supporting the weakest programs will be reallocated to support those programs that are deemed central to the University’s future development.
The process has already begun and will continue in stages. The first phase was completed at the close of fiscal year 2009 (June 30, 2009). The purpose of Phase 1 was to achieve efficiencies and cost reductions in current operations concurrently with university-wide efforts that included restrictions on hiring and the expenditure of university funds, and the Staff Voluntary Separation and Incentive Retirement Program (VSIRP). Within the divisions of Academic Affairs and Health Sciences, complementary steps include reducing the number of adjunct faculty members and canceling under-enrolled courses.

The work of Phase 2 (FY 2010) has also begun. This phase involves further cost reductions aimed toward reducing the projected budget deficit. External consultants are assisting in analyzing current staffing levels in all administrative units against national benchmarks and the practices of peer and aspirant institutions. Phase 2 will also involve establishing and enforcing appropriate faculty workloads, determining appropriate numbers of faculty members and support staff in academic areas (schools, colleges, and departments), and defining performance goals and objectives at the level of the individual faculty member and the academic unit.

Phase 3 will begin in Fall 2009 with appointment of the Select Commission on Academic Renewal and run concurrently with Phase 2. Once appointed, the Select Commission will follow a rigorous methodology that will include regular feedback of its work to the campus community. The Commission will determine the data required, supervise collection and analysis of the data, and make recommendations to the President. Recommendations will comprise a broad narrative of the Commission’s findings, as well as specific analyses of each program, rankings, and recommendations for future growth or contraction (in a number of cases elimination).

The Commission will work in three subcommittees, each addressing one of the broad program levels: graduate/professional, graduate research, and undergraduate. The graduate/professional program sub-committee will rank programs with a view toward identifying those that might operate with a high level of autonomy with regard to their administration, research, revenues, and expenses.

The process of Academic Renewal, of which the Select Commission is a major component, will result not only in recommendations to be adopted and budgets to be reallocated, but also a different framework for managing academic programs into the future. Academic renewal will become a dynamic process at Howard, rather than a series of discrete course corrections on periodic cycles of three, five, or seven years. At a minimum, the process will require a new level of awareness throughout the University of the imperative routinely to set goals, assess performance, and make appropriate changes based on data. Academic leaders at the school/college and departmental levels must adopt a new approach to achieving and maintaining quality in their programs. Faculty members can expect competitive compensation and to receive needed support, including modern, properly equipped teaching and research environments; in turn, faculty performance will be tracked and expectations will be high. Academic support staff will also play an important role, with new levels of skill required to support faculty and students, but in this role they too can expect to be compensated competitively. Continued efforts at aligning personnel resources—perhaps to include a phased retirement plan for faculty and continued restructuring of administrative assignments—are a central feature of academic renewal.

Successful academic renewal is intended to reduce the range of program offerings so that every program offered at Howard has the resources it needs to be a program of distinction. The Academic Renewal Process will determine which programs best fit Howard’s mission, vision, priorities, and opportunities in the years ahead and lead to more targeted and focused offerings, higher quality, and greater productivity.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

Over the past decade, the University has been committed to institutional renewal through a concerted strategic planning process in relation to its mission and goals.
Building on the successes of the 1996 Strategic Framework for Action I (SFA I), the University embarked on Strategic Framework for Action II (SFA II) in 2000. Although a significant number of the capital projects identified in SFA I and II have been achieved, several on-going projects remain. A major achievement from SFA II was the Capital Campaign, which exceeded the initial $250 million goal in gifts and pledges. Other university-wide strategic initiatives are: advancing the research agenda; improving the gender balance of the student body; enhancing the student experience, increasing openness and transparency; and improving services. Despite the success of the Capital Campaign, available resources (financial, facilities, and technology) remain a challenge for the organization and its leaders. Howard has enacted institutional renewal projects: the Students First Campaign and two Human Capital Management initiatives—Customer Service Training and Human Capital Management Reorganization, and Academic Renewal (program review and portfolio assessment). These processes will be reviewed and assessed on a periodic basis. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 2:

**Findings**

1. Planning and improvements by individual departments are not always based upon systematic evaluations and strategic priorities.
2. The Budget and Resource Allocation process was not aligned with the academic and research priorities of the University.
3. The University has not adequately reviewed and assessed the impact of planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal initiatives on a periodic basis.
4. Assessment of resource allocation shows that additional resources are needed to compete for and retain talent and to support the work of university leaders and distinguished faculty.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Implement expeditiously a university-wide planning process that links individual, departments, and unit planning and assessment directly to the University’s strategic plan.
2. Review and assess the new tuition and rates and budget processes periodically to determine their effectiveness.
3. Review and assess the impact of planning, resource allocation, and institutional and academic renewal initiatives on a periodic basis.

**Supporting Documents**

1. Strategic Framework for Action II
2. Strategic Framework for Action II Status Report
3. Summary of the Rangel Program
4. Scores of Kids Get Free Care at “Give Kids a Smile Day”
5. School of Pharmacy and CVS/Pharmacy Open New Practice Laboratory
6. Howard University and AAAA Announce Partnership to Increase Inclusion in Advertising
7. Bingham, Howard Launch Diversity Fellowship: Partnership with School of Law
8. Howard University Signs MOU with Botswana to Establish University
9. Howard University to Receive $70.6 Million from Pace
10. Richard D. Parsons Appointed First Holder Gwendolyn S. and Colbert I. King Chair in Public Policy
11. FACTS 2009 – Howard University
12. Howard University Dental School Dean Receives Presidential Citation from Nation’s Leading Dental Education Association
13. AAMC Honors Howard’s Donald E. Wilson with Its Highest Award
14. The Campaign for Howard
15. Services 2009 – Howard University
16. Howard University FY 2009 Internal Audit Plan
17. Howard University Libraries Strategic Plan for the Main Library Group
18. 2008 Enrollment Management Strategic Plan
19. Students First Campaign
20. Students First Campaign Summary Report
21. 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment Report
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MSCHE Standard 3

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Introduction

Howard has a range of institutional resources for support of its mission and goals. During the past decade, great strides have been made to broaden and deepen these resources. Since the last Middle States visit, the University has implemented several investment strategies, including bond financing, to support and enhance university resources, in particular, technology and facilities resources. This chapter describes the scope of the financial, human, facilities, and technical resources in the context of recent gains and ongoing challenges as well as initiatives to responsibly utilize and manage these resources.

Financial Resources

The University’s major sources of financial resources are the Federal appropriation, tuition and fees, grant and contract revenues, and the auxiliary enterprises. In addition to these sources, the University also generates revenue from its endowment and other investments, the medical faculty practice plan, and private gifts. In FY 2008, approximately $202 million (39%) and $117 million (23%) of the University’s operating revenue was derived from the Federal appropriation and tuition, respectively (Figure 6.1).

The Federal appropriation represents the single largest category of the University’s revenue. It is accompanied by a sizable proportion from tuition and fees. These two sources alone constitute 61% of the revenue. Other major sources include grants and contracts, auxiliary enterprises, and investment return. The University’s revenue distribution is depicted in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1: FY 2008 Revenue by Source ($Millions)

Source: Howard University Office of Financial Analysis and Budget
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The bulk of the appropriation supports the University and, under the 1997 general statute for Howard, can be allocated at the University’s discretion for its academic and research programs and construction activities. As shown in Figure 6.2, the Federal appropriation has been relatively flat for the past eight years. In five of the past seven years Congress has imposed rescissions on funding for most non-defense federal programs and as a result, Howard’s approved appropriation for federal fiscal year 2009 was slightly lower than in 2002.

Tuition and fees represent the second largest source of revenue for the University, excluding the hospital. Gross revenues from tuition and fees increased 60% over the past ten years, growing from $101 million in FY 1999 to $162 million in FY 2008. The tuition increase for students entering in Fall 2008 included a 7.5% increase for undergraduate and most graduate programs and a 15% increase for incoming students in four professional schools (Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Law). More aggressive tuition rate increases will be implemented in coming academic years (see New Tuition Strategy in Chapter 5).

Operating Budget

Over the past ten years, the University’s operating budget has increased by $176 million, growing at a compound annual growth rate of 4.1%, as shown in Figure 6.3. As illustrated in Figure 6.4, the University had maintained a balanced budget from the reporting period of FY 2000 through FY 2007. In 2008 the institution experienced an operating loss, and expects to end FY 2009 with a loss as well. Howard’s Board of Trustees has allowed a small planned deficit for FY 2010 on the way to achieving a balanced budget in 2011 to enable the University to invest in a limited number of critical strategic priorities as it develops its long-term plans.

Operating Results

Figure 6.4 shows actual operating revenues and expenses in financial statement format from FY 2004 through FY 2008. It should be noted that the University experienced operating surpluses through FY 2007. Over the five-year period, revenues grew at a compound annual growth rate of 2.5%, while expenditures have grown at nearly twice that rate (4.7%). In FY 2008,
the growth of operating expenses exceeded that of operating revenues, resulting in an operating deficit of $29.9 million.

**Operating Expenses**

Financial resources are deployed in support of a number of critical university functions. Figure 6.5 depicts operating expenses for FY 2008. These expenses reflect the University’s emphasis on outstanding academic preparation and student-centered priorities; with nearly three-fifths ($312 million) of the University’s operating expenditures spent directly on academics and students. Howard, on a consolidated basis, reported Total Assets of $1.4 billion as of June 30, 2008, which is a decrease of $83.2 million from the $1.5 billion reported the prior year. The decrease was due mainly to a decline in the University’s investments and a reduction in the prepaid pension cost. The total asset decrease, coupled with a small increase in liabilities, meant that the combined entity of the University and Hospital
### Table 6.1: Consolidated Balance Sheet as of June 30, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Balance Sheet</th>
<th>Balance at June 30</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounts ($ millions):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash &amp; Cash Equivalents</td>
<td>$19.6</td>
<td>$47.7</td>
<td>($28.1)</td>
<td>(58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivables (Net)</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>518.6</td>
<td>564.7</td>
<td>(46.1)</td>
<td>(8.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property, Plant &amp; Equipment (Net)</td>
<td>567.6</td>
<td>511.0</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Pension Cost</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>(30.6)</td>
<td>(35.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>117.8</td>
<td>159.1</td>
<td>(41.3)</td>
<td>(25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,388.7</td>
<td>$1,471.9</td>
<td>(83.2)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable &amp; Accrued Expenses</td>
<td>$118.2</td>
<td>$88.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Post Retirement Benefits</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonds and Notes Payable</td>
<td>184.2</td>
<td>193.5</td>
<td>(9.3)</td>
<td>(4.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>150.1</td>
<td>153.3</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$572.0</td>
<td>$558.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$527.7</td>
<td>$611.8</td>
<td>(84.1)</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>191.7</td>
<td>206.4</td>
<td>(14.7)</td>
<td>(7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$816.7</td>
<td>$913.6</td>
<td>(96.8)</td>
<td>(10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Net Assets</strong></td>
<td>$1,388.7</td>
<td>$1,471.9</td>
<td>(83.2)</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Howard University Office of Financial Analysis and Budget*
saw its net assets decrease by $96.8 million or 10.6% during FY 2008. Information on the FY 2008 balance sheet is depicted in Table 6.1.

Impact of Current Market Conditions on University Portfolios

The unstable national and global economy, and the unpredictability of financial markets, will continue to impact the University’s operations and mission in the near future. This is due both to the direct effect on Howard’s investments, and on the ability of funders and donors to continue their financial support. As illustrated in Figure 6.6, after a robust growth in FY 2007, the University’s endowment investments began to decline in FY 2008, and so far, in FY 2009 have shown further declines.

Despite current year declines in endowment market value, the University’s investment strategy is well-positioned for the future. Over the last two years, the investment strategy has been augmented to better position the endowment to take advantage of potential market swings, and to protect purchasing power during recessionary periods. The University’s liquidity position remains strong despite global market conditions.

Financial Planning Strategies

The University is facing a structural deficit, exacerbated by, rather than caused by the current global financial crisis. Despite these financial challenges, the institution continued to support priority areas (e.g., student facilities, classrooms, teaching labs, research facilities, and residence halls). In light of the $29.9 million operating deficit of FY 2008, the University has implemented short-term initiatives to reduce costs, which were outlined in President Ribeau’s letter to the Howard community, dated December 3, 2008 (see Supporting Document 6.1). These short-term strategies included:

- a hiring freeze;
- a salary freeze until the end of the 2008-2009 academic year;
- the establishment of budget reduction targets for all university divisions;
- a substantial reduction in consulting fees and professional services;
- a substantial reduction in travel, overtime, and stipends; and
- a two-day furlough for faculty and staff and a four-day furlough for members of the President’s Cabinet.

The University has developed a multi-year structural reform and cost reduction
program. It includes four components:

1. Staff VSRIP—a voluntary retirement program which included 339 staff who separated from the University on June 30, 2009;

2. Structural Reform—an organizational and process redesign driven by mandatory division-based budget reduction targets of $43 million in FY 2010, to continue in following years;

3. Academic Renewal—a carefully designed process of campus engagement, to significantly reduce the range of academic programs, and redirect resources to strategic academic/health sciences program priorities, and provide program support needed to attain excellence (see section on Academic Renewal in Chapter 5); and

4. Process Improvement—a systematic redesign of major campus processes to reflect best practices, improve services and reduce cost.

Credit Rating

In June 2008, the University received credit ratings of A2 from Moody’s Investors Service and A+ from Standard and Poor’s (S & P). During the most recent credit rating review in June 2009, S & P affirmed the current credit rating, but changed its outlook from stable to negative. The ratings agency’s analyst cited operating losses at the University and Howard University Hospital, declining unrestricted resources and university endowment, and long-term strategic challenges for the University’s hospital as the main reasons for the outlook change. S & P reported that although the Hospital has made great strides during the 2009 fiscal year in reversing its operating losses, the Hospital remains a key strategic challenge, due to its relatively small size, low acuity, and aging facility. Losses for the Hospital in FY 2009 are expected to be minimal, while the University has taken steps to further reduce costs and enhance revenues.

Standard & Poor’s also reported that University enrollment is stable with a good demand profile. The successful completion of the University’s first major Capital Campaign in FY 2008 was also noted, with a total of $276 million raised. These items, along with the University’s low debt service burden of only 2.3% of revenue, gives strength to the current rating. Management should be able to also demonstrate continued and reasonable progress toward achieving operating stability over the next one to two years.

Assessment Procedures for Financials

The University has several mechanisms in place to ensure that its financial status is reviewed and evaluated against its mission, goals, and objectives. These mechanisms include the approval of the annual budget by the Board of Trustees, annual financial audits by external auditors, annual internal audits by the Office of Internal Audit, and periodic presentations to bond rating agencies. In addition, the University reports annually to the U.S. Department of Education on a set of measures (see section on Compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act in Chapter 10—Institutional Assessment).

Budget Forecasting

The University engaged in a number of activities to improve financial management and to more closely integrate budgeting and strategic financial planning. In that regard, the Board of Trustees appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on Long-Term Fiscal Health in 2007. The Board committee proposed a long-range model projecting University revenues and costs that engendered needed discussion on the difficult truth, that “business as usual” would not put Howard on the path to sustained excellence.

The University recently completed the implementation of an even more sophisticated, interactive financial model that unites all of the planning activities for the University and Hospital into a single institutional viewpoint, to analyze the financial ramifications of operating and capital initiatives. The University also developed an enhanced budget implementation and tracking process, which leverages the power of the PeopleSoft system. This process produces a series of monthly budget reports and forecasts by division to be used as part of a more structured, regular review with cabinet officers regarding their progress in achieving financial and operational goals.
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Technological Resources

As a major component of SFA I and SFA II, the University made significant investments in its technology resources over the past ten years. These investments have resulted in the dramatic expansion of the technological infrastructure, an enhanced university Web site, and the increased incorporation of technology into instruction. In addition, to fostering increased access to technology by students, faculty, and staff, this investment has supported and improved critical university functions, including admissions, enrollment, and communications. Some of the technology infrastructure upgrades are outlined in Table 6.2.

Information Technology Infrastructure

Guided by SFA I and SFA II (see Supporting Documents 6.2 and 6.3), the University made significant progress in building the information technology (IT) infrastructure that supports academic instruction, student life and administration. The Report on the Infusion of Information Technology Supporting Academic Instruction and Student Life at Howard University (January, 2005) (see Supporting Document 6.4), summarizes the major IT projects Howard has implemented as of that time. These include:

- FacNet II and FacNet III (the second and third rounds of distributing new computers to all full time faculty members);
- ResNet I and ResNet II, creation of the Information Laboratory (iLab), implementation of wireless network access to all dormitory residents followed by the installation of wired voice, data and cable video;
- Expansion of wireless network capability to various parts of the institution;
- Major upgrade of the wide area network from Fiber Distributed Data Interface (FDDI) to Fast Gigabit technology;
- Establishment of six eStop, electronic kiosks;
- Construction of two digital libraries;
- Creation of a digital auditorium and smart classrooms with full network and audio visual capabilities; and
- Technology upgrade of the Howard University Bookstore.

The Information System and Services (ISAS) Office hosts the University information network and operates all university computer labs. The University’s fiber optic wide area network enables the delivery of IT services campus-wide and programs and activities have been implemented to strengthen IT access. ISAS has developed and published improved technical standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Budgetary Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabling Infrastructure</td>
<td>Campus wide underground Data Cabling upgrade. Building fiber network wiring infrastructure for students, faculty and administration.</td>
<td>$2,995,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net II/Net III</td>
<td>The capacities (server, bandwidth) of the University Computing Network infrastructure were strengthened and improved. The iLab ($5.3M), Student commuter Lab and E-Mail stations were built to facilitate student learning.</td>
<td>$26,360,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Soft Program</td>
<td>The current implementation of computer web-based Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) technology to replace the old mainframe (financial and human resources) system.</td>
<td>$33,028,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Classroom Technology</td>
<td>42 existing classrooms/seminar rooms were renovated to house student-teacher interactive smart technology at seating locations in all colleges. Faculty meeting rooms and conference rooms were also updated.</td>
<td>$2,668,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResNet Program</td>
<td>In the ResNet program, all residence halls were upgraded to include new voice, video and data technology.</td>
<td>$13,658,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Integrated Visual Communicating System</td>
<td>Installed in hallways lobbies at the school of law, medical, and dental schools and in student activity centers at the Blackburn center and in student dining hall.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Howard University Office of Information Services
Chapter 6

for wiring, networks, services, telecommunications systems, and protocols. To alleviate the effects of increasing external challenges to the University network from spam, viruses, worms, and “Trojan Horse” attacks, ISAS has been very proactive in the implementation of information security measures.

Howard University Web site

The Web site (www.howard.edu) was first launched in 1997 and in March 2007, a major redesign of the site was completed. In the site’s evolving role, it not only is a repository of official information, but a key academic resource with links to the library system and electronic databases. Further, it is a vital tool that facilitates many administrative processes, including admissions, enrollment management, and university communications. As evidence of the utility and centrality to the community, in January 2009, the Web site registered 92,765 of page views per day. In the 2008 Self-Study surveys, 56% of students, 57% of faculty, and 61% of senior administrators surveyed responded “good” to “excellent” that the Web site effectively communicates information to all stakeholders (see Supporting Document 6.5).

Technology in Instruction and Learning

Technological resources are employed to enhance instruction and facilitate student learning. In the 2008 Self-Study surveys, most students (53%) but fewer faculty (28%) reported that technology is used to a good or excellent degree in the classrooms. Sixty percent of faculty reported a “good” to “excellent” level of success in introducing cutting-edge technological programs into the curriculum (see Supporting Document 6.5). The University now has 42 smart classrooms and each one contains high-end, integrated audio-visual presentation and production capabilities, including a smart board, automated instructor station, and network capable student seating.

The University now has 42 smart classrooms and each one contains high-end, integrated audio-visual presentation and production capabilities, including a smart board, automated instructor station, and network capable student seating.

was used by 84% of the students. In addition, faculty use of Blackboard’s many features has helped to facilitate the shift to on-line instruction at the University, an increasing trend in higher education.

Technological Advances in Administrative Functions

New system upgrades and software recently were implemented to increase the efficiency of university administration. The upgrades included an industrial strength messaging system, secure remote access, and capacity to support Howard’s Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system, PeopleSoft that links and integrates operating units through a common database. Roll-out of the PeopleSoft Human Capital Management (HCM) modules in 2007 provided a streamlined system for hiring, payroll and other critical personnel management functions. Launch of the PeopleSoft Financial modules in 2008 improved efficiency of the purchasing, accounts payable, and other financial functions.

Facilities Resources

The University consists of five campuses, 115 buildings and 258 acres. This past decade, investment in the physical facilities markedly increased – three new buildings, major building renovations, program space for research/teaching, building code conformance enhancements, and annual campuswide maintenance repairs and renovations of residence halls, classrooms, and laboratories. In addition, the University has developed comprehensive plans to improve and maintain the physical facilities.

More specifically, during this period, expenditures included over $60 million for building code compliance renovations; $56 million invested in new buildings; over $37 million for major building renovations; and $13.5 million in renovated space for research, teaching, and learning. Among these investments were two new libraries, the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library and the Law Library, which opened in 2002. These facilities added value to the University library system, which is a member of the Association of Research Libraries. In addition, the Howard University Research Building I (HURB I) opened in 2005, becoming the first campus building dedicated solely to research.
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Other facilities renovated included Tubman Quadrangle Residence Halls, Meridian Hill dormitory, Howard Center, Carnegie, Armour J. Blackburn University Center, and Wonder Plaza Building, as well as 11 programmed spaces for research and teaching/learning. Building code corrections included elevator replacements, sprinkler system installations, HVAC system replacements, roof replacements, ADA compliance, restroom improvements, doors/security systems, and building structure integrity.

Feedback from the 2008 Self-Study survey reflected a range of responses regarding perceptions of University facilities. Table 6.3 presents student, faculty, senior administrator, and staff feedback expressed as the percentage of “good” to “excellent” responses elicited. The pattern of responses strongly indicates the need for continued improvement.

### Facilities Maintenance Program

To guide continued systematic investment in facilities resources, the Physical Facilities Management (PFM) department has developed a Deferred Maintenance Program, which identifies additional renovations and/or replacements over five years. The plan has three major areas: 1) Deferred Maintenance Projects for Building Systems; 2) Deferred Maintenance Projects for Grounds; and 3) Deferred Maintenance for Life Safety and Regulatory Projects. The plan is ever-evolving and lists University facilities, conditions, costs of deficiencies, and replacement values. Each year the University also identifies facilities needing urgent repairs or renovations.

The University is in the midst of a multi-year, $69 million deferred maintenance (DM) project largely funded by bonds issued in July 2006 to replace building systems (HVAC, sprinklers and fire alarms) in 14 academic buildings and to repair or replace elevators throughout the campus. Among the capital and deferred maintenance projects completed are:

- Repaired or replaced 41 elevators;
- Updated mechanical and fire safety systems in Just Hall (Biology), Mackey Building (Architecture), and Downing Hall (Engineering); and
- Renovation of the Blackburn Center Sculpture pool and the Lower Quad fountain.

Other critical maintenance priorities include facility and classroom projects requested by the academic units. Some scheduled student impact projects included: renovated/new labs, renovated/new class-

| Table 6.3: Student, Faculty, Senior Administrator, and Staff Perceptions of the University’s Facilities |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Item**                                         | **Student**     | **Faculty**     | **Senior Admin.** | **Staff**       |
| 1. Availability of physical facilities for conducting state-of-the-art research | 28%             | 14%             | 4%              | –               |
| 2. Quality of physical facilities for conducting state-of-the-art research | –               | 18%             | 5%              | –               |
| 3. Adequacy of facilities for optimal learning | 29%             | –               | –               | –               |
| 4. Quality of classrooms for teaching           | –               | 24%             | –               | –               |
| 5. Adequacy of day-to-day maintenance of classrooms, offices, common building areas and campus grounds | 32%             | 12%             | –               | 25%             |
| 6. Quality of physical facilities available on campus for meetings, seminars, conferences and workshops | 41%             | 29%             | 18%             | –               |
| 7. Quality of on-campus residential facilities | 20%             | –               | –               | –               |

Source: 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation
rooms/study halls, renovation of administrative areas, and other general physical requirements.

To reduce the University’s energy consumption and the environmental footprint, several new initiatives have been launched, which target the following goals: implementation of a comprehensive recycling program in place by December 31, 2009; reduction in university energy consumption by 15% by June 2010; and the longer-term objective of becoming climate neutral by the end of 2019.

**Human Resources**

As of Fall 2008, Howard had 3,869 staff employees at the University (1,950) and the hospital (1,919) as well as 1,520 faculty (full-time 1,064; part-time 456). In addition, there is an additional 128 faculty members (7 full-time and 121 part-time) without compensation (WOC) as authorized in the Faculty Handbook (see Supporting Document 6.6). These appointments occur in two major categories: (1) in the health sciences, clinical practitioners with practices outside the University offer their services without compensation, and they are given temporary faculty appointments accordingly and (2) appointments to the Graduate Faculty are without compensation above and beyond the compensation that the faculty member earns from his or her departmental salary. The reason for the WOC appointment is to create a formal record of service for which the person is not compensated. The Faculty is discussed in detail in Chapter 13—Faculty.

Howard has demonstrated its commitment to professional development in a number of innovations. The Professional Development and Leadership Academy, established in 1997, offers training to all university employees in new office technologies. It also provides workshops to enhance performance, and expand employees’ technical and people skills. In an effort to continually invest in fac-
ulty, the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CETLA), also provides on-going instruction in a variety of instructional and assessment strategies as well as expanding faculty expertise in new content areas or methodological strategies. Results from the 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment Study revealed that the University has the rudiments of human capital development in place, albeit uneven throughout the institution. Plans are being developed to establish a more comprehensive applied program to reduce the unevenness.

Staff Voluntary Separation Retirement Incentive Program (VSRIP)

The staff Voluntary Separation Retirement Incentive Program (VSRIP) was implemented for the purpose of reducing salary costs to better align functions with the university’s mission and to assist in meeting budget reduction targets. Eligibility for participation was limited to university staff only. Faculty and hospital staff members were not eligible to participate. In addition, University staff had to meet one of two criteria: (1) retirement eligible or (2) vested with 10 or more years of service. Incentives included two weeks of severance pay for each year of creditable service up to a maximum of one year and current annual leave balance.

Overall, one thousand and sixteen university staff members were eligible to participate: 733 by retirement and 283 vested. Of that number, 339 employees (306 retired and 33 vested) accepted the VSRIP and separated the University on June 30, 2009. The total payroll of those participating in the program was $18,887,566. The total severance paid out was $16,984,378. The annual leave cost was $1,772,582.

Separating staff included an Associate Provost, two Deans, the University’s Assistant Treasurer, the Vice President for Alumni Affairs, the Associate Director and Medical Officer of the Student Health Center, 12 Assistant and Associate Deans, an Assistant Vice President, a senior Associate Vice President, and numerous mid-level managers. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the separating staff reported to the Provost, 29% reported to the CFO, and 20% reported to the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. Departments with a significant number of separations include Enrollment Management, Financial Aid and Student Employment, the Moorland Spingarn Research Center, Office of the Dean of the Graduate School, Office of the Dean of Medicine, Office of the Dean of Dentistry, Office of the Associate Dean of Pharmacy and Allied Health, Campus Police, Custodial Services, and Materials Management.

Persons accepting the staff VSRIP are not eligible for permanent re-hire. Subject to the approval of the Cabinet, separating individuals can be re-hired on wages at their last hourly salary for a period not to exceed 90 days. During this re-hire period, the focus is on transfer of knowledge, rather than on solely continuity of services. In addition, persons re-hired are involved in initiatives to implement the Budget Advisory Committee and McKinsey transformation initiative. To date, 117 persons have been re-hired for periods ranging from one month to three months at a projected cost of $764,000.

Performance Evaluation

The institution has two separate performance evaluation systems in place for faculty and staff. Faculty performance evaluation is discussed in detail in Chapter 13—Faculty. The Performance Evaluation Program (PEP) is the primary instrument utilized at the University to manage staff performance. This program covers all non-union, non-hospital, and non-faculty employees with at least ninety days of service and is designed for both supervisory and non-supervisory staff. The annual cycle starts in April or May with an assessment of the evaluation instrument. Decisions are made whether to maintain the present performance appraisal form or make revisions. The forms are available for supervisors in June. PEP information sessions are conducted for supervisors in early July. Evaluations are conducted in August with completed documents sent to the Office of Total Compensation (OTC) in mid-August. The OTC evaluates documents for completeness and enters data into an Access database. If individuals are eligible for a merit award, OTC prepares the notice of
award letters and delivers them to the major offices of the University. The performance management process consists of planning, managing, improving, appraising, and rewarding performance. It also includes objective setting for the following year. This process engages both employees and supervisors in ongoing communication designed to assist employees to perform successfully in their jobs through goal setting and reinforcement of behavior that supports institutional, departmental, and individual objectives. During the evaluation process, employees meet one-on-one with their supervisor to review and discuss the past year and develop plans for the upcoming year.

In the 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment Study; results revealed that the University has performance systems in place; however, they were not consistently implemented with the needed metrics, rigorous evaluation, and associated consequences (see Supporting Document 6.7). To remedy this issue, in the 2007-2008 PEP, the University implemented a revised approach to organizational performance review to include the element of feedback. Previously, all appraisals were on an individual basis and supervisors have consistently rated most employees in the top two tiers of the PEP. The revised process begins with assessment feedback regarding performance of the organization relative to the standards set at the beginning of the cycle. Additionally, the rewards process is being revised to assure that performance compensation is given to employees who are the best performers.

Resource Management

Responsible stewardship of university resources is a top priority. Great efforts are taken to ensure that the fiscal, facilities, technological, and human resources are appropriately and efficiently employed in service of the University’s mission and aspirations. Both internal controls and external oversight have helped to facilitate this priority.

Internal university controls ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of operations, timely and accurate financial reporting, and compliance with laws and regulations. Adequate institutional controls are in place to deal with financial, administrative and auxiliary operations. To assess its own controls and establish best practices, the University operates under the Cost Accounting Standards (CAS); Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-110: Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; and OMB Circular A-21: Cost Principles for Educational Institutions. There are two oversight committees—Audit and Legal Committee and Finance Committee, which operate according to the By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007 (see Supporting Document 6.8). Several times during the year, the committees meet to discuss issues in relation to audit issues as well as fiscal, ethical, and legal requirements.

In addition to the two oversight committees of the Board of Trustees, several university departments also play similar roles. The Office of the Controller ensures that adequate internal controls and best practices are in place to manage university financial resources as well as federal grants and contracts. The Office of Internal Audit performs audit investigations, departmental audits and follow-ups and provides advisory services. The Office of the Vice President for Research and Compliance initiates and reviews non-compliance reports in sponsored research. Some of the internal controls in place are contained within the following:

- Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System;
- Research Policies; and

Further, there are several opportunities to review financial management practices. Annual independent audits confirming financial responsibilities are evident in the following reports:

- Howard University Financial Statements and Report on Federal Awards, Year ended June 30, 2008;
- Howard University Financial Statements and Report on Federal Awards, Year ended June 30, 2007; and
To strengthen operations and services, the University completed a major study of its procurement operations and processes and concluded that there are major areas of opportunities including professional services, telecommunications, and contracts for repairs and maintenance, which will benefit the University in two ways: (1) cost reduction or avoidance in line items and (2) the opportunity to get “more for the money” in university departments. Savings in the amount of $100,000 have already been observed in the Physical Facilities department because of a new elevator maintenance contract. Through strategic purchasing of future contracts on natural gas, the University has been able to avoid increases in utility costs for the next two years.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The University is facing financial challenges, made worse but not caused by the current global financial crisis. In the midst of these financial challenges, Howard continues to support priority areas, including investing in student facilities. Howard has used technological resources to significantly improve instructional capabilities, student learning, and staff productivity. Over the past decade, the University has achieved some improvements in technology resources and physical facilities—new buildings, major building renovations, renovated program space for research/teaching, building code conformance enforcement, and annual campus-wide maintenance renovations, including residence halls, classrooms, lab repairs and renovations.

Significant improvements in the University’s physical infrastructure have also been made with major renovations completed or underway, although significant infrastructure needs remain. Short- and long-term strategies have been implemented to combat financial challenges. Short-term strategies included University-wide furloughs, salary and hiring...
freezes, while long-term measures included a staff Voluntary Separation and Incentive Retirement program.

In addition, in the 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment Study, the conclusion was that the University has rudiments of human capital development in place, albeit uneven throughout the institution. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 3:

**Findings**

1. The University’s financial management and human resource management systems are in need of improvement.
2. The University’s current budget is not adequately aligned with its academic priorities.
3. There is insufficient communication or awareness within the University community regarding its internal and external reviews of financial and human resource management systems.
4. Human capital development across university academic and administrative units is uneven.
5. Assessment of resource allocation shows that additional resources are needed to compete for and retain talent and support the work of leaders and distinguished faculty.
6. There is insufficient diversification of the University’s revenue stream.
7. The University’s physical and technology infrastructure is in need of on-going enhancement and maintenance to remain competitive as a research university.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Align the University’s resources and budget with academic priorities resulting from program reviews and portfolio assessments.
2. Initiate procedures to communicate annually to the University community the results of various internal and external reviews of the University’s financial and human resource management systems.
3. Develop and implement a comprehensive program to address the unevenness of human capital development.
4. Increase the diversity of university revenues, which may include targeting alumni giving and other private donors and growing the University endowment.
5. Intensify efforts to increase revenues from non-government sources to complement tuition and Federal support so that there are adequate resources to compete for and retain talent and to support the work of leaders and distinguished faculty.
6. Continue to invest in physical and technological infrastructure to support academic, research and student life priorities.

**Supporting Documents**

6.1 President Ribeau’s Letter to Member of the Howard University Community, December 3, 2008
6.2 Strategic Framework for Action I
6.3 Strategic Framework for Action II
6.4 Report on the Infusion of Information Technology Supporting Academic Instruction and Student Life at Howard University, January, 2005
6.5 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
6.6 Faculty Handbook, 1993
6.7 2006 Senior Leadership Development and Succession Assessment Report
6.8 Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007
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MSCHE Standard 4

The institution’s system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Introduction

A sound governance system, competent leadership, and effective management are regarded as critical to the University’s ability to confront complex challenges and to produce sustainable results. The University also recognizes the need for effective management systems to advance and strengthen its mission, goals, and vision. This report section addresses leadership, governance, policy development, and decision-making at the University, including the concept of shared governance.

Leadership of the University

Board of Trustees

In accordance with its charter and By-laws, Howard is governed by a Board of Trustees (the Board), which has the ultimate authority and responsibility for “controlling and directing the affairs, property and interests of the University.” The Board conducts its work through eight standing committees: Academic Excellence, Audit and Legal, Development, Finance, Executive, Medical Affairs, Trusteeship, and External Affairs. The functions and responsibilities of these committees are delineated in the Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees (Amended January 27, 2007) (see Supporting Document 7.1).

Addison Barry Rand was elected chairman of the Board of Trustees in 2006. The Board has 35 authorized voting members (including the President of the University) of whom seven are designated “Constituent Trustees.” Comprising the “Constituent Trustees” are three alumni, two faculty members, and two students, each nominated by their respective constituencies. With the exception of the President, constituents and general members of the Board are selected by the Board following recommendations from its Trusteehip Committee as outlined in the Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees (Amended January 27, 2007). Also, the Board may designate as members non-voting Trustees Emeriti or Honorary. All new Board members participate in an orientation at the beginning of their terms.

The Board’s membership comprises a governing body that is capable of assuring that the body’s fiduciary responsibilities are fulfilled (see Supporting Document 7.2). Board members represent diverse fields of professional endeavor, including business, law, higher education, medicine, and scientific research. The Trustees have actively advanced the University’s cause by providing leadership in the Capital Campaign with personal contributions and by lending fundraising assistance; working with government officials to continue the Federal appropriation, an essential part of the University’s annual budget; and encouraging an assessment of academic programs through a designated Academic Excellence Committee.

Currently, the Board meets a minimum of four times each year. The January, April, and September meetings are reserved for Board action. The November meeting is utilized as an evaluative and planning retreat in odd years, when there is in-depth discussion. Even years are utilized as a forum for in-depth analysis of issues of strategic importance. The Executive Committee acts on behalf of the Board between meetings, as needed.
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Assessment of the Board

Each year after the annual meeting in April, the Board conducts a series of assessments. Beginning July 1, 2006, the Board enhanced its self-assessment procedures. In September 2006, the Board identified the following focus areas based on the results of its November 2005 retreat: Academic Excellence, Health Sciences Enterprise, Long-Term Fiscal Health, Board Effectiveness and Strategic Vision. As part of the Board Effectiveness focus area, the Chairman recommended that the Board of Trustees establish, as a high priority, performance accountabilities for executive, academic, and administrative levels.

At the November 2006 meeting, the Board Chairman presented the Governance Effectiveness Management System, which set forth performance metrics for the Chairman, the President, Board Committees and Committee Chairs, and Trustees. The system was approved and assessment tools were drafted and approved.

Governance of the University

The University has a shared system of governance. Ultimate authority for governance of the University is vested in the Board and delegated by the Board to the President. The President exercises that authority through the Provost/Chief Academic Officer, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, and other officials of the administration in consultation, as necessary, with the units of the University and with faculty, staff, and students.

The University has experienced an accelerated pattern of faculty engagement and collaboration with the administration in matters of governance. President Ribeau embraced a shared approach to governance. In his first year, he prioritized making information about the University’s operations more transparent and widely accessible to the university community. In addition, Dr. Ribeau meets regularly with Faculty Senate leadership, and encourages involvement of faculty, students, and staff in major University initiatives, such as the Budget Advisory Committee, the Students First Initiative, and the recently announced Select Commission on Academic Renewal.

Faculty

In addition to their teaching, research, and service responsibilities, Faculty has the responsibility to assist Howard with the fulfillment of its mission and vision through the development and implementation of policies that will advance the University’s educational mission. Matters of exclusive concern to a single college/school are subject to deliberation and recommendation by its faculty through consultative bodies and procedures set forth in the By-laws of that individual unit. For policy initiatives impacting more than one school/college, the consultative process may involve the twelve faculty deliberative bodies and the Faculty Senate. Examples of the extent of faculty consultation include the merit award process, faculty appointments, promotions and tenure recommendations, and the recent proposal to implement a new performance assessment system.

The Faculty Senate (“Senate”) is the independent organizational unit through which the University-wide Faculty (“University Faculty”) participates in the governance of the University. This body deliberates and determines the faculty positions/decisions on issues of concern and makes recommendations to the President and the Board on matters within the Senate’s jurisdiction. The Council of the Faculty Senate is its legislative body, consisting of representatives from all schools/colleges. It is governed by a Board-approved constitution. Senate Officers and Council representatives are elected by the Faculty through a secret ballot. The Senate has responsibility for deliberating and making recommendations regarding educational policies that are applicable to more than one school or college. Faculty Trustees are nominated to the Board through an election process managed by the Senate. Members of the Senate actively participate on various university committees, such as the Budget Advisory Committee, Tuition Rate Advisory Committee, University Self-Study Steering Committee, and other ad hoc committees and task forces. Although
the Faculty Senate actively participates in the University’s governance process, it has expressed continuing concerns about the administration of the University, its operations and shared system of governance (see Supporting Document 7.3).

Support Staff

The Howard University Staff Organization (HUOSO) is the official staff representative body. All non-faculty employees of the University are eligible for HUOSO membership upon payment of a nominal fee. Under By-laws approved in 2004, HUOSO serves in an advisory capacity and facilitates communication between the staff and administration. As outlined in the HUOSO constitution, it provides input to the administration regarding university policies and procedures (see Supporting Document 7.4).

Students

Student governance at Howard is carried out through three categories of student organizations: the Howard University Student Association (HUASA); Undergraduate and Graduate Student Assemblies; and School/College Student Councils. Representatives to these organizations are elected by the appropriate student bodies. To be eligible for and maintain their positions, students must maintain a 3.00 cumulative grade point average. Student government elections are held every Spring semester. The University-wide student association, HUSA, is the official representative of all students. HUSA operates according to its constitution and By-laws and consists of members of the undergraduate and graduate student assemblies and representatives from each school/college student council (see Supporting Document 7.5). Student government representatives and other students actively participate on councils, task forces, and committees at the department, school/college levels. The student governance bodies provide input in the formulation of policy and advise students, faculty, and administrators at the various levels of the University. Recent examples of student service on important committees include the Presidential Search Committee, University-wide Self-Study Steering Committee, Tuition and Rate Advisory Committee, and Budget Advisory Committee. One student elected from and representing the undergraduate units of the University, and one student, elected from and representing the graduate and professional divisions of the University, serve on the Board of Trustees.

Decision-Making at the University

Under the University’s organizational structure, the President serves as the University’s Chief Executive Officer and exercises executive, supervisory, and management authority as delegated by the Board. Because Board membership includes the President and constituent representatives (alumni, faculty, and students), all stakeholders are involved in the University’s decision-making process.

Faculty members are actively involved in the University’s decision-making process and serve on search committees for academic administrators. The Board of Trustees Search Committee that recently recommended the appointment of President Ribeau included a faculty representative. The Faculty shares responsibility with the University administration in matters related to academic programs, including faculty recruitment and development; faculty evaluation for reappointment, promotion and tenure; program development and review; student advising; class schedule planning; and general supervision of the research, teaching, and school and college outreach activities. Faculty involvement in these matters is outlined in the By-laws of the respective schools and colleges.

Academic policy and program recommendations begin at the departmental level and are submitted for consideration by the school/college faculty. Following school or college faculty consideration, the Dean transmits recommendations to the Provost and Chief Academic Officer or the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences for review and consideration. If approved, the recommendation is forwarded to the President for consideration. Final authority for the establishment of university policy rests with the Board of Trustees. Board decisions related to academic policies and programs are communicated to the Faculty.
Faculty members are involved in decision-making as it relates to the University’s operating budget and the setting of tuition rates. Working with the Faculty Senate leadership, President Ribeau facilitated the Senate’s submission of FY 2010 budget development recommendations and participation on the University’s Budget Advisory Committee. President Ribeau recognizes the Faculty Senate as a key constituency and works collaboratively with the Senate leadership to ensure that the University’s decision-making process is transparent and inclusive.

Assessment of Leadership and Governance

The assessment of leadership and governance at the University was conducted in light of Middle States’ response to the 1999 Self-Study Report, which praised the University’s inclusive approach to decision-making, but highlighted the need for a balance between full policy deliberation and implementation.

The governance structure, established by the Charter, By-laws, and regulations of the various University entities, provides substantial opportunities for faculty and student consultation, with appropriate legal authority clearly vested in the Board or delegated by it to the President. The Board, the President, and the Provost and Chief Academic Officer refer to examples of shared governance in the By-laws and Handbooks of each school. They note the crucial consultative role of the faculty in admissions, in awarding degrees and in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty. However, a review of the Faculty Handbook revealed dated policies since the Handbook was published in 1993.

Some Senate leaders contend that the Faculty is not sufficiently involved in decision-making that affects them directly. Illustrative of their contention, Senate leaders point to the Board’s Academic Excellence Committee decision to meet with Senate leaders only once a year for thirty minutes. Also, the Senate disputed the Board’s view that the search process for a new President represented an inclusive process. In some instances, administrative leaders and Senate leaders have different views regarding important university issues and approaches. For example, during the presidential search, the search committee informed and updated the Faculty about the search via letter. The
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Faculty Senate Chair, however, “... wanted better communication and a more open process from the presidential search committee ... not a vaguely worded letter from the Chair of the Search Committee that attempted to update and inform Faculty; the process was more of a closed-door exercise” (Interview with Chair of Faculty Senate, May 2008). (A more detailed discussion of Faculty Senate concerns is set forth in a letter, which was sent to the Middle States Commission, dated April 17, 2008) (see Supporting Document 7.6).

Their feeling of a lack of commitment to the concept of shared governance led the Senate Chair to propose the creation of an Office of Ombudsman at Howard. The proposed office would be charged with improving communications and addressing grievances involving the Faculty and university administrative leaders. The University recognizes the need to adopt basic standards to resolve faculty grievances and to revise the 1993 Faculty Handbook, as well as to consider other issues pertaining to faculty life and governance during the revision process.

Other governance concerns that have been expressed by the Faculty include: the proposed Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES); lack of integrity associated with faculty compensation; academic restructuring without faculty consultation; the lack of inclusion in budget and budgetary matters; and issues associated with the Faculty Handbook. Several of these concerns emerged during the Self-Study interviews with the leadership of the Faculty Senate and Deans.

A common thread identified by the Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate was their perception of a lack of transparency in the decision-making processes of upper administration. They noted decisions regarding hiring, appointments, policy-development, evaluations, promotions, and information sharing—particularly the budget even though the By-laws of the Faculty Senate require that the administration and Faculty have access to budget information.

Notably, the issue of faculty participation in budget development was resolved with implementation of a new budget development process, which operates within the existing governance structure and explicitly recognizes the role of the faculty. The new budget process is designed to engage the entire university community and improve transparency and openness. The new budget process is detailed in Chapter 5: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal.

Under President Ribeau, the current university administration has worked assiduously to engage faculty in a transparent and participatory process on most academic matters at the University, consistent with both Faculty Handbook and principles of good practice in higher education. Accordingly, the University administration has acknowledged the need for full faculty participation in the aforementioned faculty evaluation system and has (1) suspended implementation of the plans for one year until faculty voices can be heard and considered and (2) sought explicit reactions to the proposed plan, plus the submission of alternate plans, if desired, to the Office of the Provost. This input will be considered in the preparation of the final plan.

In the Faculty Senate’s judgment, faculty should have a role in many more University processes as well as within their respective colleges and schools. For instance, Faculty Senate leaders criticized the appointment of a Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (SVPHS) because the reassignment of oversight for the Health Sciences from the Provost’s authority occurred without consultation with faculty of the respective Schools and Colleges. The Board, during the Swygert administration, reorganized the offices of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer (CAO) and the SVPHS with limited input from the University community. Under that reorganization only the nine colleges and schools in the academic affairs division report to the Provost and CAO, while the three colleges dealing with health sciences (Medicine; Dentistry; Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences) report to the SVPHS.

Nonetheless, the current administration regards this reorganization as an imperative response to the need for closer oversight and heightened attention to the health sciences and hospital. As the University’s health-related functions and operations improve, this direct reporting line to the President may be unnecessary.
Both Faculty Senate leadership and some Deans complained that there is no shared governance with central administration and that neither group had input in major decisions and policy development. Of the Self-Study Survey respondents, 38% of students, 18% of faculty and 10% of staff reported a “good” to “excellent” level of opportunity for involvement in the decision-making that affected them. Moreover, perceptions of senior administrators regarding input by stakeholders in university decision-making also varied, yielding reports of good or excellent levels of involvement by students (31%), by faculty (35%) and by staff (14%).

President Ribeau is aware of these pre-existing Faculty Senate concerns and has demonstrated his commitment to resolving them. The President and Interim Provost and CAO met with the Faculty Senate periodically during the 2008-2009 academic year. In addition, the establishment of the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), comprised of students, faculty, and staff, represents a significant step toward more transparency and broader involvement in decision-making.

Findings

1. The recent reorganization of the University’s academic affairs and health sciences units was done without sufficient consultation with the faculty, deans, and other stakeholders.
2. The 1993 Faculty Handbook does not reflect changes in academic policy, faculty participation in decision-making, and administrative organization.
3. Despite significant efforts over the past year, there remains a perception among some faculty of insufficient transparency in the University’s decision-making process.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Revisit the Provost and Chief Academic Officer /Senior Vice President for Health Sciences model in consultation with the various faculty, deans, and other appropriate university stakeholders.
2. Revise the 1993 Faculty Handbook to reflect current policies and processes.
3. Enhance policies and procedures on Board of Trustees and leadership succession.
4. Continue to build upon recent initiatives that are designed to enhance the transparency of the University’s decision-making processes.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The governance structure established under the Charter, By-laws, and regulations of the various university entities provides substantial opportunities for faculty consultation and student input, with legal authority appropriately vested in the Board or delegated to the President. This structure has led to clear policies, and unambiguous roles and responsibilities for the governing Board, central administration, deans, department chairs, faculty, and students. The University’s governing documents provide for a structure, which complies with the leadership and governance principles set forth in the Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education. The University also has a system of shared governance. Still, Senate leaders maintain that the members of the faculty are not sufficiently involved in the decision-making processes that affect them.

Concerns have been raised regarding the ability of the organizational and leadership structure of the University to effectively and efficiently develop policies that can lead to significant change. The current administration has been aggressively and assiduously responding to many of these concerns. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the university’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 4:

Supporting Documents

7.1 Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007
7.2 Board of Trustees 2009-2010 Membership List
7.3 Faculty Senate Constitution, 2000
7.4 Howard University Staff Organization By-laws, 2004
7.5 Howard University 2009-2010 Student Handbook
7.6 Faculty Senate Letter to Middle States Commission, April 2008
Administration
MSCHE Standard 5
The institution’s administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution’s organization and governance.

Introduction
Howard’s structure is organized into a number of administrative and academic units which facilitate the efficiency and effectiveness of the day-to-day management of the University. The University’s administrative services enhance instruction, learning, and research and support the institution in achieving its mission and goals. The administrative structure of the University is reviewed and revised as new leadership is appointed and as needs dictate.

Overview of Administrative Structure

University Officers

The organizational structure of the University is delineated in Figure 8.1. As decreed by the University Charter, the ultimate authority is the Board of Trustees with the President as Chief Executive Officer. The administrative structure over the past decade has provided stability in leadership. H. Patrick Swygert served as president for 13 years, the third longest tenure of a president in the 142-year history of the University. In May 2007, President Swygert announced his retirement as president of Howard, effective June 30, 2008. On May 7, 2008, the Board of Trustees announced the appointment of Sidney A. Ribeau, Ph.D., president of Bowling Green State University to the presidency of Howard, effective August 1, 2008. During a short period of transition, July 1, 2008 to July 31, 2008, Ms. Artis Hampshire-Cowan, J.D., Senior Vice President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees, served as interim president.

The President has a cabinet of administrative officers who serve in an advisory capacity. The presidential cabinet is comprised of nine officers: University Secretary, Provost and Chief Academic Officer (CAO), three Senior Vice Presidents, three Vice Presidents, and a General Counsel. In addition several other positions report directly to the President, some of which are members of the cabinet. As the Chief Executive Officer of the University, the President has responsibility for the management and supervision of all activities in accordance with established policies and procedures. The President is responsible for the implementation of the University’s policies established by the Board of Trustees and for recommending courses of action to the Board in coordination with faculty, staff, and other constituents in the University community.

In recent past, the University has undergone some administrative changes revising the structure and creating new positions. Within administrative ranks, there has been turnover either by resignation or retirement. Since the last Middle States visit in 1999, there has been substantial turnover in the position of Provost and CAO with six individuals having served in that position [Antoine Garibaldi, 1996-2000; Don Coleman (Interim), 2000-2001; Toy Caldwell-Colbert, 2001-2003; Richard English, 2003-2008; Kurt Schmoke (Acting Senior Vice President for Academic Matters), 06/2008-08/2008; and Alvin Thornton (Interim), 2008-present]. Also several changes have occurred in the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer position, with four persons having served since 1999 [Thomas Elzey, 1995-2002; Henry Jackson (Interim), 2002-2004; Sheila Roberts (Acting), 2005; Sidney Evans, Jr. 2005-present].
Figure 8.1: Organizational Chart
Source: Office of the President
In the last two years, changes in responsibilities have shifted between the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences (SVPHS). As stated in Chapter 7, the Faculty Senate believes there was insufficient engagement of the faculty in this decision. The Provost and CAO now has the responsibility for all undergraduates and graduates in nine colleges and schools (excluding the Colleges of Medicine; Dentistry; and Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences), the libraries (excluding the Health Sciences Library), and several academic support units. Additionally, the Provost and CAO has oversight for academic offerings, space availability, personnel and facility resources, and expenditures of university funds within budgets of units in the Academic Affairs Division.

The SVPHS presides over the Hospital, Health Sciences Library, the Colleges of Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences and possesses line authority from the President for the overall management of the University's clinical enterprise and dedicated health sciences segments of the academy including oversight of these entities. Further, the SVPHS is responsible for the educational, research, and service programs in the Health Sciences. With this administrative change, the University needs to assure that there is proper alignment and collaboration between the Office of the SVPHS and the Provost and CAO.

Other important changes include the creation of new cabinet level positions. As a result of the NSF 2006 audit report, the Board of Trustees approved position of Vice President for Research and Compliance (VPRC) to provide oversight for administration of the research enterprise. With this cabinet level position, the University needs to assure that there is proper alignment between the Office of the VPRC, which has responsibility for extramural research administration, and the Office of the Provost, which has general responsibility for research, as well as for coordination with the SVPHS office.

In early 2006, President Swygert appointed Don Coleman, Ph.D. as the Interim VPRC. Dr. Coleman's tenure ended after a national search and the appointment of Oliver G. McGee, Ph.D. as the University's first permanent VPRC on July 1, 2007. Dr. McGee resigned after serving for one academic year,
and Florence B. Bonner, Ph.D., Associate Vice President for Compliance was appointed VPRC (Acting) in August 2008.

In July 2008, Ms. Elizabeth Stroud, the Associate Vice President for Human Capital Management was promoted to Vice President for Human Capital Management, a newly created cabinet level position. Under President Ribeau’s leadership, a new cabinet level position, Vice President for Presidential Initiatives, was created to support the President, Provost and CAO, and the other Vice Presidents in organizational renewal. Additionally, as part of the restructuring of the Division of Communications and Marketing, President Ribeau appointed an Interim Executive Director of Communications and Marketing in May 2009 to report directly to the Office of the President. This reorganization is part of a comprehensive plan to coordinate the University’s diverse communication assets and to improve internal and external communications.

Recruitment and Hiring Process of University Officers

A rigorous hiring process for senior executives ensures that individuals selected for these positions best meet the required skills and qualifications. Prior to advertising the vacancy of University Officers, the President seeks approval from the Board of Trustees. University Officers are recruited through national searches that are coordinated by a search committee, published vacancy notices, and formal search committee interviews. Position descriptions and vacancy notices include the responsibilities and qualifications for prospective candidates. The roles and responsibilities of the Officers are outlined in the Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007 (see Supporting Document 8.1); position descriptions; and job announcements. Additionally, Officers in temporary (acting or interim) positions do not have clearly defined written responsibilities but assume the role of the vacant position.

The executive officers of the University serve “at the will of” the President. Those officers in “interim” roles may not serve in excess of twelve months during any continuous period of eighteen months (Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007). Initial hires receive an individual orientation from Human Capital Management, in consultation with the President. At that session, the Officer receives copies of the Equal Employment Opportunity Policy; Sexual Harassment Policy; Code of Conduct Policy; Personnel Guideline and Statement of Current Benefits; and a Confidentiality Agreement (see Supporting Documents 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, and 8.6).

Academic Administrative Officers

The administration of academic units falls under the purview of the Provost and CAO and the SVPHS. They in turn, for their respective Divisions, delegate the responsibility of the schools/colleges and other units to the Deans and Directors. Academic deans are responsible for faculty recruitment and development; faculty evaluation; program development and review; student advising; collegiate budgeting and budget control; class scheduling/planning; general supervision of the research, teaching, and outreach activities of the school/college. As appropriate, the Deans consult with the faculty of the school/college (Faculty Handbook). Some of these responsibilities are delegated to the departmental chairs by the Deans. Departmental chairs are responsible
for overseeing the administration of academic departments within schools/colleges. Directors are responsible for the administration of units that are not schools/colleges and may share such responsibility with faculty in the units. Additionally, directors consult with faculty who are part of their units (see Supporting Document 8.7).

Assessment of the Administration

There have been some inconsistencies with the evaluation of university officers and academic administrative officers in terms of its frequency. Additionally, there is no evidence that additional training or leadership development is routinely available for deans, directors, and officers of the University to assist them to function at maximum capacity in their defined positions such that operational effectiveness is achieved.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The organizational structure of the University is hierarchical. In the recent past, the administrative structure has undergone several revisions, which include the creation of several new senior administrative positions. Concerns were expressed about the division of academic responsibilities between the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences—an organizational arrangement with implications for institutional operation and decision-making. The Vice President for Research and Compliance position was created to enhance the administration of the research enterprise and a Vice President for Presidential Initiatives was created to support the President, Provost and CAO, and other Vice Presidents in organizational renewal. As part of the restructuring of the Division of Communications and Marketing, an Executive Director of Communications and Marketing was created, reporting directly to the President. The following findings and recommendations emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 5:

Findings

1. There has not been stability in the positions of Provost and CAO and the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer/Treasurer.
2. Strengths and weaknesses of the administrative structure are not currently reviewed
periodically to maintain efficiency and ability to respond to evolving requirements.

3. There is insufficient leadership training focusing on a broadening set of responsibilities and opportunities that would strengthen the operational effectiveness of deans, directors and departmental chairs.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. The President should consider practices and procedures that will lead to stabilization in senior level university officers.

2. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the University’s administrative structure periodically to maintain utmost efficiency and continuity.

3. Implement individual developmental plans focusing on operational effectiveness for university officers, deans, directors and departmental chairs as ongoing leadership development training.

**Supporting Documents**

8.1 *Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, 2007*

8.2 *Howard University Policy and Procedure on Equal Opportunity in Employment and Education Programs and Activities, 1999*

8.3 *Howard University Policy Against Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Discrimination in Education Programs and Activities, 1999*

8.4 *Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy, 1998*

8.5 *Personnel Guideline and Statement of Current Benefits, 1999*

8.6 *Howard University Employee Financial, Personal and Private Information Confidentiality Agreement, 2008*

8.7 *Faculty Handbook, 1993*
9 Integrity
MSCHE Standard 6

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.

Introduction

Integrity inevitably requires transparency, consistency, impartiality, fairness, clarity, accountability, effective and accurate communication, academic freedom, and institutional honesty. The Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct was adopted by the Board of Trustees in June of 1998 and the opening statement is very clear in addressing the fact that integrity and honesty are required of every member of the University community in all dealings and at all times (see Supporting document 9.1).

Academic Integrity

Howard affirms that the main purpose of an institution of higher education is the discovery of new knowledge through scholarly teaching, research, and service to the community. In pursuit of knowledge, the Faculty and students must hold learning and research at the highest level of integrity. The overarching university policy is to comply with the policies in place regarding ethical standards of integrity in relationships within the University and all related entities, business units, subsidiaries and affiliated organizations, including, but not limited to, Howard University Hospital and the community, in support of academic and intellectual freedom. Information pertaining to academic and intellectual integrity is well documented in Howard policies and is made available to university constituencies. University policies that govern each of the constituency groups reference integrity and how it is the responsibility of each entity to hold itself accountable and perform its functions with integrity and in accordance with their respective professional codes of ethics.

University-wide policies are disseminated to the various departments and are made available to all faculty, staff, and students. Additionally, policies are integrated into University communications and publications. Academic policies are found in the print or electronic versions of the Howard University Faculty Handbook (Section 2.3.1—Terms and Conditions of Faculty Employment) (see Supporting Document 9.2); and the Howard University Student Handbook, 2007-2008 (Section—Academic Policies, Page 16; Section—Policies and Regulations, Page 102) (see Supporting Document 9.3). Academic regulations are also available in the Student Reference Manual, Howard University Student Handbook, and Undergraduate Bulletin (see Supporting Documents 9.4, 9.5, and 9.6).

Academic freedom is described in the Faculty Handbook as the freedom of faculty members and students to teach, study, and conduct research in pursuit of knowledge without interference or restriction from the law or internal and external pressures. The Howard University Academic Freedom policy is outlined in Section 2.2.4 of the Faculty Handbook (see Supporting Document 9.2). Additional information pertaining to academic freedom is found in the Student Code of Conduct (see Supporting Document 9.7) and the Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct, Section IV: E (p. 7) (see Supporting Document 9.1).

Students at the University are held to a high standard in pursuit of learning. The University prohibits any type of academic dishonesty. As stated in the Academic
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Code of Conduct, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1987, students enrolled at the University may be disciplined for academic infractions such as cheating and plagiarism. The minimum disciplinary penalty for a violation of the Code is that the student will not receive credit for the course assignment or examination in which the infraction(s) occurred. A more severe penalty, such as failure in the course involved or suspension from the University, may be imposed depending upon the nature and extent of the infraction(s). The authority and responsibility for the imposition of any discipline rests with the faculty of the school/college in which the student is enrolled. However, it may be delegated by the faculty to the Dean of the school/college in which the student is enrolled (see Supporting Document 9.8).

Through the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA), the University subscribes to Turnitin.com, a research resource tool that teaches the planning, organizational, and citation skills essential for producing quality writing and research. One of the assessment tools included is a plagiarism detection service. Some professors at the University now require students to submit their papers electronically to this site to determine the originality of texts based on comparisons with the Turnitin.com internal database. Since 2008, the Graduate School required all thesis and dissertation authors to submit an electronic version of their document to the Turnitin.com site and generate a Turnitin.com Originality Report in order to safeguard academic integrity.

Since 2008, the Graduate School required all thesis and dissertation authors to submit an electronic version of their document to the Turnitin.com site and generate a Turnitin.com Originality Report in order to safeguard academic integrity.

Through the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA), the University subscribes to Turnitin.com, a research resource tool that teaches the planning, organizational, and citation skills essential for producing quality writing and research. One of the assessment tools included is a plagiarism detection service. Some professors at the University now require students to submit their papers electronically to this site to determine the originality of texts based on comparisons with the Turnitin.com internal database. Since 2008, the Graduate School required all thesis and dissertation authors to submit an electronic version of their document to the Turnitin.com site and generate a Turnitin.com Originality Report in order to safeguard the academic integrity of Howard theses and dissertations. This report is submitted with the oral defense request (see Supporting Document 9.9). Although the penalty for plagiarizing theses and dissertations is clear, the penalty is not so clear with regard to other types of student writing—especially if a faculty member wants to go beyond what is in the Student Code of Conduct (i.e., a “0” for the plagiarized assignment).

The University uses a grade point average (GPA) system to evaluate the overall performance of the student at the end of each semester. The GPA is computed for all courses attempted, excluding courses repeated. To receive a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree, students must have a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. Students graduate with honors under the following conditions: those with a quality GPA ranging from 3.20 through 3.49 will graduate cum laude; those with a quality GPA ranging from 3.50 through 3.79 will graduate magna cum laude; and those with a quality GPA of 3.80 or higher will graduate summa cum laude.

Grievance procedures, which were approved by the Board of Trustees in 1994 and are detailed under the Policy on Student Academic Procedures in the Student Reference Manual, Howard University Student Handbook, and other University publications, are applicable in the case of challenges to academic decisions.

Integrity of Academic Programs

Academic programs at Howard are accredited by a number of national and specialized agencies which are approved by the U.S. Department of Education and other accrediting entities. At present, all programs at the University are accredited. Within the last two years, the College of Medicine and Schools of Law and Business, and several departments maintained accreditation with their respective academic associations. Self-Study interviews with six Deans resulted in a consensus that the integrity of academic programs is challenged by issues arising from deficient infrastructures; inadequate services; inefficient administrative and management systems; noncompetitive compensation packages for new and current faculty, and little organizational support. Concerns expressed that also may threaten the integrity of the academic program included an aging faculty body with few who are productive in research. The Deans of the professional schools found it problematic that there was an apparent increase in faculty that were lacking in expertise or scholarship and demonstrated minimal professional and scholarly growth.

Assessment is an important and integral part of academic programs. At Howard, most professional programs use national examinations as benchmarks for measur-
Integrity in the success of their students and graduates. This information has led to program enhancements, including curricular modifications and the institution of supplemental initiatives to improve national examination scores.

Scientific Integrity

Integrity in the conduct of research is a key priority for the University. In 2003, the Graduate School implemented a required Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) seminar for all graduate students. Attendance at the workshop is a prerequisite for graduate candidacy and is designed to ensure that all students conducting research demonstrate their understanding of the multiple ways that integrity can be assured including the role of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), research guidelines, ethical reasoning, conflict of interests, data management, authorship and publication practices, and mentorship.

The Research Compliance Office is charged with administering the review and approval of the use of human participants and vertebrate animal subjects in research through the IRB and IACUC. In this role, the Research Compliance Office provides guidance to faculty in preparing protocols to submit to the relevant review committees. The IRB reviews all research protocols that involve humans, and requires the highest standards of care to ensure privacy and informed consent and to reduce the risks to human research participation. The IACUC reviews protocols that involve vertebrate subjects.

Workplace Integrity

The University reaffirms its commitment to equity and nondiscrimination in the workplace, consistent with federal mandates and D.C. laws. The Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct provides the framework for ethical conduct. The University strives to ensure fairness and equality in its hiring, evaluation, and promotion practices with regards to administration, faculty, staff, and students. Recruitment of staff and wage employees are conducted through the new PeopleSoft Human Resource on-line application system, which was implemented in 2007. Employment appointments are made by the Office of Employment in accordance with the Affirmative Action law.
The Office of Employment conducts orientation for all initial hires on or before their scheduled report date. In addition to receiving benefits information, new employees receive the Howard University Policy and Procedure on Equal Opportunity in Employment and Education Programs and Activities, 1999; Howard University Policy Against Sexual Harassment and Gender-Based Discrimination in Education Programs and Activities, 1999; Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy, 1998; Personnel Guidelines and Statement of Current Benefits, 1999; and Confidentiality Agreement, 2008.

Conflict of Interest

Conflict of interest statements and policies are outlined in the Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct, Faculty Handbook, the Howard University By-laws of the Board of Trustees, and Sponsored Programs Conflict of Interest Policy, No. 600-002. At the Board level, duality of interest, conflicts or potential conflicts of interest are required to be disclosed at least once a year and members with said conflicts are excused from participating in relevant decision making. Additionally, all Deans sign conflict of interest forms every year, which are maintained in the Offices of the Provost and General Counsel.

Policies regarding faculty conflicts of interest and commitment apply to faculty on full-time appointments. The conflict of commitment policy requires faculty to limit outside employment and activities to one day per week so as to not interfere with the primary responsibilities of research, teaching, and service. Faculty members must discuss potential conflicts of interest with their Dean and avoid or withdraw from situations that may lead to personal gain or advantage of any kind that conflict with the University’s interest and the member’s duty to serve them.

In terms of research, beginning April 2007, all Principal Investigators (PIs)
were required to submit a completed conflict of interest (COI) form as part of their application package for extramural funds to the Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Administration. Prior to this new University requirement, only PIs submitting applications to the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health were required to submit the COI form as per Federal regulations.

**Integrity in Communication and Media**

The University community is informed about important issues through the Office of University Communications and Marketing, which is the central point for the dissemination of information regarding Howard to the community. This office’s media operation disseminates news in a variety of formats including e-newsletters (Capstone On-line), Web sites, e-mails, and periodicals (Howard Magazine). Also, the University Web site is the main communication portal through which faculty, staff, students, alumni, and the greater community can access a wide array of information about the University. In addition to the aforementioned communication media, the University’s student newspaper, The Hilltop is published daily under the direction of an advisor.

Other major University publications include:

- The Bison Yearbook—published annually by a student staff under the advisement of the Office of Student Activities.
- The H-Book—published by the Office of Student Activities, provides information on University policies, rules, codes of conduct, campus services, campus events, and annually observed events.
- Howard University Facts—a booklet of information taken from several University databases published by the Office of University Research and Planning.
- Howard University Service—provides city and community activities in which Howard faculty, staff, students, alumni and relatives are engaged.
- Scholarship@howard—a searchable online database of Howard faculty authors published since 1995.

- Quest—a bi-annual research publication that chronicles faculty and student research across the University.

Additionally, the on-line schedule of classes, bulletins, and catalogs via the University Web site provides students with basic information pertaining to deadlines, examination schedule, finance, and academic rules and regulations. This information is presented in a logical and navigational format, which makes it easier for the reader to follow through links. A university on-line events calendar informs the community of campus activities, past, current, and forthcoming (http://www.howard.edu/calendars/).

**Summary, Findings and Recommendations**

University-wide ethical policies are disseminated to the various departments and are shared with faculty, staff, and students. As reinforcement, policies are integrated into university communications and publications. Academic policies are found in the print or electronic versions of the Howard University Faculty and Student Handbooks. Academic regulations are also available in the Student Reference Manual, Howard University Student Handbook, and Undergraduate Bulletin.

The University’s standards of fairness and equity are in many respects undergirded by a culture of compassion and a passion for excellence.
ing findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 6:

**Findings**

1. There is insufficient inclusion of ethics and integrity as core components in the orientation process for students, faculty, and staff.
2. There are insufficient procedures to ensure a systematic evaluation and monitoring of compliance with university policies related to integrity.
3. The University’s various official policies are not readily available in a single central location.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Develop integrity as a core component for all orientations of students, faculty, and staff.
2. Develop and implement effective assessment procedures to ensure a systematic evaluation and monitoring of compliance with university policies related to integrity at all levels.
3. Publish the University’s various official policies and procedures in a central location on the University’s Web site.

**Supporting Documents**

9.1 Howard University Code of Ethics and Conduct Policy, 1998
9.2 Faculty Handbook, 1993
9.3 Howard University 2009-2010 Student Handbook
9.4 Howard University Fall 2009 Student Reference Manual
9.5 Undergraduate Bulletin*
9.6 Graduate Bulletin*
9.7 Howard University Student Code of Conduct, 2000
9.8 Howard University Academic Code of Student Conduct, 1987

*The Howard University Bulletins may be accessed through the University’s website: www.howard.edu (Click Administration; then click, Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer; then click, Publications/Policies and School Bulletins)
Institutional Assessment

MSCHE Standard 7

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

Introduction

Institutional assessment and effectiveness is discussed throughout this report. However, this chapter presents additional assessment information to give an overall portrait of institutional evaluation. Assessment activities at Howard are designed to determine the level of conformity of institutional practices to its mission. The University has a long history of assessing institutional effectiveness, including regular internal and external evaluations. Howard conducted its first University-wide Self-Study for Middle States accreditation in 1921, received university-wide accreditation, and has successfully reaffirmed its accreditation ever since. Additionally, more than 30 accrediting bodies currently review more than 60 academic programs at the University. School-specific assessments are conducted on a periodic basis, typically for disciplinary accreditation.

The U.S. Department of Education’s assessment of the University’s performance on key indicators and congressional oversight of the University’s budget provide an additional layer of external accountability. Internally, University units conduct internal audits and provide annual reports. The systematization of a formal internal University-wide assessment function is a relatively recent endeavor and continues to evolve. To promote the University’s effectiveness in achieving its mission, several major initiatives, including organizational restructuring, financial planning, and academic streamlining have continued, while new initiatives have commenced that enhance the student experience and institutional operations.

Institutional Assessment Climate

The University continues to incorporate assessment across all its functions. The creation of the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) in 2008 is an indicator of the University’s continued commitment to the assessment enterprise. OIAE is in the process of working aggressively to facilitate, coordinate and institutionalize assessment activities across the University.

The results of the Self-Study surveys of faculty, senior administrators, and staff reflect significant University challenges in connecting the goal of incorporating assessment into institutional decision-making, planning, and budgeting. Although there is imbalance in the perception of the quality and extent of the incorporation of assessment across units, it was particularly noteworthy that among respondents, 51% of staff, 43% of faculty and 11% of senior administrators reported unawareness of their unit’s assessment plan, while 13% of senior administrators reported that there is no assessment plan. Among the small sample of faculty respondents, the majority (86%) were aware of their department’s policies and procedures to assess its programs and student learning outcomes. However, almost half (43%) were unaware of their school or college’s written assessment plan. In general, the faculty’s rating of school/college assessment functions indicated considerable room for growth in that very high percentages reported that they were either unaware or did not know of the assessment function. Among senior administrators, perceptions regarding the integration of assessment into decision-making
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are mixed. Although over three-fourths (76%) are aware of their unit’s assessment plan, a fifth (20%) did not know enough to rate its implementation. Further, while 61% endorsed the perception that their respective units have policies and procedures to effectively assess activities and programs, the majority (61%) negatively evaluated the degree to which appropriate assessment tools are used to determine if expected outcomes are being achieved (see Supporting Document 10.1).

Staff perceptions of assessment indicate the need for increased attention, with two-fifths of respondents consistently reporting lack of knowledge of their unit’s assessment plan. The level of awareness or lack thereof across the University community suggests that the profile of assessment functions needs to be raised and although the strategies undertaken by OIAE for communicating assessment information and activities appear vital, they should be studied for their impact on the “assessment culture.” OIAE’s plans demonstrate that it will provide leadership to “cultivate a culture of assessment” that enhances evidence-based decision-making and thus institutional effectiveness.

University Assessment

During the past decade, to assess unit level progress and plan execution, the University has utilized internal and external assessment teams and consultants to conduct feasibility studies and assess selected University operations.

University Assessment

During the past decade, to assess unit level progress and plan execution, the University has utilized internal and external assessment teams and consultants to conduct feasibility studies and assess selected University operations. Annual reports from each school/college and department/unit are compiled and reviewed annually by the individual departments/units and University cabinet members. Additionally, the Office of University Research and Planning compiles and publishes summary data annually in the University Facts Book (see Supporting Document 10.2), which is distributed internally and to external audiences. In January 2000, an Interim Task Force on University Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE) was established in response to concerns raised in the 1999 Self-Study Report. The Interim Task Force was comprised of representatives from the faculty, administrators, staff, and students. The Interim Task Force was charged to propose a campus-wide organizational structure for the OAIE initiative to develop guiding principles for the conduct of assessment activities; to outline the functions, roles, and responsibilities of individuals and units involved in assessing institutional effectiveness and educational outcomes for students; to document current levels of assessment activities underway on campus; and to develop a timeline for the implementation of a fully coordinated program of institutional effectiveness measures and student learning outcomes assessments. The Interim Task Force designed a committee structure and a set of guiding principles (see Supporting Document 10.3) that were consistent with the recommendations of the Middle States Association and prepared a draft framework for a centralized, coordinated University-wide assessment program at the University. To enhance the readiness of the University community to participate in assessment-related activities, Howard supported participation in national, regional, and discipline-based assessment conferences; established in-service training; increased library resources on assessment; and arranged for site visits to model programs.

In March 2001, Howard submitted its Follow-up Report on Progress in the Development and Implementation of a Comprehensive Assessment Plan, which was accepted by the Middle States Association. Several departments and units developed assessment plans in 2003. Since that time, schools and colleges have engaged in a variety of assessment activities, some driven by accreditation requirements and others by University expectations. However, the implementation and related outcomes of the departments/units assessment plans were not adequately coordinated across the University. Institutional assessment remained decentralized until Fall 2008 when the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) was established under the Office of the Provost. From the outset, OIAE encountered practical challenges in fulfilling its agenda to identify, access, and compile various sources of data across the University, apparently, because there was not a clear division of
responsibility among OIAE and the Office for University Research and Planning, and other offices with assessment responsibilities. The lack of coordination complicated the process of “completing the circle” where data and assessment informs change in approach, policy, and practice.

Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation

At the onset of OIAE under the direction of Gerunda B. Hughes, Ph.D., a five-year (2008-2013) Strategic Plan was developed (see Supporting Document 10.4). The Plan took into consideration the current developments and climate in higher education with respect to outcomes assessment (e.g., more emphasis on student learning), the University’s culture and climate in relation to outcome assessment, the availability of human, material, and financial resources—especially resources to report and disseminate results and findings pertaining to institutional assessment, research, and evaluation.

Organizational Structure for the OAIE Committee

Because assessment is fluid, the OAIE Committee evolved both in organizational structure and design. Originally formed in 2001, the OAIE was restructured in Spring 2009 under a different rubric (see Supporting Document 10.5). The OAIE Committee is large because it includes primary stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, administrators, and alumni) from all University units. The University’s OAIE is divided functionally into three subcommittees—College/School Assessment (CSA), Student Quality of Life (SQL), and University Community Experience (UCE). The Executive Committee, which consists of the chairpersons of the three subcommittees and the OIAE Director, coordinates the activities of the University OAIE Committee.

College/School Assessment (CSA) Subcommittee

The CSA Subcommittee provides oversight of the assessment activities of colleges and schools with particular emphasis on improving outcomes related to student learning and development, student advisement, faculty teaching and instruction, faculty development, research and scholarly productivity, and academic support services. Supporting Document 10.5 provides a detailed outline of the CSA Subcommittee’s structure and responsibilities.

Use of College/School Assessment Information

Assessment of student learning has been the main thrust of the University’s assessment activity. The greatest progress in documenting, organizing, and sustaining the assessment process has been made in this domain. Recent findings of direct measures of student learning are detailed in Chapter 17, Assessment of Student Learning. Samples of assessments used for accountability or evaluation purposes with the primary focus on college/school assessment are summarized as follows:

A. Case Studies

The following case studies describe how individual units or several collaborating units identified an area of interest or concern, collected data for analysis, reviewed and reflected on the results, and used the information to improve their programs, services, or student learning outcomes.

- “Using Survey Results to Improve the Curriculum” (see Supporting Document 10.6)
- “Predicting Successful Matriculation through Basic Sciences” (see Supporting Document 10.7)
- “Improvements in Passage Rates: United States Medical Licensure Examinations” (see Supporting Document 10.8)
- “Biology Department Review Leads to Facilities Renovation and Improvement in Academic Programs” (see Supporting Document 10.9)

B. Indirect Measures of Student Learning using Locally-developed Instruments

1. 2008 HU Self-Study Surveys

The purpose of the surveys was to collect data and information about the perceptions and opinions of samples of students, faculty, administrators, and staff on key topics, such as the University’s mission, lead-
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ership and governance, resource allocation, technology, physical facilities, student support services, faculty concerns, and student learning outcomes. Different surveys were developed for different stakeholder groups; however, some topics appeared on multiple stakeholder surveys.

Students (N=415) were asked, for example, to indicate on a 4-point Likert-type scale the extent to which they agreed with a set of 13 statements (Items 55-67) about “student learning outcomes.” The scale values ranged from 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, to 4 = Strongly Agree. Across the set of 13 items, the mean and standard deviation M = 2.8 and SD = .012, respectively (see Supporting Document 10.1).

Faculty (N=72) were asked to indicate, on a similar 4-point scale, the extent to which they agreed with a set of 6 statements (Items 54-59) about “student learning outcomes.” Across the set of items, the mean and standard deviation M = 2.9 and SD = .038, respectively (see Supporting Document 10.1).

2. 2009 Undergraduate Graduating Students’ Exit Survey

Graduating undergraduate students were asked to indicate the level of satisfaction with training in or the development of certain competencies while matriculating at the University (see Supporting Document 10.10). The Survey produced 866 respondents. The percentages of students who responded that they were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” with the training or development are presented below.

- Preparation for leadership 92.1 %
- Knowledge of African-American culture 89.3 %
- Knowledge of the social sciences 86.8 %
- Knowledge of the sciences 86.4 %
- Critical thinking and analysis 86.3 %
- Verbal communication 85.9 %
- Written communication 82.8 %
- Knowledge of the humanities 81.7 %
- Knowledge of African culture 79.8 %
- Research skills 79.6 %
- Knowledge of global policies & issues 76.7 %
- Preparation for employment in major 72.2 %
- Preparation for a tech world 69.3 %
- Knowledge of mathematics 67.0 %
- Computer applications 62.3 %
- Preparation for grad/professional school 60.5 %

C. Indirect Measures of Student Learning using Standardized Instruments

1. College Student Needs Assessment Survey (CSNAS)

One way to maximize the effectiveness of the University’s response to the personal and academic needs of its incoming freshmen and thereby increase rates of retention and levels of satisfaction with their university experience is to identify their perceived needs. The College Student Needs Assessment Survey (CSNAS), which evaluates the educational and personal needs of college students, was administered initially to the Howard University (HU) 2008 freshman class. The areas of greatest need reported by this class focused on finances for education and opportunities
Table 10.1: Overall Areas of Greatest Need*:
Howard University Students and Normative Sample from Private Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Item: Area of Consideration</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining adequate funds to finance my education</td>
<td>85%*</td>
<td>75%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning more about other sources of financial aid available</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining work experience in career areas of my interest</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging to discuss my career interests with people in my planned career area</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about educational opportunities after graduation</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages include all levels of need (from a little to most)
Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008

Table 10.2: Perceived Student Need for Assistance* in Personal and Academic Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Item: Area of Consideration</th>
<th>HU</th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs in Personal Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding what to do with my life</td>
<td>59%*</td>
<td>71%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying career areas that fit my skills, abilities, and interests</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to handle stress and anxiety in my life</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to solve personal problems</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing my time more effectively</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs in General Academic Support Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining remedial/tutorial assistance</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping with academic difficulties</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my test-taking skills</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my problem-solving abilities and reasoning skills</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and using computers</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to make better use of library facilities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs in General Education Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing skills in mathematics</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing ideas in writing</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my understanding of what I read</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing my reading speed</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving my study skills and habits</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing understanding of art, literature, and culture</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentages represent all levels of need (from least to most).
Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008
for career or job placement (see Supporting Document 10.11). The data in Table 10.1 compare the perceived needs of HU freshmen and a national norm group, while the data in Table 10.2 compare the perceived student need for assistance in personal and academic areas.

A comprehensive CSNAS summary report was submitted to the Office of the Provost for use in institutional planning. Additionally, individual CSNAS reports were prepared for the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Business—the two largest undergraduate schools/colleges—for use in planning programs aimed at providing resources and academic support for students who have particular needs.

### 2. Results of Selected Accrediting Agencies’ Visits

- Division of Architecture and Design (see Supporting Document 10.12)
- School of Law (see Supporting Document 10.13)

#### Student Quality of Life (SQL) Subcommittee

The SQL Subcommittee provides oversight of and coordinates assessment activities related to improvement of student satisfaction and quality of life. The SQL Subcommittee’s work concentrates on activities of the following university departments—Student Life & Activity, Special Student Services, Enrollment Management,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10.3: Students Perceptions of Their Experiences with Student Support Services</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Not Able to Rate</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans Office</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in Dept.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff in Dept.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of President</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Provost</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll Mgt. (Overall)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookstore</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Life and Activities</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Student Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Service</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008*
Intercollegiate Athletics, Residence Life, Career Services, University Counseling Services, Student Health Services, Student Financial Services, and the University Bookstore (see Supporting Document 10.5 for a detailed outline of the structure and responsibilities of the SQL Subcommittee).

**Use of Student Quality of Life (SQL) Assessment Information**

This section presents examples of assessments that were used for accountability or evaluation purposes within student quality of life areas.

1. **2008 HU Self-Study Surveys**

Students rated the perceptions of their experiences with each of the offices in Table 10.3. A greater proportion of student respondents rated their overall experiences with the various offices as favorable. Sizeable proportions of respondents reported no experiences with several offices, among which were those of the President and the Provost.

2. **HU 101: Parent Survey of Selected SQL Units**

The OIAE conducted a paper-based survey of parents who participated in Howard University 101: 2008 New Student Orientation on August 20, 2008. The purpose of the survey was to elicit ratings of the effectiveness of key University offices that parents were likely to encounter during the college selection and admissions processes. Using a 4-point scale, parents rated “the quality of information provided on-line or in written form” and “the responsiveness of University personnel on the phone or in-person.” Survey results were shared with the units in order to facilitate planning, staff development, and improved customer service. The data in Tables 10.4 and 10.5

### Table 10.4: Parent Ratings of “Quality of Information”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HU Office Rated</th>
<th>Quality of Information Written/On-line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accounts</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008*

### Table 10.5: Parent Ratings of “Responsiveness of Personnel”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HU Office Rated</th>
<th>Responsiveness of Personnel Phone/In Person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Accounts</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Life</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Police</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008*
show parental ratings of quality of information and responsiveness of personnel (see Supporting Document 10.14).

The results of these surveys were distributed to the administrators of President Ribeau’s newly created Students First Campaign for initial use in targeting the focus of immediate and projected efforts to improve student support services during phase one of this Campaign.

3. Case Studies

- “Evaluations of Counseling Center Services” (see Supporting Document 10.15).
- “A Review of Operating Procedures to Increase Effectiveness of Student Services” (see Supporting Document 10.16).

University Community Experience (UCE) Subcommittee

The UCE Subcommittee provides oversight and coordination of assessment activities of all units not covered by the CSA or SQL Subcommittees. This Subcommittee utilizes assessment results to improve and gain efficiencies in administrative services and processes. UCE units conducted assessment activities to determine the satisfaction of all members of the Howard community.

Use of University Community Experience Assessment Information

Presented in this section are examples of evaluations used for accountability or evaluation purposes with the primary focus on the University community experience.

1. 2008 HU Self-Study Surveys

- Physical Facilities
  Students, faculty, staff, and senior administrators rated the availability, quality, and adequacy of “physical facilities” at the University for various purposes. The scale ranged from excellent to poor and included “don’t know.” As indicated in Table 10.6, moderately high proportions of students rated the quality of physical facilities available on campus for meetings, seminars, conferences, and workshops as “fair” or “poor”, with similar ratings for the adequacy of physical facilities for learning and the adequacy of physical facilities for conducting state-of-the-art research. Similarly, high pro-

| Table 10.6: Availability, Quality, and Adequacy of “Physical Facilities” at the University |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|
| Quality of physical facilities available on campus for meetings, seminars, conferences, workshops | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | DK |
| Students N=172 | 6% | 35% | 39% | 17% | 3% |
| Faculty N=79 | 5% | 24% | 38% | 32% | 1% |
| Staff N=326 | 4% | 22% | 42% | 27% | 4% |
| Senior Administrators N=65 | 3% | 15% | 46% | 34% | 2% |
| Adequacy of physical facilities for... |
| Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | DK |
| Students N=648 ...learning | 5% | 24% | 33% | 32% | 6% |
| Faculty N=71 ...teaching | 6% | 18% | 34% | 42% | 0% |
| Adequacy of physical facilities for conducting state-of-the-art research (e.g., labs, studios) | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | DK |
| Students N=648 | 8% | 20% | 30% | 34% | 8% |
| Faculty N=1148 | 3% | 11% | 24% | 57% | 4% |
| Senior Administrators N=65 | 2% | 2% | 36% | 33% | 8% |

Note: Percentage may not sum to 100, due to rounding. Source: 2008 HU Self-Study Surveys, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation, 2008
portions of faculty rated the quality of physical facilities available on campus for meetings, seminars, conferences, and workshops as “fair” or “poor”, with similar ratings for the adequacy of physical facilities for teaching and the adequacy of physical facilities for conducting state-of-the-art research.

Students, faculty, staff, and senior administrators rated the quality and adequacy of “technology” at the University for various purposes, using the same response scale employed for the physical facilities assessments. As shown in Table 10.7, students’ opinions were widely divergent on the rating of quality of computer-supported services provided by the University, with slightly more than half rating the quality as “fair” or “poor”. Faculty and senior administrators were highly critical of the quality and adequacy of technology resources at the University.

### 2. 2009 Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional Graduating Students’ Exit Surveys

Table 10.8 indicates that high proportions of 2009 undergraduate graduating students respond favorably to each of the items focused on overall satisfaction with University systems (see Supporting Document 10.10). Similarly, Table 10.9 shows that high proportions of 2009 graduate and professional graduating students respond favorably to each of the items focused on overall satisfaction with University systems (see Supporting Document 10.17).

### Ongoing Institutional Assessment Activities

**Compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act**

Each year Howard provides the U.S. Department of Education with updated performance indicators measuring the University’s ability to meet targets relative to the quality of incoming students’ academic records, student academic achievement (as measured by retention and graduation rates), faculty research, fundraising initiatives, and the University’s teaching hospital. This institutional assessment is in compliance with a directive set forth by the Congress and is transmitted through

---

**Table 10.7: Quality and Adequacy of “Technology” at the University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of computer-supported services by the University</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students N=154</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N=79</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff N=325</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrators N=66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequacy of technology resources provided by the University</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N=150</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff N=326</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrators N=66</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of the condition of computer technology on student learning</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students N=195</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty N=79</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Administrators N=64</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentage may not sum to 100, due to rounding. Source: 2008 HU Self-Study Surveys, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation*
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Table 10.8: Overall Satisfaction with University Systems: Undergraduate Graduating Students

Please indicate your level of overall satisfaction with the following systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANNER Registration System</td>
<td>17.6% (154)</td>
<td>65.6% (573)</td>
<td>11.2% (98)</td>
<td>2.9% (25)</td>
<td>1.3% (11)</td>
<td>1.5% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLab and Campus Computer Laboratories</td>
<td>15.5% (135)</td>
<td>59.5% (519)</td>
<td>18.4% (161)</td>
<td>5.0% (44)</td>
<td>0.5% (4)</td>
<td>1.1% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>13.1% (114)</td>
<td>62.7% (547)</td>
<td>15.7% (137)</td>
<td>4.9% (43)</td>
<td>1.9% (17)</td>
<td>1.7% (15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage may not sum to 100, due to rounding. Graduating students probably experienced a positive change in the functioning of these systems since their freshman year. Source: 2009 HU Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation

Table 10.9: Overall Satisfaction with University Systems: Graduate/Professional Graduating Students

Please indicate your level of overall satisfaction with the following systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BANNER Registration System</td>
<td>16.7% (95)</td>
<td>61.1% (347)</td>
<td>9.0% (51)</td>
<td>4.8% (27)</td>
<td>4.2% (24)</td>
<td>4.2% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iLab and Campus Computer Laboratories</td>
<td>14.6% (83)</td>
<td>53.0% (301)</td>
<td>13.4% (76)</td>
<td>6.3% (36)</td>
<td>5.3% (30)</td>
<td>7.4% (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>16.7% (95)</td>
<td>58.5% (332)</td>
<td>13.0% (74)</td>
<td>6.9% (39)</td>
<td>2.1% (12)</td>
<td>2.8% (16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentage may not sum to 100, due to rounding. Source: 2009 HU Graduate/Professional (GP) Graduating Student Exit Survey, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation

The completion of a report as prescribed in the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993. GPRA requires the University to set targets for performance; measure progress toward those targets; report on whether or not the targets have been met; and describe future strategies for continued progress toward those targets. This process is designed to improve program management as well as to help the Congress, Howard University, the Office of Management and Budget, and others review programs’ progress toward their goals. Data for this initiative are compiled and analyzed by the Office of University Research and Planning in collaboration with the offices of the Provost, Enrollment Management, and Research and Compliance. The Department of Education uses the data to prepare a report to the Congress on the University’s performance pursuant to the GPRA format (see Supporting Document 10.18, p. 9-15). Through the GPRA process and the annual testimony of the University President to the House Appropriations Sub-Committee, the University demonstrates its accountability, effectiveness, and efficiency to Congress.

Cooperative Institution Research Project (CIRP)

Howard University has participated in the Cooperative Institution Research Project (CIRP) for 36 years and plans to continue this method of evaluation. The CIRP sur-
The survey is administered to incoming University freshmen during orientation and registration. The survey covers a wide range of student characteristics such as parental income and education, ethnicity, and other demographic items; financial aid; secondary school achievement and activities; educational and career plans; values, attitudes, beliefs, and self-concept. The results of this survey, which are published annually in “The American Freshman,” provide a comprehensive snapshot of the changing character of entering students at the various participating institutions. Supporting document 10.19 provides the results of the 2008 CIRP.

**National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)**

Howard is among more than 1200 colleges and universities in the U.S. and Canada which have participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Annually, the NSSE obtains information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide regarding student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. In 2009, the University again participated in NSSE for the first time since 2003 as part of its overall institutional assessment and will continue utilizing this method of assessment in the future. Data from the NSSE will not be available until around mid-August 2009. The survey items on this instrument reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired undergraduate educational outcomes. The University is able to use the NSSE survey results to assess and evaluate students’ undergraduate experiences.

**Faculty Survey of Student Engagement**

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) was designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and is coordinated by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. FSSE measures faculty expectations for and observations of student engagement in educational practices that are known to be empirically linked with high levels of learning and development. Additionally, the survey collects information pertaining to how faculty members spend their time on professional activities, including teaching and scholarship, and the types of learning experiences their institutions emphasize. The University participated in FSSE for the first time in 2009 as part of its institutional assessment and will continue to use this method of evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Instrument</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) (survey)</strong></td>
<td>To gather information about expectations of the college experience, secondary school experiences, reasons for attending college, and other issues</td>
<td>Freshman students (Census)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College Students Needs Assessment Survey (CSNAS) (survey)</strong></td>
<td>To assess and evaluate the self-perceived educational and personal needs of college students</td>
<td>Freshman undergraduate students (Census) and a sample of grad/professional students and sophomores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prospective Student and Parent Survey 2008</strong></td>
<td>To identify and rate the importance of factors from a list of those deemed to be likely for consideration in the college selection process</td>
<td>Prospective students and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of General Education Competency: Written Communication</strong></td>
<td>To assess students’ level of proficiency with writing skills development in English 003</td>
<td>Mostly Freshmen (and some sophomores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of General Education Competency: Quantitative Reasoning</strong></td>
<td>To assess students’ level of proficiency with the development of quantitative reasoning in College Algebra I, College Algebra II and Pre-calculus</td>
<td>All students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Comprehensive Examinations (sample)</strong></td>
<td>To assess students’ level of proficiency in their major course of study at or near the point of graduation</td>
<td>Seniors (some juniors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Howard University Undergraduate (UG) Graduating Students’ Exit Survey 2009</strong></td>
<td>To obtain information about students’ undergraduate educational experiences at Howard University and your post-graduation plans</td>
<td>Prospective candidates for graduation in undergraduate programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Howard University Graduate/Prof (GP) Graduating Students’ Exit Survey 2009</strong></td>
<td>To obtain information about students’ educational experiences at Howard University in graduate and professional programs and their post-graduation plans</td>
<td>Prospective candidates for graduation in graduate and professional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Survey of Student Engagement 2009 (NSSE)</strong></td>
<td>To measure student engagement in their academic careers</td>
<td>Freshmen and Seniors (Random sample from each population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Survey of Student Engagement 2009 (FSSE)</strong></td>
<td>The FSSE surveys faculty perceptions of student engagement</td>
<td>Random sample of faculty who teach undergraduate students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Institutional Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When Does Assessment Take Place</th>
<th>Type of Administration</th>
<th>Who Assesses</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Orientation and Fall Semester of first year</td>
<td>Paper-based (centralized)</td>
<td>The Howard University Counseling Center</td>
<td>To build a profile of the expectations and aspirations of the freshman class and establish trend data on incoming students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To provide normative data for comparisons among peer institutions and aspirational peer institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Orientation for incoming student; during the first few weeks of semester for sophomores</td>
<td>Paper-based (centralized)</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (Office of the Provost)</td>
<td>To help university personnel identify, recommend or develop programs and services to address the students’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early September Fall Semester 2008</td>
<td>Paper-based</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (Office of the Provost)</td>
<td>To inform recruitment strategies implemented by the Office of Admissions and university schools and colleges, and for the development of related materials. Administrators and faculty should also use this information for their planning and evaluation purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final examination period: Spring Semester 2009</td>
<td>Paper-based Essay Rubric scored Two raters</td>
<td>English Department</td>
<td>To provide feedback to the English Department about student performance so that changes can be made at the course-level, where necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final examination period: Spring Semester 2009</td>
<td>Paper-based Constructed Response Key scored</td>
<td>Mathematics Department</td>
<td>To provide feedback to the Mathematics Department about student performance so that changes can be made at the course-level, where necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Comprehensive Exams: Fall Semester 2008</td>
<td>Variety of modalities</td>
<td>Departments – Theatre Arts – Classics – English – Biology – Chemistry – Mathematics – Physics &amp; Astronomy – Political Science</td>
<td>-To use for program review and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15-May 15 Spring Semester</td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>To improve programs and services for current and future students at Howard and measure the extent to which Howard is accomplishing its mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15-May 15 Spring Semester</td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td>To improve programs and services for current and future students at Howard and measure the extent to which Howard is accomplishing its mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Options Paper-based Web-based</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (Office of the Provost)</td>
<td>To determine the “value-added” experience of attending Howard University—includes measures of the quality of academic advising, acquisition of knowledge, skills and personal development, amount of reading and writing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (Office of the Provost)</td>
<td>To inform practice and faculty interactions with students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data from *FSSE* will not be available until approximately mid-August 2009. *FSSE* results can be utilized to identify areas of institutional strength and aspects of the undergraduate experience that may warrant attention. The information will be a channel for productive discussions related to teaching, learning, and the quality of students’ educational experiences.

**Summary of Assessment Data Collected by OIAE, AY 2008-2009**

In addition to assessments conducted in the different departments/units, Table 10.10 presents a description of institutional assessments conducted during AY 2008-2009.

**Challenges in Institutional Assessment at the University**

**Development and Maintenance of a Culture of Evidence**

**Challenge:** To produce across the breadth of the University community enhanced knowledge, skills, sensitivities, expectations, and values related to the collection and use of empirical evidence for institutional improvement and accountability. Individuals representing all constituent groups should be clear about what assessment is, why we assess and evaluate, their own assessment responsibilities, and how to use results.

**Potential Solution:** Use all possible avenues to provide all University constituencies more assessment information that promotes professional growth and develops assessing/evaluative habits of thought and behavior. These avenues will include utilization of local and campus media (television, radio, newspapers, Web sites, etc.), other publications, personal presentations and academic interactions. OIAE will collaboratively set and inform the community on the University’s assessment agenda and related schedules and encourage, promote and reward participation in assessment activities. University-wide assessment committees and “Assessment Fellows” positions will be established.
Managing and Coordinating Assessment Activities with Other Units

Challenge: Many assessment and evaluation activities (e.g., surveys, focus groups) are conducted individually by units (e.g., administrative and student services units) across the University. These activities (e.g., surveys) often overlap, are redundant, and occur at conflicting times. These conditions negatively affect response rates and create “silos” or isolated pockets of limited data that are neither effectively nor efficiently utilized at institutional or other levels.

Potential Solution: Share OIAE Strategic Plan and master schedule of assessment activities with all schools, colleges, and units, and, in turn, have all University units share their schedules of assessment/evaluation activities, instrumentation, and procedures with OIAE. OIAE will collaborate with its subcommittees to align and streamline instruments and procedures, and coordinate assessment activities, in order to eliminate redundancy, misalignment (e.g., with the mission, unit goals, and objectives), and counterproductive scheduling conflicts. Achieving this will require educating many stakeholders university-wide on these considerations, and adopting related policy changes.

Response Rates

Challenge: Obtaining high response rates in voluntary surveys is recognized widely as a pervasive and perennial problem. OIAE is challenged to change the culture around assessment, such that stakeholders (i.e., administrators, faculty, staff, and students) increasingly will willingly and reliably participate in assessment activities such as completing surveys, and expect to do so periodically.

Potential Solution: Consistent, clear and prominent communications that explain the value/importance of assessment and related expectations should be generated by the President and the Provost and Chief Academic Officer. Strong top-down endorsements should translate into greater stakeholder buy-in and stimulate the generation of more effective strategies and garner support. Additional resources should be provided to publicize assessment data collection efforts more extensively with these resources being sufficient to test the effects of certain incentives on participation. Further, regular, coordinated, and well-conceived assessment activity schedules that are less burdensome to subjects should be developed, thereby leading the University community to expect the periodic occurrence of assessment-related activities/events.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

Assessing the effective functioning of the University is a top priority. Much progress has been made, including establishment of the organizational assessment infrastructure, development of an assessment strategic plan, and increasingly, the use of assessment findings for institutional decision-making. Since 2001, Howard has developed and worked towards implementing an institution-wide program utilizing assessment for planning and decision-making. The program involved design of an underlying infrastructure, establishment of an effective leadership team, advancement of the University assessment culture, and development of processes for reporting and using information gathered for strategic planning. The College/School Assessment (CSAC), Student Quality of Life (SQL), and University Community Experience (UCE) Subcommittees were created. In 2008, building on this structure, the University established the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation.

In addition, there has been a fundamental shift in the focus of Howard’s assessments of educational, co-curricular, and student services. The shift has been from primary emphasis on “input” measures (e.g., student qualifications, services, activities) to “outcome” measures designed to assess impact (e.g., student learning). The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from review of the university’s status relative to this Standard:

Findings

1. There is not a clear division of responsibility for assessment between the Office of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness (OIAE) and the Office for University Research and Planning.
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2. The appropriateness and effectiveness of Assessment Committee and College/School Assessment (CSAC), Student Quality of Life (SQL) and University Community Experience (UCE) subcommittees should be assessed periodically.

3. There is insufficient access to and transparency of institutional data in a number of areas at the University that could enhance the effectiveness of academic and administrative decision-making.

4. Howard University has developed and is implementing an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards; however, there is room for improvement as the following recommendations suggests.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Consider an option of organizational restructuring that would consolidate the functions of the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) with those of the Office for University Research and Planning into one office that is an autonomous direct report to the President, which would receive, maintain, and secure assessment data from all academic and institutional offices, including the Cabinet, Office of the President and the Board of Trustees.

2. Invigorate the College/School Assessment (CSAC), Student Quality of Life (SQL), and University Community Experience (UCE) subcommittees in order to accelerate the full implementation of the assessment visions and plans of the University, and as resources permit, establish and incorporate Assessment Fellows campus-wide.

3. Provide adequate resources for a more aggressive execution of the assessment agenda.

4. Authorize access to university assessment data by appropriate University stakeholders; revisit/update policies and procedures related to data management (including storing/maintaining, securing, and sharing information).
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The Howard Experience
Student Admissions and Retention
MSCHE Standard 8
The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the student’s educational goals.

Introduction
This section of the Self-Study examines and assesses issues related to undergraduate, graduate, and professional student recruitment and admission, student retention, and graduation rates and recent changes in the University’s enrollment function. The goal of this section is to assess whether the University is recruiting, admitting, retaining, and graduating students whose interests, goals, and academic skills are aligned with its mission.

Recruitment Effort

Undergraduate
The Office of Enrollment Management provides leadership for University undergraduate recruitment efforts, with a particular emphasis on first-time-in-college undergraduate students. Recruitment officers, admissions representatives, and alumni from schools/colleges pursue these efforts through participation in college and community fairs, and visits to high schools and community colleges. For the period 2003-2008, more than 186 college fairs, 31 community college and 250 high school visits were conducted (see Supporting Document 11.1). The Office of Admissions hosts more than 10,000 visitors annually for information sessions and campus tours. In addition, the Office of Admissions has launched several special initiatives which include:
- Recruitment sessions in cities around the country in conjunction with the Campaign for Howard
- “Virtual tours” accessed on-line
- Specialized recruitment events, including luncheons and overnight or weekend events
- Targeted recruitment for high achievers and African-American males
- Open House for prospective and admitted students
- High school and community college luncheon and information sessions
- Direct mail campaigns

The on-line application process, staff realignment, and other technological modifications have expedited the application process. Additionally, increased communication with prospective students has become a priority and includes earlier notifications and creation of the electronic information request program, Ask Admissions.

Over the past seven years, the University has increased its competitiveness as demonstrated by more undergraduate students applying to the University; fewer undergraduate students offered admission; and the increased percentage of admitted undergraduate students who enrolled (see Supporting Document 11.1).

Graduate and Professional
The Graduate and Professional schools also participate in aggressive recruitment efforts. In addition to a presence at relevant national conferences and recruitment fairs, the Graduate School is engaged in recruitment efforts targeted at high-achieving undergraduate students who are interested in research and graduate study. The Graduate School sponsors the Ronald E. McNair Post Baccalaureate Achievement program—for new and continuing first generation, low-income, college students pursuing a Ph.D.; the Alliance for Graduate Education (AGEP) in the Professorate—for Social and Behavioral Economic Sciences (SBES) and the Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) program, to mention a few.

The Professional Schools also recruit at college fairs, college classroom settings, panel discussions, and health fairs. Students
interested in the Colleges of Medicine and Dentistry must apply through the respective professional organization clearinghouse and selected students may be invited to interview.

Recent Changes in Enrollment Management

As depicted in Figure 11.1, Howard’s student enrollment has remained stable. Over the past ten years, total headcount enrollment has grown slightly (2.2 percent), to 11,227 in academic year 2007-2008. Enrollment has decreased slightly in the past three years but the University is following this issue assiduously.

Over this ten-year period, enrollment in the four main professional programs (Dentistry, Law, Medicine and Pharmacy) has remained essentially stable. This is as planned, as the Colleges of Dentistry and Medicine, and School of Law have agreed to remain at capacity. The four professional programs enrolled 1,574 students in Academic Year 2008-2009.

Enrollment in Howard’s graduate and other professional programs has decreased by 10.7%, or 261 students, over the past ten years, to a total of 2,173 as shown in Figure 11.2, contrary to the strategic goal of increasing enrollment by 700 students. Figure 11.3 shows that undergraduate enrollment remains strong, having increased by 6.9% during the period 1999-2008, to a total headcount of 7,480 in academic year 2008-2009.

Howard received 9,750 applications for its Fall 2008 undergraduate programs (Figure 11.4). The overall application trend enabled the University to become more selective, increasing and then stabilizing in achieving the targeted freshman class size. For Fall 2008, 49% of applicants were offered admission to Howard, in comparison to 68% for Fall 2001. Yield rates remain stable, at approximately 32%.
Consistent with its mission, the credentials of incoming undergraduate students remain strong as depicted in Figure 11.5. The University achieved its target of an average entering freshman SATC score of 1080 in 2002, although it fell just slightly short of the target in the past two years, which may be attributed to the change in SAT format.

Retention and Graduation Rates

Undergraduate Retention and Graduation

Student retention and graduation rates are critical measures for the University. Howard continues to have concern about its undergraduate retention and graduation rates. As a result, an important strategic student matriculation goal is to increase the rate at which undergraduate students graduate. Table 11.1 presents the retention and graduation rates for all undergraduate schools/colleges from 1996 to 2008. The four-year graduation rate has increased since 1996 moving from 30.8% in 1992 to 47.2% in 2004.

Howard’s retention rate was benchmarked against those of the peer institutions (Figure 11.6) selected for this study, using data reported to US News & World Report. Relative to its national peers, Howard’s freshmen retention rate was better than that obtained by only three of the seven comparison institutions; acceptable but signaling the need for improvement. Howard’s freshman retention rate is certainly respectable relative to its local peers, but as shown in Figure 11.7, it is the lowest, again a stimulus for more effort and improvement.

![Howard University Undergraduate Enrollment, AY 1998-2008](image1)

*Figure 11.3: Undergraduate Enrollment, AY 1998-2008*

*Source: Howard University Office of Enrollment Management*

![Howard University Applications for Admission and Matriculation, AY 2002-2008](image2)

*Figure 11.4: Application for Undergraduate Admission and Matriculation, AY 2002-2008*

*Source: Howard University Office of Enrollment Management*
Table 11.1: Retention and Graduation Rates for Undergraduate School/Colleges: Cohort Years 1996-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Head Count</th>
<th>% Cont’d to 2nd Yr</th>
<th>% Cont’d to 3rd Yr</th>
<th>% Cont’d to 4th Yr</th>
<th>% Cont’d to 5th Yr</th>
<th>% Graduated in 4 Yrs</th>
<th>% Graduated in 5 Yrs</th>
<th>% Graduated in 6 Yrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>74.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,453</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N/A refers to not applicable as of March 2009; Source: Howard University Office of Enrollment Management
Graduate and Professional Student Retention and Graduation

A number of initiatives are underway to increase retention and reduce doctoral attrition in the Science and Engineering fields, as well as to provide a supportive and supplementary role in the training of undergraduate and graduate students. These initiatives include the Graduate School’s Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professorate (AGEP); the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participants; the Howard University Science, Engineering and Mathematics Program (HUSEM); the Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Program; and the Frederick Douglass Scholars Fellowship Program. The Graduate School’s Retention, Mentoring and Support Program was established in 1999 to reduce attrition, reduce time to degree, provide opportunities for fellowships and internships, and enhance career and professional development.

Howard is among 21 university research partners engaged in the Council of Graduate Schools’ Ph.D. Completion Project. This three-year study creates and evaluates intervention strategies to enhance doctoral completion.

At Howard, eight departments are identified as program partners: Biology, Chemistry, Communication and Culture, Communication Science and Disorders, Electrical Engineering, History, Mathematics, and Physics. Soon, Mechanical Engineering and the interdisciplinary programs in Atmospheric Science and Materials Science will become partners. Project activities include seminars and workshops specifically designed for Ph.D. students, and strategies implemented by faculty to increase retention and reduce attrition rates for students at the beginning, middle, and end of completing their degrees.

The University has witnessed some positive results in graduate student matriculation. During the three-year period from 2005-2007, the mean time-to-degree for completion of the Ph.D. decreased from 7.8 years (in 2005) to 5.5 years (in 2007) as shown in Figure 11.8. In 2008 and 2009, it took 5.7 and 6.3 years, respectively, for students to complete their doctoral degrees.

As shown in Figure 11.9, the highest percentage of doctoral graduates in each cohort year was in the fifth year across all disciplines. Among masters’ degree recipients, the highest percentage receiving the degree was two years across all fields of study as depicted in Figure 11.10.
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Cost of College

The cost of attendance is a critical factor in admissions at any university. Howard’s tuition strategy traditionally was close to that of public institutions (Figure 11.11). During the past ten years, Howard engaged in substantive planning around its tuition pricing and aid leveraging strategies through its Tuition and Rate Advisory Committee (TRAC). The arrival of President Ribeau in August 2008 heralded a more aggressive tuition strategy, consistent with his vision and which was reflected in the multi-year tuition strategy approved by the Trustees in January 2009.

Strategic discussions occurred over the past several years about whether Howard should change pricing strategies, charging higher tuition, but also increasing financial aid. Over the past five years, the University increased its tuition rates to levels more consistent with national averages. In 2007-2008, as reflected in Figure 11.11, Howard’s average tuition increase was 8.0%, while the average increases at the other categories of institutions were as follows: private 4-year (6.3%), public 4-year out of state (5.5%), and public 4-year in state (5.5%). Howard’s increase occurred in large part because the University’s Federal appropriation had remained flat, and additional tuition revenue was needed to sustain current programs. During this period, student aid budgets increased commensurately, with the result that the tuition discount rate (the percentage of gross tuition revenue the University gives back in the form of student aid) remained stable at 26–28%.

Earlier this decade, Howard increased its tuition discount rate by increasing merit-based aid for undergraduate students in response to increased competition from other institutions for highly credentialed Black students. University-funded student aid is largely merit based.

Data for total financial aid disbursed to students raise interesting strategic questions. During AY 2007-2008, the Financial Aid Office reported a total of $201.8 million in student aid disbursed (Table 11.2). During that year, the University’s gross revenue from tuition and fees was only $163 million.

Planning and Assessment

Strategic Enrollment Plan

The University has made important steps in developing a strategic approach to enrollment management. In 2002, a five-year enrollment plan was developed to provide a systematic evaluation of current enrollment trends, and design strategies to achieve enrollment goals within each school and college.

The enrollment projections for the schools and colleges within the plan are tied to the University’s Strategic Framework for Action II, which articulated the goal of increasing total enrollment to 12,000 students within five years, including a 1,400 FTIC student ceiling, with a ratio of 40% undergraduate to 60% graduate.

Table 11.2: Total Student Aid Disbursed, by Type, Academic Year 2007-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Aid</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>$52,353,959</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>138,402,473</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Remission</td>
<td>8,617,220</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Funded Assistance</td>
<td>346,909</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2,045,883</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$201,766,444</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Howard University Office of Financial Analysis and Budget
and professional students. Additionally, over the five-year planning horizon, the University would increase student aid, particularly for graduate students; achieve improvements in academic programs and administrative efficiency; increase faculty research grant and instructional productivity; and improve facilities and technological resources.

A review of current plans revealed that each school and college incorporates student enrollment and retention into its planning. Interviews with individual Deans confirmed that they are concerned about success in student retention and incorporate retention data into their efforts to identify the factors that promote or hinder student success.

The University did not achieve the planned change in its enrollment makeup, a population where graduate and professional
students comprised 40% of the student body. In fact, the percentage of graduate and professional students declined over the past 10 years, from 36 to 33% in AY 2009.

The expected restructuring of University programs and reallocation of budget funds to new priorities did not occur. In the absence of restructured University programs, available financial aid was not reallocated from undergraduate to graduate and professional students. The University was, however, able to identify limited additional budget funds ($1.5 million), beginning in FY 2008, to increase the number and level of graduate assistantships. Stipends remain below market. Existing resources were not reallocated to support research and graduate education, and no significant new resources were generated. The expected increase in externally-funded research did not materialize, so there were fewer than expected new research projects to engage and support additional graduate students. Howard’s major funder, the Federal government, is also experiencing fiscal constraints and has not appropriated additional funding for
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*Source: Howard University Office of Enrollment Management*
major capital projects; in particular, funding for the planned Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Center. The Campaign for Howard, while very successful, did not raise significant “bricks and mortar” gifts for improvements in facilities and technology, especially critical to graduate education and research. The Campaign raised additional funding for student support, but not at a transformative level. Ninety percent of university-funded student aid awarded is from unrestricted sources. In summary, these were the environmental factors that mitigated against the changed student body composition envisioned under SFA II.

Assessment of Admissions Measures and Enrollment Data

Howard utilizes an on-line application process for admission. The 2008 Self-Study survey revealed that overall, students felt that the following aspects of the application process were good or excellent: prompt responses to requests for information and materials (34%); prompt processing of applications for admission (45%); and the willingness of Howard staff to answer questions (36%) (see Supporting Document 11.2).

The student application process involves an interface with a number of departments within the Office of Enrollment Management; namely, Admissions, Recruitment, Records, and Student Financial Services. Together, these offices are the first line of communication with incoming students. Staff evaluations of the effectiveness of these offices were also captured in the Self-Study survey, the results of which are listed in Table 11.3.

An ongoing challenge has been the proportion of female-to-male undergraduate student enrollment, as is found in many other colleges and universities. This widening gap gave rise to a strategic initiative aimed at recruiting and retaining more African-American male students to the University. Dr. Leslie Fenwick (Dean, School of Education) was charged with developing an urban education and leadership development concept, which includes an African-American male achievement component. The goal of the African-American Male Initiative is to increase the number of first-time-in-college African-American male students in Howard’s undergraduate programs.

Communication with Prospective Students: Web Site Analysis

A leading consulting firm in higher education enrollment management was commissioned in 2008 to examine how effectively Howard communicates with its potential students and provides the information needed to make an informed enrollment decision. The results confirmed the importance of the Web site as a communications tool. Prospective students are clearly interested in using the Web as a research tool to assist them in making their enrollment decisions and work through the admissions process. Fewer than 3% of undergraduate prospects and only 1% of graduate prospects surveyed indicated that the Internet plays “little or no role” for them in their decision-making process. The Web Opportunities Analysis for Howard University Report contains a substantive discussion of the results of the study, and recommendations for how the Web site can better serve Howard’s student recruitment efforts (see Supporting Document 11.3). Other conclusions of note include the following:

- Howard can increase market share among competitors if it enhances the quality of the experience delivered to prospective students through its Web site.
- For prospective undergraduate students, the largest gaps between their priorities and expectations and their experience with Howard’s Web site came in the form of navigation and search, and in their ability to connect or communicate with individuals through the Web site.
- Resources spent to create a financial aid/scholarship calculator and blogging program could pay strong dividends, and are relatively easy to implement.

Graduate students are less satisfied with Howard’s Web site than are undergraduate students. The quality of content on a college or University site is of highest importance to graduate students, followed by ease of navigation. Howard could improve service to graduate students by improving content quality and navigation (including search features), and by building more interactive resources for students to complete transactions and make direct connections with faculty, admissions staff, and current students.
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Table 11.3: Staff Evaluations of Offices of Enrollment Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>No Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008 Self-Study Surveys, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

Demand for a Howard education remains strong, particularly at the undergraduate level. However, the need to attract and retain talented students in an increasingly competitive and financially constrained environment will require continued attention. Over the past seven years, the University has increased its competitiveness in recruiting first-time-in-college undergraduate students, and strengthened the effort in recruiting graduate and professional students. At the undergraduate level, more students have applied to the University, the number of students offered admission has decreased, and the percentage of students who enrolled has increased. Among peer institutions, Howard maintains a good retention rate for undergraduate students.

In addition, Howard’s effort to increase its reputation as a research university over the past 10 years has necessarily focused on growing Ph.D. programs. This effort has been very successful. For example, the number of Ph.D.s awarded annually has increased almost 35% since 1999—from approximately 75 per year to approximately 100 per year. In May of 2009, the University awarded 97 Ph.D. degrees. In 2008, the University graduated its largest Ph.D. class ever – 101 students.

The University must address tuition rates and student financial aid, communication with and outreach to potential students, and the quality of student advisement and mentoring. Additionally, the nature of the student body, specifically, the gender imbalance and the mix of graduate to undergraduate students, remain areas that require attention. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 8:

Findings

1. The University has not achieved its strategic goal of adjusting its student enrollment mix to 60% undergraduate and 40% graduate/professional students.
2. The University needs to increase funding that is available for need-based financial aid.
3. The University should continue to review its admissions index across schools and colleges to assure alignment with its mission.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Develop an explicit University-wide strategy, with supporting budgetary and infrastructure priorities, to achieve the desired undergraduate to graduate/professional student mix.
2. Develop, implement, and assess a more structured approach to student retention through enhanced monitoring of the quality of the student experience across all schools and colleges.
3. Enhance access to a Howard education by increasing need-based student aid.
4. Focus on continuous evaluation and improvement of Howard’s Web site, acknowledging its primacy as an information source for prospective and continuing students.

Supporting Documents

11.1 Summary of First-Time-in-College Undergraduate Recruitment and Enrollment Activities (February 2008)
11.2 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
11.3 The Web Opportunities Analysis for Howard University Report
Introduction

Within the scope of its mission, the University provides a continuum of preventive, developmental, remedial, and support services and activities designed to increase the probability that each student will achieve academic success and personal development. These activities include residential, recreational, academic, health care (including mental health care), spiritual, and social support services.

Academic Support

Academic Advisement

Academic advisement is a key element to the progress and success of each student. Howard University is fully committed to the belief that fundamental to successful academic advisement is an ongoing one-to-one advisor-advisee relationship, where the student actively participates in the decision-making process.

All newly enrolled students at Howard are assigned a faculty or staff academic advisor and are encouraged to schedule appointments to discuss their matriculation. Prior to or during the general registration period, some schools/colleges require students to report to their advisors for guidance in course selection and to receive an alternate “PIN” to register for courses. Generally, students are provided assistance in becoming familiar with academic policies, procedures, and program requirements. Although advisors are available to assist and guide students, the student has ultimate responsibility for reaching his/her educational goals.

To supplement the faculty advisement process, academic, and other counseling are provided in each of the schools/colleges by Assistant and/or Associate Deans for Academic or Student Affairs.

At the undergraduate level, the University also maintains two Educational Advisory Centers, one located in the College of Arts and Sciences, the other in the John H. Johnson School of Communications, which are staffed by professionals who provide counseling and advisory assistance to students in these areas.

There is anecdotal evidence that the student advisement process does not always meet student expectations. In the Self-Study student focus group, students recalled instances when miscommunication between the advisor and advisee resulted in the postponement of graduation. Additionally, some students reported that communication between the academic counselors and departmental advisors was sometimes inefficient and inconsistent.

Center for Academic Reinforcement

The Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR) is an academic support unit that provides a variety of services to Howard students. Freshmen receive assistance to bridge the gap between high school and college, reinforce basic skills (Chapter 16), and enhance performance. Continuing students participate in CAR’s auxiliary programs such as tutoring, assessment, and workshops on special topics. Additionally, students utilize the CAR’s instructional program which includes courses in basic mathematics, study skills (Chapter 16), and reading improvement.

Student Academic Computing

The Office of Academic Computing Services provides University-wide computing facilities, consulting support, and training services on the use of information technologies for students and faculty (see Supporting Document 12.1). The central computer facility, which includes an...
academic computing help desk, is located at the iLab (Information Lab). There are also 11 ResNet (Residential Network) computer labs located in University residence halls. All matriculated students are assigned account numbers to access computer resources. Additional information regarding technology is in Chapter 6—Institutional Resources.

Libraries

The University Libraries System consists of a central library complex, which includes the Founders Library, the contiguous Undergraduate Library building, and branch units in the Schools of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science, Business, Divinity, and Social Work. Other campus information and resource facilities include the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library, the Law Library, the Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, the Afro-American Studies Resource Center, and the International Affairs Center Reading Room. The Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library is a world-class research facility for students and health professionals in Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences, and staff of the Howard University Hospital. Located on the West Campus, the Law Library is a state-of-the-art facility supporting legal research and instruction in the Law School on the West Campus.

The mission of the University Libraries is to provide innovative, effective information services and products that support, strengthen, and advance teaching/learning and research in the University community. The library system has comprehensive resources incorporating virtually every discipline, supported by information specialists and technical personnel. Holdings include more than 2 million volumes, more than 12,000 current serial titles, 3.4 million microforms, and a multimedia collection.

The libraries’ collections of traditional materials are complemented by a strong and continually updated digital component. On-line Web-based catalogs provide quick access to library holdings. The Web site is a virtual library of local and global networked resources, with full-text journal articles, bibliographic databases, reference books, e-reserves, data files and multimedia accessible 24/7 from the library, dormitory, office, and home. Onsite electronic facilities include a fiber infrastructure, more than 150 fully networked workstations, laser printers, and a 22-desktop digital learning classroom.

The University is a member of the Association of Research Libraries, the Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance (CIRLA), as well as a number of regional and national organizations. The library has effectively increased access to materials through its membership in CIRLA, which offers faculty and graduate students direct reciprocal borrowing privileges at CIRLA’s academic members libraries—George Washington, Georgetown, University of Maryland, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Delaware.

The University library system has significantly advanced its technological capacity. Founders Library, the center of the system, has implemented electronic reserves and expanded access to online databases. However, the continued development of
resources remains a major challenge. Staffing and funding needs hinder its ability to operate effectively. The Law library manages its own digital resources, whereas the Health Sciences Library digital resources are integrated with those of the general library. Despite improvement in resources, Howard lags behind its peers. For instance, although two new state-of-the-art libraries have been built, Howard still lags behind its peers in its expenditures (see Figure 12.1).

The Office of University Research and Planning compiled data from 1994-2005 from the Association of Research Libraries (Library Investment Index, 108-114 members) to compare the rank of the Howard University Library System with that of Howard’s congressionally-designated peers (Georgetown, Maryland, Vanderbilt, and the University of Virginia). The ranking is based on five factors: Volumes in the Library, Volumes Added, Current Serials, Permanent Staff, and Total Expenditures. The findings indicate that Howard’s holdings, professional staff, and total expenditures are in critical need of increased investment for effective student learning and faculty research.

**Main Library Group Strategic Planning & Assessment Program**

**Strategic Planning**

The Main Library Group has in place a strategic plan (see Supporting Document 12.2) and an assessment plan (see Supporting Document 12.3). In addition, a University-wide Library Advisory Committee, appointed by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, on which the four library directors sit as ex-officio members, has analyzed all aspects of operations and developed a set of six strategic goals for University consideration, which together would bring the libraries up to the standards of a Research I institution. This committee was comprised primarily of faculty, but also included administrators and student representatives.

**Library Assessment Initiatives**

The Main Library Group has a two-prong approach to outcomes assessment: (1) an annual user Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS) and (2) an assessment of student learning outcomes for its library instruction activities.

---

**Figure 12.1: Library Expenditures at Howard Peer University Research Libraries, 2006-2007**

Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 29, 2008, Volume LV, Number 1
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Customer Satisfaction Survey and The Information Literacy Tutorial

The CSS is an annual exercise conducted by eight units of Howard University Libraries—namely, Architecture, Business, Divinity, Founders, Media Center, Pollock Theatre Collection, Social Work, and the Undergraduate Library. (In addition to the Library’s annual Spring User Satisfaction Survey, the Social Work Library was assessed by the May 2008 School of Social Work graduating MSW students in an exit survey). CSS results showed general satisfaction with the resources, services and facilities of the library. Ninety percent found the collection adequate, 98.8% found the staff of the library knowledgeable and helpful most of the time. There were some areas of dissatisfaction and those are being addressed to improve services.

The overall number of students participating in library instruction classes decreased by 8.9%, while there was a marginal increase in the number of students seeking individual consultation. Class instruction with faculty support and collaboration is the method found to be most effective in teaching information literacy. A pre- and post-test typically is used to assess what is learned by participants in classes offered by library professionals.

Student Learning Outcomes (Recent Reports)

During the 2006-2007 academic year, 707 students completed quizzes in all three modules of The Information Literacy Tutorial (TILT). The mean scores for each of the quizzes were above 91%. The majority of the students were in English 002 and English 003; however, TILT was also used in the courses Communications Orientation (COMC 101) and MCMC 590.

The library’s freshmen challenge page contains information about the information cycle, the information explosion, and library resources, plus quizzes to test comprehension and recall. Students in the Communications Orientation class and a few other classes completed the mandatory quiz and one or more optional quizzes for extra credit.

In 2007-2008, connectivity issues plagued assessment efforts during the first semester and server glitches played havoc with the ability to obtain sufficient cases and reliable results for TILT scores. During the year, 868 students registered for the Information Literacy Test. The students in COMC 101 were encouraged to complete a battery of library quizzes. Overall, assessment of information literacy was a challenge, given the absence of an assessment tool that is an integral part of faculty student learning outcomes assessment. Therefore, the capacity to assess whether students were able to navigate, critically evaluate and communicate information following library instruction is limited. A solution is to incorporate, in collaboration with faculty, information literacy assessment as an integral part of required courses. The Library submitted a proposal that, if implemented, would facilitate the assessment of the degree to which reference and information literacy skills are reflected in student’s research papers and assignments (see Supporting Document 12.4).

The results of the annual Customer Satisfaction Survey and the library initiatives in assessing improvements in student information skills as a result of library instruction formed the basis for several strategic goal recommendations contained in the Provost’s December 2008 Library System Advisory Committee’s Report (see Supporting Document 12.5).
Housing and Dining Services

Housing

The University operates 10 residence halls, which house approximately 4,000 students. Students have a choice of their preferred housing based on availability. Housing patterns over the past four academic years have shown an increased need for additional housing. The population is comprised primarily of female residents. Since 2002, the percentage of students who attained a 3.0 GPA or better while residing in University housing has increased from 50.4% to 53.3%. Some residence halls offer special-category floors, such as an honors floor and graduate and professional floor. Beyond university housing, the Office of Residence Life maintains a listing of off-campus rental properties with the various amenities and contact information on their Web sites.

According to the 2008 Self-Study Survey, 37% of Howard students judged the on-campus residential services as “fair,” while 20% indicated that they were “good” to excellent as shown in Figure 12.2. Further, students reported that some dormitories (e.g., Tubman Quadrangle, Drew Hall) needed renovations. In addition to renovations, students indicated that more residence halls should be constructed. Physical Facilities Maintenance has identified and scheduled needed dormitory renovations in their Deferred Maintenance Projects (see Chapter 6—Institutional Resources for more details on the Deferred Maintenance Plan).

Dining Services

The University provides dining services to students through a contract process. All students are eligible to participate in the dining services provided at the University. However, students living in 4 of the 10 residence halls (Bethune Annex, Cook Hall, Drew Hall, and Tubman Quadrangle) are required to purchase a meal plan. There are four types of meal plans offered to students, namely:

1. Traditional 19 is designated for residents and provides the maximum number of meals (19) served during the week.
2. Traditional 14 is designated for the resident student who will leave the campus occasionally. This plan allows any 14 meals provided during the week.
3. On The Go 10 is designed for the resident student who will frequently be off campus. This plan provides any 10 meals served during the week.
4. On The Go 5 is designed for the off-campus student and provides any 5 meals per week, Monday through Friday.

In addition to the meal plans, all students can purchase “dining dollars,” which is a declining debit account that allows students cash-free and tax-free access to all of the dining facilities, thereby providing added security and a savings of 10% with every meal.

---

Figure 12.2: Quality of On-Campus Residential Facilities

Source: 2008 Self-Study Survey

*The calculation of the mean and the std. deviation does not include the category of "Don't Know" (which is assigned no weight).
purchase. Students on the mandatory meal plan can purchase both “dining dollars” and their mandatory meal plan. The minimum buy-in for “dining dollars” is $100 per semester. Unused “dining dollars” at the end of the semester are forfeited. The dining services are evaluated through a voluntary customer satisfaction form which is available daily. Results from the customer satisfaction forms are used to improve services in the dining areas.

### University Safety and Security

The safety and security of students, faculty, and staff are top the priorities at Howard. As an urban campus, the University is vulnerable to the crime patterns that plague large metropolitan areas and the Administration is aggressively addressing this issue. In light of various tragedies, which have occurred in recent years on American college campuses and in an effort to consistently improve emergency response procedures, Howard implemented an Emergency Response Plan in conjunction with the District of Columbia’s Response Plan in January 2008. This plan was tested in September 2008, during Tropical Storm Hanna by the opening of the Emergency Operations Center that effectively managed an emergency team and coordinated with key internal stakeholders, city officials, and emergency officials at local universities.

In addition, a University-wide emergency notification system (AlertHU) was implemented in 2006. This system allows the University to send time-sensitive notifications via voice, e-mail, and text messaging during an emergency on or near campus. Students are encouraged to register via the Bison web at www.howard.edu/bisonweb in order to receive emergency notifications. Emergency notifications are limited to severe weather alerts, emergency building concerns, intruders or potential epidemics.

In January 2008, an external security consultant firm commenced a comprehensive safety and security assessment of the University’s multiple campus locations, which identified several areas for improvement. As a result of the external evaluation, an integrated state-of-the-art ADA compliant emergency call station system was installed.

The University regularly posts Safety Alerts and Tips to inform the University community via HU Communications e-mail alerts. University Police Chief, Leroy James developed a strategic plan for campus police, which includes prevention and reduction in university-wide crime, the professionalization of the workforce, the incorporation of technology into security operations and implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 Security Assessment.

Student responses to the 2008 Self-Study survey also indicated some concerns about campus security. Thirty-eight percent of students rated the Campus Police/Security Services as “fair” and 31% rated them as “poor”. A specific concern raised was the response time of campus police in crisis situations. Howard University Campus Police have taken a proactive approach to addressing this and other concerns (see Supporting Document 12.6).

### Student Services

#### Student Financial Services

The Offices of Financial Aid, Scholarships, and Student Employment and Student Accounts, Collections, Student Loans, and Financial Accounting, under the auspice of the Office of Student Financial Services, are responsible for all aspects of student financial support. Financial aid at Howard refers to scholarships, loans, grants, and part-time employment from Federal, university, and private sources. To support their education, many Howard students depend on Federal monies, primarily through the U.S. Department of Education Student Financial Assistance (SFA) programs such as Federal Pell Grants, Stafford Loans, Perkins Loans, PLUS loans, Consolidation Loans, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, and Federal Work Study initiatives. To make the application process easier, the University utilizes the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form.

Emergency loans are also available to assist students with financial hardships. The University administers short-term low interest loan funds, from which students may borrow if they experience temporary
cash flow problems related to emergency educational expenses such as rent, food, and books. Students are usually approved for amounts up to $800, depending on the availability of funds and loan repayment provisions.

As indicated in Table 12.1, results for the Self-Study Student Survey items regarding financial assistance revealed that 25% of the sampled students rated the University’s financial assistance as “good” (25%) and “poor” (31%).

Participants in the student focus group reported there had been noticeable improvement in services in the Administration Building over AY 2007-2008. Nevertheless, students stated that the most common complaint regarding the Financial Aid Department was poor customer service. Students commented on very long wait times and noted their accounts sometimes are not credited in a timely manner, even when payments are on-line bank transfers.

In recognition of the pervasive challenges in customer service that preceded his tenure, President Ribeau launched the Students First Campaign (SFC) in January 2009, administered by the Office of the Provost. This initiative “is designed to improve all dimensions of the Howard University student experience from recruitment through graduation. The major goals of the SFC are to (1) initiate immediate University-wide improvements in the delivery of student services, (2) generate and sustain an environment of continuous quality improvement, and (3) enhance customer service across the academy to students, faculty and staff” (see Supporting Document 12.10).

### University Student Health Center

After more than three decades in a temporary facility, the University Student Health Center was relocated in 2003 to a permanent home in the Medical Arts Building near the University Hospital. The Student Health Center occupies two floors for a total of 7,700 square feet and was designed based on feedback from staff and students. The Center provides full- and part-time students with access to care for acute sickness and injuries, chronic disease management, specialty referrals, health promotion, and disease prevention education.

### Howard University Hospital (HUH)

Howard University Hospital (HUH) was established in 1862 as Freedmen’s Hospital and was incorporated into Howard University by Congress in 1962. As a private, nonprofit institution, HUH is the nation’s only teaching hospital located on the campus of a Historically Black University. The hospital is a Level 1 Trauma Center and has become one of the most comprehensive health care facilities in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.

Today, HUH serves as a major acute and ambulatory care center for the inner city of Washington, DC, receiving over 13,000 admissions and 47,000 emergency room visits annually. During the non-operational hours of the University’s Student Health Center and in cases of emergency, students are advised to seek medical assistance at HUH.

Hospital operations are financed through a combination of Federal funds, hospitalization insurance and Medicare payments, and contractual agreements for patient care.

| Table 12.1: Students’ Responses to Items Related to Financial Assistance (n=302) |
|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Item                      | Excellent (%) | Good (%)      | Fair (%)       | Poor (%)       | NA (%)         |
| Process for obtaining financial assistance information | 5 | 27 | 33 | 32 | 2 |
| Application Processing    | 4 | 24 | 37 | 30 | 5 |
| Administration of financial assistance after awarded | 9 | 25 | 32 | 30 | 5 |

Source: 2008 Self-Study Student Survey, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation
services with the Washington, DC government, and other local jurisdictions.

The Hospital is also a major teaching and training facility for nurses, pharmacists, paramedics, and physicians, providing training for approximately 450 medical school students and 300 dentistry students annually. In April 2007, the Hospital ranked number one among selected area hospitals on 19 quality measures published by the U.S. Health and Human Services Department.

**Special Student Services**

The Office of Special Student Services (OSSS) administers disabled student services, Veterans Affairs benefits, judicial, and new special student orientation programs. In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and other pertinent Federal, state, and D.C. disability and antidiscrimination laws, Howard reaffirms its commitment through OSSS to provide access and reasonable accommodation to students with documented disabilities and assistance in their academic programs of study. During the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 academic years, 483 and 360 students, respectively, requested assistance.

Through OSSS, the University is approved by the District of Columbia State Approving Agency to file for benefits for students who are deemed eligible to receive funds from Veterans Affairs. Upon validation each semester, eligible students report to OSSS to initiate the filing of required documentation.

The University through OSSS conducts the New Student Orientation Program, which is held each Fall semester. The orientation program facilitates a smooth transition for new and transfer students into their academic and community life at Howard. The program includes academic advising, course registration, workshops, and seminars, as well as social and spiritual experiences.

OSSS also ensures that all students enrolled at the University are aware of the expectation that they are to adhere to and uphold the Code of Ethics and Conduct, 1998. Students found in violation may be subject to the rules as outlined in the Student Code of Conduct and Judicialies, 2000. These two documents outline prohibited behaviors and procedures for responding to and adjudicating such issues.

**International Student Services**

In 2008, the student body at Howard consists of individuals from 67 countries with different cultural and ethnic needs. The Office of International Student Services (ISS) provides guidance and support to ease adjustment to life in a new country. This guidance begins with a specialized orientation program for approximately 600 new and transfer international students at the beginning of the Fall and Spring semesters. Individual orientation sessions are also provided to international faculty and staff.

ISS provides several support services to Howard’s international community. These include visa and immigration assistance, personal counseling, and orientation to academic and social life in the U.S. ISS also facilitates the integration of international students and scholars into the Howard community and promotes awareness of this group’s important contributions to the mission and international character of the University. ISS serves as a resource center for information often needed by the international and university communities and functions as an advocate for international students, staff, and scholars. The Office publishes a newsletter four times a year, organizes informational meetings with non-University resource people, and maintains information on international student financial aid sources. ISS sponsors and participates in activities to increase awareness of the international and intercultural nature of Howard University, including Global Community Week and projects of regional student organizations.

**Career Services Office**

The University Career Services Office (CSO) provides an array of career development services to the entire student community, Howard alumni, academic units, and recruiting partners. Career professionals provide guidance to students as they chart their academic and career paths that lead to graduation, employment, careers and life experiences. The programs and services offered by CSO include individualized career coaching, training workshops and seminars, comprehensive on-line and in-house job search
resources, Fall and Spring career fairs, on-campus interviewing and employer information sessions. These offerings significantly augment the educational experience by helping reduce anxiety associated with career and major selection, thus contributing to improved academic performance, retention, graduation, and job placement rates. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the CSO measured its effectiveness using a number of key performance indicators. The results on some of the key performance indicators are presented below.

- Students reported job placement rate of 67% after graduation.
- Over 96,000 students and alumni accessed CSO on-line platforms for the reporting period.
- A total of 515 students signed into the career resources library for usage.
- Between 23% and 25% of graduates indicated that they would pursue graduate or professional degrees.
- 191 employers scheduled structured on-campus interviews, information sessions and corporate presentations.
- 352 employers participated in the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 career fairs.
- 15 career education training sessions were coordinated between staff and employer partners.
- 74 graduate and professional schools attended the 2007-2008 Graduate & Professional Schools’ (GAPS) Fair (October 3-4, 2007).
- Over 4800 students attended the combined Fall and Spring Career Fairs (October 3-4, 2007, and February 20, 2008, respectively).
- 550 student and alumni consultations were conducted through walk-in and scheduled appointments with Career Services staff.
- 435 students attended the GAPS Fair.
- Student registration with on-line job search and career development services remained strong; 4866 students and alumni registered with the office.
- Student surveys for career fairs, on-campus recruitment services, and on-line survey were consistent in reports of high levels of satisfactions with a rating of 4 on a 5-point scale (5 = Completely Satisfied).

Employers’ ratings were consistently high, reflecting almost complete satisfaction with the services and programs offered by the CSO. Ratings were 4.5 on a 5-point scale with 5 being “Completely Satisfied.”

University Counseling Service

The University Counseling Service offers a wide range of counseling and psychological services to assist students and psychiatric services are available upon referral. The clinical staff of the Counseling Center is comprised of licensed mental health professionals and professionals in training. Confidential individual and group counseling and psychotherapy are available to students who report a broad range of concerns. In addition, the Counseling Center also offers University community education and campus group consultation.

Student Activities

Student Clubs and Organizations

The Office of Student Activities facilitates the student organization recognition process and maintains updated contact information for all approved student groups in the following areas: academic and professional; religious; student government; cultural and social; honor societies; and state and regional
organizations. There are over 200 student organizations on campus. Each academic year, during one of the University’s Chapel worship services, all student leaders from the various organizations are commissioned to serve in their elected or appointed positions.

**Athletics**

Howard University supports 19 varsity athletic programs, including Division 1-AA football; seven programs (basketball, cross country, soccer, swimming and diving, tennis, indoor track and field, and outdoor track and field) for men and women; and four programs (bowling, lacrosse, volleyball, softball) in which only women participate. Howard is a member of the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC) and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). All student athletes must be medically and academically cleared before participating on any intercollegiate athletic team. Additionally, athletes are required to register and maintain the minimum number of course credit hours. From 2002-2006, Howard student athletes led the MEAC All Academic Team with a 3.0 and above grade point average.

**Summary, Findings and Recommendations**

Howard’s concern for the overall quality of student life is evidenced by the myriad services and activities that are available to enhance and facilitate the development of a well-rounded student. However, major findings indicate that there is a need to strengthen services in areas such as student advisement, library services, and campus security. For example, Howard’s library system has large and comprehensive resources incorporating virtually every discipline, supported by information specialists and technical personnel. The University library system has significantly advanced its technological capacity. Despite these advances, it still lags behind its peers. To address the challenges in student services, in 2009 President Ribeau launched the *Students First Campaign* to improve service delivery by making process improvements in critical areas that influence the student experience. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 9:

**Findings**

1. Unevenness is reported in student advising across schools, colleges, and departments.
2. The University’s library resources are insufficient for a research university.
3. Despite considerable progress in student services in recent years, some areas remain that require attention by the University.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Provide support for and expansion of the *Students First Campaign* to all departments and student support functions, including space utilization.
2. Continue to enhance the quality of student services offered by the University.
3. Implement the recommendations promulgated by a recent task force on library resources.

**Supporting Documents**

12.1 *Howard University 2009-2010 Student Handbook*
12.2 *Howard University Libraries Strategic Plan for the Main Library Group*
12.3 *Library Assessment Plan*
12.4 *Referencing Rubrics*
12.5 *Library Advisory Committee Report, 2008*
12.6 *Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys*
12.7 *Students First Campaign*
Faculty
MSCHE Standard 10

The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Introduction

The University’s mission recognizes the importance of having a distinguished faculty that is committed to student development, scholarly productivity, and service. Howard’s faculty members perform a variety of instructional, research, service and professional development activities as part of their contributions to the realization of the University’s mission. This chapter provides a profile of the faculty, reviews the University’s faculty recruitment and development efforts, and summarizes the faculty’s research and scholarship achievements. Issues related to faculty compensation, evaluation, and their roles in the governance of the University are also addressed.

Profile of Faculty

Currently, Howard has 1064 full-time and 456 part-time faculty members. Seventy-percent (70%) of the Faculty is full-time. During the 2008-2009 academic year, the number of full-time faculty members did not change from the previous year when there were 1068 full-time faculty members at the University. During the 2006-2007 academic year, there were 1083. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the number of part-time faculty members increased substantially from 162 to 573.

Figures 13.1, 13.2, and 13.3, display Howard’s 1520 faculty members based on rank and gender, ethnicity, and their distribution among the University’s schools and colleges, and ethnicity as of Fall 2008. As illustrated in Figure 13.1, 57% of Howard faculty members are males and 43% are females. Women are 25% of the Professors, 42% of the Associate Professors, 50% of the Assistant Professors, and 49% of Instructors, Lecturers, Adjuncts, and Others as depicted in Figure 13.1.
Figure 13.2 shows that the College of Arts and Sciences has the highest number of faculty followed by the College of Medicine. Although the Faculty is predominantly African American (71%), it has a significant number of White (19%) and Asian/Pacific Islander (8%) members. This level of faculty diversity contributes to an environment in which Howard students are exposed to differing perspectives in the acquisition of an education.

Of the full-time faculty, over 86% hold the Ph.D. or their First Professional Degree (FPD), or both, as do over 69% of the part-time faculty (and thus about 81% of the overall faculty). Two percent hold the Bachelors, 6% hold the MSW or MFA, and about 11% hold other Master’s Degrees, with most of these faculty members appointed as instructors, lecturer, adjuncts, and technicians.

Faculty Recruitment and Retention

The University’s commitment to excellence in teaching, research scholarship, and
service begins with the recruitment and retention of quality faculty members.

The general policy and requirements for faculty appointments are described in the Faculty Handbook (1993) (see Supporting Document 13.1). However, schools and colleges may have additional requirements or procedures regarding the search and appointment process. Most faculty positions require a terminal degree, with the doctorate considered the terminal degree in most fields of study. Howard follows relatively conventional procedures for faculty recruitment, which begins at the departmental level. Once approval is given to hire, job announcements are posted to various Internet or publication sites. Also, faculty members may contact prospective applicants at relevant professional meetings where colleagues with knowledge of promising candidates are requested to spread the word about open positions within their professional networks.

Howard competes with other institutions in a very competitive market to hire and retain excellent faculty. Many factors influence its ability to be competitive in this regard, including the competitiveness of its compensation and benefits, program and degree offerings, quality of students, and support for research and professional development. Although in recent years the University has lost a number of very productive faculty members, it has also been able to recruit many very qualified faculty. The goal going forward is to recruit, hire and retain faculty in areas that align with the University’s revised mission and strategic goals and objectives. During the 2006-2007 academic year, in part to retain highly qualified faculty, the University implemented a major salary adjustment for faculty to bring faculty to 90% of the median by rank and discipline.

Faculty Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the faculty are presented in the Faculty Workload Policy (see Supporting Document 13.2) and Faculty Handbook (1993). The primary foci of the faculty are dedication to instruction, scholarly research, and service to the community in promotion of the University’s and departmental missions, goals, objectives, and strategic plans. A general faculty workload policy was developed in 2002 to establish the principles of consistency, equity, and flexibility, together with a uniform process for determining workload responsibilities across schools and colleges. This policy established a university-wide framework for individual effort in each of the three workload categories, while allowing for variation in an individual faculty member’s proportion of effort within this context. The policy allowed each college/school to establish minimum expectations for its entire faculty across the three domains of work responsibility.

Teaching

The delivery of instruction at Howard is conducted by faculty, who utilize a variety of approaches and teaching methods to enhance student learning. Instructional methods commonly include lecture, discussion, group work, case studies, laboratory work, field work and guided self-instruction, both mediated and not. Prominent among the teaching methods is widespread use of the Blackboard system as a support for instruction. Usage varies among faculty members, but includes posting of course syllabi, assignments and other pertinent course information, grading and assessment, presentation of course content, and dialog and information exchange opportunities between the instructor and students, and among students themselves. Several smart classrooms have been installed throughout the campuses that give students real-time access to the internet during class periods and to other distance learning opportunities. In some cases, students can enrich their classroom experience through service learning. A Center for the Advancement of Service Learning has been established on campus, which develops and promotes initiatives that integrate service learning into existing courses and curricula throughout the University.

Courses are assigned to faculty at the department level. Under the supervision of a faculty member, graduate students, apprenticing as teaching assistants, provide instruction for some courses. The current policy allows the chairperson (or the Dean) discretion in allocating teaching workload.

…Howard competes with other institutions in a very competitive market to hire and retain excellent faculty.
responsibilities with consideration for research and service activities of the unit (see Supporting Document 13.3). However, perhaps a more systematic approach to allocating workload is warranted, given the perception by the majority (60%) of faculty surveyed that the workload in their department is not fair (see Supporting Document 13.4).

Faculty members indicate that “commitment to their students” is the strongest contributor to their job satisfaction. Evidence for this strong positive impact of faculty on students is observed in both the faculty and student survey results. According to the Self-Study Survey, students’ overall responses regarding the quality of faculty instruction and availability were positive (Table 13.1).

**Research and Scholarship**

In addition to maintaining excellence in teaching, Howard’s faculty members have distinguished themselves in research and scholarly work. Faculty productivity levels are noteworthy in terms of extramural and intramural funded projects and published articles, despite unevenness in the levels among faculty, departments, and colleges. A detailed summary of research productivity as reflected by extramural and intramural funded projects is provided in the research emphasis section. Other evidence of scholarly productivity includes the significant numbers of publications in refereed journals in the arts, humanities, and sciences and health sciences (Table 13.2). Howard’s faculty work to enhance student scholarship and collaborate with them in research and publication activity.

In addition to dissertation and thesis projects, faculty mentored student research is presented annually during school and college research days.

**Service**

The Faculty’s commitment to professional and university service is evidenced by their participation on numerous university committees and involvement in local community service, and national service initiatives corresponding to their respective fields. Faculty serve on national boards, as editors and reviewers for peer-reviewed journals, as reviewers for public and private grant applications, as site visitors to other campuses, and hold leadership roles in their professional organizations. Also, faculty members lead or participate in centers on campus, that, in addition to research activities, have prominent service functions.

**Faculty Development**

The concept of professional development is reflected in the activities of all three components of faculty responsibility. The University administration recognizes that effective faculty development is essential to strong academic programs. Through the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor’s ability to stimulate critical thinking</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of student-faculty interactions in your Department</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of your professors to provide students with additional help beyond classroom and office hours</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of faculty for academic advising during scheduled office hours</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of opportunities in your Department to collaborate with your professors on projects</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2008 Self-Study Student Survey, Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation
and Assessment (CETLA), the Professional Development and Leadership Academy, the Office of Research Education and Technical Assistance, the Fund for Academic Excellence Initiative, the sabbatical leave program, the Intramural Research Program (Research Section), and with modest support at the departmental level to attend professional conferences, the faculty can hone their skills and enhance their professional development.

From its inception CETLA has been an invaluable resource to University faculty and is playing an increasing role in faculty professional development. CETLA offers workshops throughout the year in two broad areas—teaching with technology and teaching strategies and classroom teaching assessment. CETLA’s Summer Institute offers an opportunity to earn certification for professional development that will enhance teaching, learning, and assessment. CETLA also maintains a repository of course syllabi for archival purposes and for information sharing among colleagues.

To increase extramural funding and enhance compliance, the Office of Research and Technical Assistance (RETA) provided the University research community with training to more successfully obtain and manage sponsored research projects. RETA promoted the understanding of institutional policies and procedures, sponsor requirements, and federal regulations to ensure financial, program, and regulatory compliance. Through its certification program, RETA offered courses that cover the lifecycle of an award (see Research Education and Technical Assistance in Chapter 18).

**Faculty Recognition**

In order to support and advance excellence in teaching and scholarship, recognition is given for outstanding instruction by Howard faculty. Annually, the Faculty Senate presents the Exemplary Teaching Award to a selected faculty member, judged by a committee of peers to have demonstrated notable instructional accomplishment. Additionally, CETLA features on its Web site teachers who exhibited noteworthy achievements in teaching. Since 1997, the University has held a Faculty Authors Appreciation Day, at which published authors during the previous academic year receive a certificate of recognition signed by both the President and Provost and Chief Academic Officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Schools</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEACS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPNAHS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Publications as of May 12, 2009
Source: Office of University Libraries

*Note: Numbers include joint authors duplicate entries
Curricular Development

Each school/college has oversight of its program offerings, curricular development standards, and faculty involvement as described in the By-laws of that school/college. The schools/colleges, departments/programs have an Academic Curriculum Committee that is elected by faculty members, consistent with the By-laws of that particular entity. These Committees ensure that curricula and learning outcomes are properly aligned. Additionally, to assist with achieving this alignment, CETLA’s syllabus development initiative emphasizes the importance of articulating appropriate learning outcomes.

Faculty Compensation

Despite significant efforts over the last decade in addressing the issues of salary compression, equity and competitiveness, lack of faculty salary parity relative to institutional peers remains a concern for faculty and university administration. During fiscal years 2002 and 2004-2008, the University provided across-the-board faculty salary increases for eligible faculty, ranging between 2.0-3.0% of base salaries per year. While no across-the-board salary adjustments were made for FYs 2000, 2001, and 2003, eligible faculty received merit-based salary adjustments during those periods. Although these increases resulted in significant progress, some individual salaries remain below those of counterparts at other private research institutions and local peers.

In 2007, former President Swygert and the Board of Trustees began to examine faculty salaries with the aim of making market adjustments an important component of faculty compensation. This initiative promises to close the gap between faculty salaries at the University and those of its local and national peer institutions, and to alleviate the perception and the reality of salary compression among the faculty. Despite these efforts, faculty members continue to express concerns related to the Faculty Performance Award Program. An ad hoc faculty committee has proposed a model for compensating faculty in a manner competitive with peer and regional institutions. These recommendations are under review in light of budgetary realities.

Variable Salary Component

A faculty member’s salary for a given academic year is comprised of two factors: the current base salary and a variable salary component. Together they encompass a faculty member’s institutional base salary. The variable salary component, instituted in 2007, acknowledges and offers rewards to faculty members who have been productive in securing funded grants and contracts in a given academic year. The dollar amount comprising the variable salary component is determined through a relatively complex formula. This formula takes into account the total number of funding dollars a faculty member accrued in the previous academic year; whether the person served as PI (principal investigator), Co-PI, or participant on a given grant or project in that time span; the total number of research/contract dollars brought in by the faculty as a whole for that given year; and the amount of monies set aside by the University for this compensation program. This variable amount, by definition, will fluctuate from year to year for a given faculty member depending on faculty productivity for the previous year. This plan to properly compensate faculty for their extramural research productivity is noteworthy; however, an assessment of variable salary component revealed that this effort did not significantly increase the
number of extramurally funded researchers. The initiative has been suspended.

**Benefits**

The University offers a comprehensive benefits program which includes medical, prescription, dental, and vision coverage provided through a select network of providers. Benefits also include workers compensation, unemployment compensation, and a retirement plan supplementing Social Security. In 2001, an Employee Assistance (HU-HELPS) and a commuter assistance program (Smart Benefits) were initiated. In addition to comprehensive benefits, full-time faculty members, as well as their dependent children, are eligible for remission of tuition within the University. Generally, the benefits package offered to faculty is typical of universities of comparable size in the region.

**Faculty Promotion**

The *Faculty Handbook (1993)* and the By-laws of each school/college, clearly state the policies and procedures for appointment, renewal, promotion, tenure, and dismissal. Appointment, promotion, and tenure criteria are discussed at the New Faculty Orientation conducted by the Office of the Provost.

**Faculty Evaluation**

**Faculty Performance Award Program**

The Faculty Performance Award Program is the University’s sole method for faculty salary adjustments that are premised on performance. The decision to grant performance-based monetary awards depends on the availability of funds in each fiscal year. The program is intended to provide a clear and distinct link between pay strategy and exceptional performance of the faculty. Awards are determined based on annual performance evaluations by faculty Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committees and administrators.

**Faculty Performance-Based Evaluation System**

As outlined in the *Faculty Handbook, 1993*, each member of the faculty holding a temporary, probationary, or tenured appointment, whether full- or part-time, is evaluated at least every two years. The purpose of this evaluation is to (1) provide a basis for rewarding merit pay; (2) establish a basis for making decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, and tenure; and (3) provide a basis for faculty development. The department chair and the department’s APT or Executive Committee reviews the faculty member’s documented performance. Student input is also required in this process. There have been some inconsistencies with the frequency of faculty evaluation. The *Faculty Handbook* prescribes that evaluation should occur at least every two years for each faculty member. To ensure that the reviews occur, the Deans must submit a written notice certifying completion of the review to the Provost or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. There has been discussion of the need to create more uniformity in the University faculty teaching performance system, including the procedures that are used to distribute the results of the evaluations.

The Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES) is currently under review. During the 2007-2008 academic year, a committee chaired by Dr. Leslie T. Fenwick (Dean, School of Education) consisting of faculty members, chairs, deans, and other representatives, reviewed the University’s existing faculty performance evaluation process and developed baseline criteria for evaluating faculty performance. In February 2008, the Committee submitted its report recommending the proposed FPES through the Provost to the President. FPES, which will complement the policies outlined in the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Faculty Workload Policy*, has two goals:

- To develop a general rubric for use in assessing and evaluating faculty performance in the areas of instruction, research, and service commensurate with the University’s mission and the goals and objectives of each school and college.
- To ensure accountability and transparency in a context of mutual commitment to the ideals of a healthy and productive academic environment.

During the Spring 2008 semester, the proposed FPES was reviewed by faculty members, who submitted individual feedback...
on-line, and reviewed at the school/college level during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. Each school/college was asked to develop specific faculty evaluation scoring rubrics and procedures within the FPES Committee’s framework. The framework recommends that the Faculty in the respective schools/colleges define performance expectations in the categories of instruction, research, and service relative to academic discipline, rank and the workload of individual faculty members.

Faculty Governance

Faculty participation in the governance at Howard University is recognized as a central value both by the Faculty and University’s leadership. As discussed in Chapter 7- Leadership and Governance, numerous efforts have begun under the leadership of President Ribeau to engage the faculty in decision-making on such topics as budget, compensation, and the academic future of the University. With respect to faculty governance, there is a need to revise the Faculty Handbook.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

University faculty members are particularly committed to the student-centered focus of the University’s mission. They are dedicated to quality teaching, productive research, service, and professional development. A number of factors, including staffing levels, unevenness of workload, lack of competitive salaries, and inadequate support for new faculty recruitment and new faculty-start up funds, have compromised faculty effectiveness. Recent efforts to revisit the workload and evaluation policies to address some of these challenges are underway and should be a priority. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 10:

Findings

1. There is a continuing perception by the majority of the faculty that the implementation of the workload policy is not fair.
2. There is unevenness within and across departments, schools, and colleges regarding faculty productivity, notwithstanding the noteworthy productivity of many faculty.
3. Faculty salary parity relative to institutional peers continues to be a significant issue for most faculty members, despite recent improvements.
4. Howard does not have a dedicated pool of funds to attract and retain additional nationally-known scholars and faculty.
5. Departmental-level staffing and infrastructure to support faculty research is insufficient.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Review the University’s faculty workload policy as part of an effort to address the perception by the majority of faculty who believe the implementation of the faculty workload policy is not fair.
2. Refine and enhance the structure of the University’s faculty development program.
3. Increase faculty salaries to be more competitive with peers at other research universities in the context of enhanced university revenue from diverse sources.
4. Establish a dedicated recruitment and retention fund to attract additional nationally-recognized scholars, retain the strongest current faculty, and promote the development and retention of the University’s young and promising faculty.

Supporting Documents

13.1 Faculty Handbook, 1993
13.2 Faculty Workload Policy, 2000
13.3 Academic Affairs Strategic Planning and Budgeting Updates, 2007
13.4 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
Educational Offerings
Educational Offerings

MSCHE Standard 11

The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Introduction

The University’s academic programs, most of which are more than 100 years old, emanate from Howard’s mission of being a comprehensive research-oriented university. The University strives to respond to evolving societal needs and prepare students for leadership and service to the nation and the global community. Howard addresses these challenges by providing a high quality academic experience of great breadth and depth across its five colleges (Arts and Science; Dentistry; Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences; Medicine; and Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences) and seven schools (Business, Communications, Divinity, Education, Graduate, Law, and Social Work). Howard’s colleges and schools have a strong tradition of academic excellence, offering undergraduate degrees in 80 disciplines, master’s degrees in 63 disciplines, Ph.D. degrees in 29 disciplines, other doctorates in 4 areas, first professional degree in 5 disciplines, and professional certification in 5 areas. In addition, the University offers 5 dual degrees (see Supporting Document 14.1).

Over the past 10 years, 51 academic programs have been accredited. One program has not been reviewed, one program closed, and one program is seeking first-time accreditation. Between 2008 and 2009, there were 29 programs in 8 schools/colleges undergoing self-studies and external reviews for reaccreditation.

All schools and colleges have adopted mission statements consistent with the emphasis of providing an “educational experience of exceptional quality,” which has been demonstrated by the continued reaffirmation of accreditation of academic programs. Additionally, “the quest for solutions to human and social problems in the United States and throughout the world” is evident in the foci of most schools and academic programs, and particularly so in the professional programs that are deeply rooted in a tradition of service. In fact, a survey of senior university administrators found that 73% believed that the educational offerings at Howard are aligned with the University’s mission.

Led by its faculty, the University has engaged in curriculum reform that is designed to respond to changes in academic disciplines and national and international environments. A few new degree programs and certificates have been added. Various special programs, centers, publications, and school and college academic initiatives supplement the University’s educational opportunities and sustain its service legacy.

Curricular Development and New Programs

Curricular development and new programs are the major responsibility of the faculty. (Curricular development is discussed in Chapter 13 – Faculty). A few new courses, degree programs, and certificate programs have been created in response to significant employment and development opportunities. Proposals for new curricula undergo an extensive planning and review process that addresses need, quality, student learning outcomes, assessment, and institutional fiscal resources. After completing the planning and review process, proposals for new programs are recommended to the Provost.
and Chief Academic Officer or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. A few of these innovative programs added recently are highlighted below:

- The School of Business established a Bachelor of Business Administration degree program in Supply Chain Management (SCM), which was approved by the Board of Trustees in August 2007 (see Supporting Document 14.2).
- An introductory, freshman-level, interdisciplinary research course was offered in Spring 2007 to broaden undergraduate perspectives on research, foster consideration of alternative career paths, and institutionalize interdisciplinary research in the College of Arts and Sciences (see Supporting Document 14.3).
- A master of Public Health program was created in 2004 but was discontinued in 2008.

The Graduate School has developed graduate-level certificate programs; to date, four are offered and a fifth has been approved:

- Graduate Certificate in Computer Security (see Supporting Document 14.4),
- Graduate Certificate in University and Faculty Preparation (see Supporting Document 14.5),
- Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies (see Supporting Document 14.6),
- Graduate Certificate in International Affairs (see Supporting Document 14.7), and
- Graduate Certificate in Migration Studies (proposal approved Spring 2008).

In addition, three interdisciplinary doctoral programs have been launched. These include new Ph.D. programs in Atmospheric Sciences, Materials Science, and Mass Communications and Media Studies.

**Program Reviews**

The schools and colleges conduct program reviews, generally rotating among departments, in order to accomplish periodic reviews. Many of these reviews are associated with periodic accreditation reaffirmations such as in the professional schools. Typically, a review committee is established consisting of faculty, students, and sometimes alumni and faculty from other schools and colleges. Site visits by external reviewers are sometimes a part of the program review process. Final reports are submitted to the Dean and the Provost or Senior Vice President for Health Sciences as appropriate, for review.

Enhanced academic program reviews will be an important component of the University’s academic renewal process that President Ribeau has initiated. The program reviews will facilitate the realignment of program and curricular offerings and more strategic and efficient use of resources in the realization of the University’s mission. During the 2009-2010 academic year, a Select Commission on Academic Renewal, appointed by President Ribeau, will lead a review of undergraduate, graduate and professional programs and make recommendations for changes to the President. The President will consider the recommendations and present to the Board of Trustees a plan for academic renewal (see the section on Academic Renewal in Chapter 5 – Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal). Following the implementation of the University’s Strategic Frameworks for Action I and II, the University embarked on a next phase of strategic academic planning involving school and college-level program reviews. After he assumed his position,
President Ribeau asked the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences to assess their respective academic portfolios and make recommendations for changes, taking into consideration program performance and national standing, disciplinary trends, and student and societal demands. He also asked each dean to offer short-and long-term recommendations for changes in their academic program. The President will make this information available to the Commission as a baseline for its work.

Learning Goals and Objectives for Academic Offerings

The range, relevance, and rigor of educational offerings at the University are grounded in the development of and adherence to learning goals and objectives. Articulation and documentation of learning outcomes occurs across university academic units and at different levels. At the level of the individual course, the syllabus articulates the expected learning outcomes. Usually, syllabi include summary statements of the course goals for student learning by expressing what a student should be able to do after completing the course successfully. This general goal is often supplemented by specific objectives, articulating particular activities and the knowledge and skills that a student should be able to demonstrate at the end of the course.

The University has, through its Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA), institutionalized the University’s commitment to enhancing the quality of academic offerings with emphasis on improving faculty teaching and student learning. To ensure that course syllabi consistently meet these criteria, CETLA, established a course in syllabus development that emphasizes the importance of articulating learning outcomes and the ways they are measured. CETLA began a “syllabus competition” in 2006, with detailed feedback provided to submitters, intended to enhance the ability of syllabi to clearly communicate learning outcomes and measurements.

At the program level, learning objectives are generally presented in well-documented program descriptions. General Education requirements in the undergraduate programs are described by each department. Also, major and minor requirements are generally well-articulated. Graduate and professional programs have well-defined and documented curricula with associated learning outcomes.

Undergraduate departments prepare comprehensive examinations in the major fields that are aligned with the learning objectives presented in the respective departmental/programmatic curriculum. Graduate departments also augment the course-based assessments with comprehensive exams, usually in the core and field areas within a discipline. In addition, for theses and dissertations, a formal process for assessing the quality of proposals exists in all departments, and the student must successfully complete the proposal before proceeding to candidacy, and publically defend the dissertation upon completion.

For professional programs, there are external certification exams (such as NCLEX in Nursing or Bar Exams in Law) that demonstrate progress toward meeting the learning objectives of these programs. Faculty and academic administrators regularly review academic programs and curricula to ensure that there is appropriate alignment with the knowledge and skills measured on certification and licensure examinations. Over the past ten years, the University has made significant strides in enhancing resources to support instruction. In the area of information literacy and access, the University has made substantial progress in providing appropriate resources for students. In particular, the central student technology laboratory (the “iLab”) was a major development that included ample computing, printing, and software power for students. Similarly, all dormitories are wired for Internet access (T3 and wireless) and all but one has computer labs. Further, most University buildings are also equipped with wireless Internet access.

All students have access to Blackboard, an electronic course management platform used to support course instruction. The library has increasingly moved to a digital format by subscribing to a variety of on-line scholarly resources, and supports remote off-campus access. Several colleges, schools, and
departments have created smart-rooms that provide multi-media and technology infused classrooms, computer labs, and specialty labs for their particular disciplines (i.e., mathematics, economics, biology, engineering, and sociology/anthropology).

In addition to the strides in technology and resources for information access and literacy, the University has invested in other critical academic support resources. Over the last decade, two new libraries (Law and Health Sciences) were constructed. In addition, a building dedicated to research (HURB1) was completed.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The quality of the University’s educational offerings is assessed through a diverse system of external site visits and internal program reviews. Each of the University's academic programs that are eligible for accreditation participates in the accreditation review process. Schools and colleges conduct regular internal program reviews, generally rotating such reviews among departments to ensure that each program and department housing the program is reviewed regularly. A comprehensive academic portfolio assessment is underway at the University, as part of the academic renewal process. The academic renewal process will result in the strategic realignment of the University’s academic programs consistent with its mission.

The University, through its Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA), has institutionalized its commitment to enhance the quality of academic offerings through CETLA’s emphasis on improving faculty teaching and student learning. CETLA provides a course in syllabus development that emphasizes the importance of articulating learning outcomes and measuring outcomes.

Finally, all students have access to Blackboard, an electronic course management platform used to support course instruction. Several colleges, schools, and departments have created “smart-rooms” that provide multi-media and technology infused classrooms, computer labs, and specialty labs for their particular disciplines. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 11:

Findings

1. The University’s academic programs and offerings are not sufficiently interdisciplinary and experientially based.
2. Student performance on licensure examinations is uneven within and across schools/colleges and requires continued attention.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Evaluate academic offerings and streamline, modify, or augment offerings in response to changing times with special emphasis on expanding interdisciplinary and experiential learning offerings, especially in international studies and community development.
2. Increase external examination passage rates by providing more student support, curricular reform, and related faculty development.

Supporting Documents

14.1 FACTS 2009 – Howard University
14.2 Supply Chain Management (SCM) Program
14.3 Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Research Course
14.4 Graduate Certificate in Computer Security
14.5 Graduate Certificate in College and University Faculty Preparation
14.6 Graduate Certificate in Women's Studies
14.7 Graduate Certificate in International Studies
15 General Education
MSCHE Standard 12

The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning and technological competency.

Introduction

General Education at Howard is designed so that undergraduate students can acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in essential skills: (1) oral and written communication, (2) scientific and quantitative reasoning, (3) critical analysis and reasoning, and (4) technological competency. To that end, a Core Curriculum Committee was appointed in 1996-1997 by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, consisting of faculty and students to make recommendations pertaining to college level proficiency in General Education. This committee was charged with devising a common set of experiences for all undergraduate students, enabling them “to become productive members of society who can analyze, think critically, understand justice, and the importance of service to humanity.” In 2000, the Board of Trustees approved the Core Curriculum for undergraduate students.

The University-wide Core Curriculum was initiated in Fall 2001 as part of the Strategic Framework for Action II. The General Education requirement is implemented in the undergraduate schools and colleges through a Core Curriculum coordinated by the Office of the Provost. A faculty advisory committee from the undergraduate schools and colleges is being contemplated to monitor its implementation and assessment of the General Education requirement.

The General Education curriculum reflects six overarching themes: intellectual openness and cultural diversity; historical awareness; empirical analysis; literacy and statistical reasoning; social and human relations; and health and physical education. It also requires that students demonstrate college-level proficiency in oral and written communication; scientific and quantitative reasoning; and technology. This curriculum is consistent with the competency areas outlined by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Schools/colleges with specific core and general education requirements have augmented these for compatibility with the University-wide Core Curriculum guidelines (see Supporting Document 15.1). The Dean’s office of each undergraduate school/college maintains the listing of courses that fulfill the University-wide Undergraduate Core Curriculum.

The General Education program requirements are disseminated to students through a variety of modalities, including the Howard University Bulletins, department Web sites, and materials developed by various departments. During advisement sessions, new and transfer students receive an orientation concerning the curriculum and graduation requirements. Transfer students are required to take courses in the Core Curriculum unless these requirements were otherwise satisfied through transfer credits from previous institution(s).

University-Wide Core Curriculum

Written Communication

The Freshman Composition Sequence is designed to ensure high levels of literacy, proficiency in analytic skills, and knowledge of various discourses. All students must enroll in the two-semester English 002 and English 003 sequence (or an equivalent year-long Honors sequence 075 and 076). Exemptions are granted because of stellar...
AP scores on the College Board examinations. Students are placed in the appropriate level of English (English 002 or Car-Verbal [remedial English] based on scores from the verbal section of the SAT II examination. Students who need additional help are referred to the Writing Center, which is staffed by faculty from the Department of English and graduate/teaching assistants. Writing proficiency is assessed for English 002 and 003 through in-class and out-of-class essays, student portfolios, and course grades. At the end of the sequence, students are required to take a departmental examination that is scored by at least two faculty members who use a departmentally-developed holistic rubric. Supporting Document 15.2 presents student learning data results on written communication for the Spring 2009 English 003 final examination. Although data have always been collected at the classroom level, Spring 2009 was the first opportunity to aggregate data across written communication courses, thereby, providing institutional level outcomes. Results indicate that 70% of students whose scores were reported were deemed proficient. The Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation is collaborating with the Department of English to develop an analytical descriptive rubric which provides evidence of student performance on all aspects of written communication. Written communication will be assessed every semester to determine student proficiency through 2013; afterwards, written communication will be assessed on an annual basis.

Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), established in 1991, is an interdepartmental, “interdisciplinary” program. This program, which is located in the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA), is another method of achieving written competency, but within a particular field. Instructors in various disciplines are certified as WAC teachers so that they can offer writing-intensive courses within their own fields. The WAC program is assessed at both the faculty and student levels on a regular basis and has many strategies for gauging its effectiveness. Data show that most students indicated that WAC courses were worthwhile, especially as a tool for learning the subject matter of the disciplines. However, despite its curricular innovation, the impact of WAC on undergraduate writing proficiency remains limited, as participation is voluntary.

Oral Communication

To fulfill the oral communication requirement in the general education curriculum, students in Arts and Sciences; Business; Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health; and Communications are required to enroll in Principles of Speech (COMC 101). For undergraduate students in the College of Engineering Architecture and Computer Science, the oral communication requirement is met through the infusion of oral communication components into the regular disciplinary classes. The Principles of Speech course facilitates effective oral communication in a variety of speech situations, familiarizing students with communicative processes and their effect on human interactions. Assessments of verbal communication competence are achieved at the classroom level. However, beginning Spring 2010, data will be aggregated across oral communication courses to enable the assessment of institutional level outcomes.

In addition to the single required speech class, there are supplemental opportunities for students to develop and demonstrate proficiency in oral communication. Other courses in the General Education program require students to conduct oral presentations. However,
there is no clear articulation of the metrics used at the departmental or course level. Additionally, all undergraduate students have the opportunity to participate in two annual undergraduate research symposia sponsored by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School. These symposia not only help students increase research competence and technological fluency; but also demonstrate proficiency of oral communication. Students are evaluated based on research competence and oral competence, including articulation, verbal coherence, maintaining eye contact, and responsiveness to questions.

**Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning**

Undergraduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the School of Business are required to complete two semesters of college-level mathematics courses. Students in the School of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences are required to complete four semesters of college-level mathematics courses (Calculus I, II, III, and Differential Equations). Students in the School of Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (Basic Nursing Program) are required to complete one semester of college-level mathematics (College Algebra I) and one course in Elementary Statistics, and Sociology. Students in the School of Education who are pursuing teacher education take the same general education courses as the COAS students; therefore, they complete two college-level mathematics courses. Except for Journalism students in the John H. Johnson School of Communications who must complete two college-level mathematics courses, communications students complete one semester of college-level mathematics—College algebra 1 (Math 006). Natural Science courses are taught under Division “D” in the College of Arts and Sciences. In this division, students are provided a wide array of courses that provide competencies in scientific and quantitative reasoning.

Although student performance in scientific and quantitative reasoning has always been assessed at the classroom level, in Spring 2009 student learning data for qualitative reasoning was aggregated across courses to provide institutional level outcomes. Evaluation of scientific reasoning is scheduled for Fall 2010. Supporting Document 15.3 shows quantitative reasoning student learning data for Spring 2009 College Algebra I, II, and Pre-Calculus departmental final examinations by school/college. Items which represented a specific aspect of quantitative reasoning were identified on each of the aforementioned final examinations and student performance on those items was recorded. One aspect of quantitative reasoning, defined by the Mathematical Association of America, states that students should be able to “use arithmetical, algebraic, geometric and statistical methods to solve problems.” Results for this aspect of quantitative reasoning indicate that the percentage of students who demonstrated proficiency (i.e., scored 60.0% or better on the item) was 63.6% for College Algebra I, 54.1% for College Algebra II, and 77.0% for Pre-Calculus. The overall proficiency rate for quantitative reasoning across the three courses in Spring 2009 was 61.7%. Quantitative reasoning will be assessed every semester through 2013 to determine student proficiency; after 2013, quantitative reasoning will be assessed on an annual basis.

**Critical Analysis and Reasoning**

Several courses satisfy the critical analysis and reasoning requirement. These include several Philosophy courses, the Afro-American Core Cluster, and other courses specifically designed to teach critical thinking. All students in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business, and Human Development majors in the School of Education are required to take one of the following Philosophy courses to fulfill this general education requirement: PHIL 051 *Principles of Reasoning*; PHIL 053 *Introduction to Philosophy of Science*; PHIL 055 *Introduction to Philosophy*; PHIL 057 *Introduction to Ethics*; and PHIL 159 *Philosophy of Economics*. Further, students in all schools/colleges must enroll in a sequence of courses to demonstrate competencies in critical analysis and reasoning in the Social Sciences, Fine Arts, and the Humanities. Although assessment has always been conducted at the classroom
level, effective Spring 2011, data will be aggregated across classes for critical analysis and reasoning to provide institutional level outcomes.

All students must enroll in the University-Wide Afro-American Core Cluster. Critical analysis and reasoning are central to the multidisciplinary study of African and African-American history and culture. The Afro-American Core Cluster was instituted over thirty years ago in response to the need to diversify the University’s undergraduate curriculum and more adequately reflect in it the legacy mission of the University. It has not been assessed since its implementation. A clear articulation of its continuing purpose and objectives should be developed.

**Technological Competence**

Students are afforded a variety of experiences that build competency in informational technology. In addition to meeting quantitative and scientific reasoning requirements, Division “D” courses also integrate technological competency into the curriculum. Further, for those with less exposure to technology, a number of courses that target computer competence are offered.

Over the past decade, with an increased campus-wide capacity in the technological infrastructure, the use of technology in administration, instruction, scholarship, communication, and literature, and for searching has become ubiquitous. All students are given e-mail accounts when they first enroll and access is required for course registration and navigation of the official university information. In addition, students are provided access to Blackboard, a web-based course management platform which is used to facilitate information dissemination, communication, and assessment in courses. All matriculated students have access to electronic databases, online information, and resources via the library system. Further, numerous faculty members have incorporated technological innovation in instruction and course assignments (i.e., presentation and multimedia software, simulcasts, e-learning, Blackboard, blogs, electronic databases, and podcasts). Technological fluency is a skill required by all students in negotiating every aspect of the University experience. Standards such as that involving technological competency are assessed at the classroom level, but this competency would be more effectively assessed at a “higher” and broader level, given the importance of technology to today’s educated student.

**Assessment of General Education**

The majority of assessments within the General Education program are at the classroom level, as was indicated earlier in each competency section. Since the establishment of OIAE, a more foundational approach has been undertaken to aggregate data across classes for the core competencies in order to provide institutional level outcome information (see Supporting Document 15.4). OIAE has done substantial work with the College of Arts and Sciences to review and improve assessment instruments and procedures in General Education areas, including quantitative reasoning (Mathematics) and written communication (English 003).

The 2008 Self-Study Survey of students, faculty, and senior administrators regarding their perceptions of various aspects of the University found that the majority of students and faculty agreed that the general education program was meeting its goals. Approximately 69% of faculty and 82% of students found that the general education academic program enhanced students’ abilities to form independent judgments; approximately three-fourths of both students (74%) and faculty (72%) indicated that it enhanced student’s abilities to understand fundamental theory; and 81% of faculty and 65% of students reported that the ability to interact in a culturally diverse world was developed more fully. Further, 71% of students reported that the general education program enhanced their knowledge of African-Americans and other people of color; while nearly three-fourths (73%) reported an enhanced ability to stimulate students to think critically; and three-fifths (59%) affirmed the University’s success in introducing technological programs into the curriculum. Approximately two-fifths (41%) of senior administrators
endorsed the view that there was alignment between general education policies and student learning (see Supporting Document 15.5).

**Challenges of the University-Wide Core Curriculum**

Although a number of policies exist on required courses, there is no uniform statement concerning the purpose and value of Howard’s General Education curriculum, or a uniform statement that explains clearly how the program is articulated across all of the undergraduate programs. Undergraduate schools and colleges require their students to enroll in general education courses with the expectation that they will acquire competencies recommended by the core curriculum. Nevertheless, there is not a single uniform General Education Core Curriculum that is required across all the University’s undergraduate programs.

Most schools and colleges already have incorporated within their curricula the basic skills required by the “Core.” Therefore, it would appear that the Core Curriculum has been fully implemented throughout the University. However, with lack of clear articulation, questions have arisen concerning what actually constitutes a University-wide Core Curriculum, as opposed to departmental (divisional) requirements.

At Howard University, all undergraduate schools require students to take first-year freshman composition. In addition, although almost all undergraduates must complete a year-long sequence in mathematics, the School of Communication requires only one semester of college-level mathematics for majors in four of its programs. Students in Journalism, however, must complete a year-long mathematics sequence. Further, only students in four colleges/schools are required to complete a formal speech course.

The School of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science effectively integrates most core curriculum competencies into its major program. As excellent role models, the Departments of Systems and Computer Science and Electrical Engineering have implemented the University Core Curriculum into their course curricula, making reference to the themes of the University-Wide Core Curriculum and the “core” experiences—events and service programs.

The core curriculum panel suggested that there might be challenges associated with implementation of the core curriculum; for example, some schools and departments would have to undertake additional course design activities and identify additional “human and material resources.” However, despite the challenges, the schools/colleges have taken
steps toward fulfilling the recommendations of the Core Curriculum Committee by identifying existing courses and experiences that could be appropriately integrated into the Core Curriculum. What remains, however, is the task of consolidation and refinement so that, across schools and colleges, all undergraduates are bonded by a universal core of learning and experiences.

**Summary, Findings and Recommendations**

General Education at Howard is designed so that undergraduate students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in essential skills: (1) oral and written communication, (2) scientific and quantitative reasoning, (3) critical analysis and reasoning, and (4) technological competency. The General Education curriculum reflects six overarching values: intellectual openness and cultural diversity; historical awareness; empirical analysis; literacy and statistical reasoning; social and human relations; and health and physical education. The University has established a core curriculum that speaks to core competencies for all undergraduates. However, the precise General education course arrangements need to be specified further across schools and colleges to develop a more distinctive Howard University experience which also will allow improved, uniform and reliable assessment of student learning outcomes and core competencies. A clear commitment to General Education at Howard is well established, as are effective strategies to achieve the core competencies. Nevertheless, the implementation of a university-wide core curriculum across all undergraduate programs remains incomplete. Whereas the English, Mathematics, and African-American cluster classes are required of all students, there is significant variation in other required student courses and experiences (i.e., courses in Speech, the Sciences, Physical Education, and special University events, e.g., Convocation and Charter Day). Because of this decentralized implementation, common data on the effectiveness of the Core Curriculum are limited or difficult to access. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 12:

**Findings**

1. There is insufficient assessment of core competencies outside of the classroom, including summative assessment.
2. There is unevenness of articulation, implementation, and assessment of the University’s core competencies across all undergraduate schools/colleges.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Appoint a body of faculty, students, and staff to review the current University-wide core competencies and to recommend strategies to schools and colleges for revising, updating, and assessing the curriculum, in order to insure effective implementation of the program designed to develop those competencies in all Howard students.
2. Refine the General Education curriculum in all undergraduate schools and colleges to best advance the University-wide core competencies.
3. Refine the delivery of core competencies in all departments and schools such that there is a recognized interconnection between general education and academic program requirements.
4. Continue to involve the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) in the review, revision and development of instruments and procedures for assessment of general education/core-curricular areas.

**Supporting Documents**

15.1 General Education Grid: Fulfillment of Competencies
15.2 Spring 2009 Assessment of General Education Outcomes in Written Communication
15.3 Spring 2009 Assessment of General Education Outcomes in Quantitative Reasoning
15.4 Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Report, July 2009
15.5 Technical Report for the 2008 Howard University Self-Study Surveys
Related Educational Activities
Related Educational Activities

MSCHE Standard 13

The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Introduction

The University offers related educational opportunities for its students, which supplement their regular academic coursework and activities, and enhance their learning and personal development. These educational opportunities include internships, undergraduate honors programs, study abroad, academic enrichment, co-op programs, on-line instruction, and certificate programs, all of which adhere to academic and professional standards and align with the University’s mission. This Standard examines the University’s efforts to provide a range of opportunities for students to supplement and enrich their educational experiences.

Academic Reinforcement Initiatives

Howard is committed to the academic success of each of its students, especially those students who need some form of academic reinforcement. The University offers academic enrichment opportunities to eligible students in Mathematics, English, and college study skills, through its Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR), which is housed in the School of Education.

Mathematics

Undergraduate students who are accepted at Howard take a Mathematics Placement Examination (MPE) via the Blackboard course management system. The MPE results are used for placement in Mathematics courses (see Supporting Document 16.1). Voluntary support is provided to all students via the Mathematics Lab located in the Center for Academic Reinforcement (CAR). The Mathematics Lab is staffed by the Department of Mathematics and CAR faculty, as well as student tutors.

The effectiveness of CAR-Mathematics classes and Mathematics Lab support has been demonstrated. A study was conducted that compared the performance of students who successfully completed CAR’s Basic Mathematics II courses from Fall 2003 to Fall 2005 compared with the performance of all other students in College Algebra I from Spring 2004 to Summer 2006. The study revealed that students in College Algebra I who had successfully completed Basic Math II generally performed better than the overall population of students in College Algebra I (Figure 16.1).

English Proficiency and Graduate Expository Writing

The Department of English does not administer a placement examination to undergraduate students. All new entrants are required to register for the first college-level English course. Based on the results of their first in-class essay (the “Diagnostic Exam”), faculty may elect to send students to the CAR-Verbal program, which is dedicated to preparing them to succeed in English 002. However, when students are identified as underprepared, most of them do not drop English 002 and enroll in the CAR-Verbal course, as shown in Table 16.1. In response to the Self-Study Committee’s findings, effective Fall 2009, the University will use writing scores from the SAT or ACT for placement into the appropriate English course.

Undergraduate students who need to strengthen their writing skills may voluntarily avail themselves of the Writing Center. In Fall 2007, the Self-Study Committee observed that the Center did not have enough operating hours or tutors. The Committee also noted a growing need for
assistance in English as a second language (ESOL). As a result of the Committee’s assessment, the University provided funds to hire enough tutors (including an ESOL specialist) to staff the Center weekdays during business hours and to pilot-test an on-line Writing Center to increase evening and weekend access. Currently, neither the English Department nor CAR tracks the performance of ESOL or other under-prepared students in subsequent English classes.

On the graduate level, all master’s and doctoral students enrolled in the Graduate School are required to demonstrate writing proficiency. The Graduate Expository Writing Examination (GEWE) is administered to all incoming graduate students and serves as an instructional vehicle for implementing the Board of Trustees’ 1976 mandate that all graduate students demonstrate proficiency in academic or expository writing as a prerequisite to candidacy. Students who do not satisfy the minimum proficiency are required to complete a course in “Academic Communication,” which focuses on scientific writing.

**College Study Skills**

Beginning in 1974, all undergraduate students who enrolled in CAR courses were required to take a study skills course. In 1980, this course was no longer mandatory for CAR-referred students, which has

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester/Year</th>
<th>Below 002 Cut-off</th>
<th>Enrolled in CAR</th>
<th>% Enrolled in CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of English and the Center for Academic Reinforcement, Howard University
resulted in declining participation among the students who are, most in need. Further, when students are accepted with the condition of enrolling in a college study skills course, there is no penalty for not adhering to these admissions requirements.

**Certificate Programs**

Howard offers 52 undergraduate, graduate, and professional certificate programs, but only 18 are for credit (see Supporting Document 16.2). Between 1997 and 2007, Howard awarded more than 600 credit-based certificates (see Supporting Document 16.3). By comparison, Howard’s ten peer institutions offer an average of 46 certificate programs, and most of these carry academic credit (see Supporting Document 16.4).

The University offers two types of certificate programs: (1) Certificate of Completion programs and (2) Certificate of Competence programs (see Supporting Document 16.2). Certificate of Completion programs do not require a college degree or college enrollment status for admission and continuing education units (CEU’s) may be earned. Certificate of Competence programs require a college degree or enrollment in an undergraduate or graduate program for admission and are designed to demonstrate competence in a specialized field. They may also fulfill prerequisites for Board examinations.

**Strengths of Certificate Programs at Howard University**

The strengths of Howard’s certificate programs include the following:

- The accessibility of certificate programs in terms of tuition cost, locations where courses are offered, and day and time of class meetings.
- The revenue-generating capacity of short-term certificate programs — revenue which may be used for regular academic programs or underfunded student educational enrichment activities. Allied Health’s certificate program in Phlebotomy is a case in point: Clinical Lab Science program has used some of the $1 million in revenues it earned between 1996 and 2004 to hire a part-time lab assistant and upgrade equipment for on-site students.
- The clearance of Certificate of Competence programs through a curriculum review process that is at the departmental, school/college and Provost levels.
- The inclusion of courses that are a part of Certificate of Competence programs
in the accreditation process of the departments in which these courses reside.

**Challenges for the Certificate Programs**

Despite these strengths, there are a number of obstacles to the effective operation of certificate programs. They are as follows:

- The paucity of credit programs. Research as well as anecdotal evidence indicates that there are missed opportunities in many areas, including computer science (e.g., various software and hardware certifications as well as help desk certification), health sciences (e.g., practical nursing, geriatric care, hospice care), biomedical science, construction management, project management, language programs, cultural programs, and the popular arts.

- The absence of a clear process for developing and implementing Certificate of Completion programs and non-credit courses.

- Administrative processes that do not facilitate the implementation of contract-based revenue-generating certificate programs in partnership with an external entity.

- Inadequate marketing, public information, and advertising support.

- Inadequate staff support and operational funding.

- The need for main-campus certificate courses to be offered in more accessible locations to better serve the community, for instance, at sites such as the Howard University Hospital and Howard Center.

**Experiential Learning**

In several programs within the University, students are involved in practicum, co-ops, internships, fieldwork and community service as part of their program or field of study. These activities are designed to enable students to grasp the concepts and theories of their discipline and how to apply them in a professional setting under supervision. Most of the experiential learning activities are in the professional programs in the Health Sciences. Other programs reside in the Schools of Education, Business, Communications, and Social Work, among others. Students are assigned to sites where faculty advisors work closely with site supervisors to assess their progress. In some programs, students maintain a log which is submitted as part of their final evaluation.
The Center for Urban Progress provides students community learning and service opportunities through the Community Development Leadership Program, the Community Development Work Study and the Center for Advancement for Service Learning. Each year, 6-8 students receive financial support through the Community Development Support Collaborative. These students obtain hands-on experience and networking opportunities through internships with partner organizations.

Internships

Numerous internship opportunities are made available to undergraduate, graduate, and professional students through their academic departments. Students typically register for academic credits for these internships under faculty direction in accordance with regulations governing degree requirements, and are assigned to internship positions at appropriate public and private agencies and facilities. Students are required to devote a designated number of hours to the internship and are often required to complete a research component or a formal paper related to the internship. Internship course faculty coordinators and internship site supervisors collaborate in the evaluation of students.

Undergraduate Honors Programs

Undergraduate honors level study is offered to students through the University’s various honors programs. Undergraduate honors programs exist in the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Business and the John H. Johnson School of Communication.

As entering freshman, students may qualify for admission to an honors program based on high school cumulative grade point average, SAT/ACT scores, statements of interest and extracurricular activities. Following their initial year of enrollment, students who meet the required cumulative grade point average may be invited to join an honors program.

Honors program participants are required to take prescribed courses, participate in designated honors activities and complete honors theses or projects. Through the Office of the Provost, the University has recently implemented a University-wide honors program that will include campus-wide honors programming under the direction of an Honors Advisory Council.

Study Abroad Programs

Through its Study Abroad Office, located in the Ralph Bunche International Affairs Center, and its undergraduate schools and colleges, the University offers students a diverse array of study abroad opportunities. Typically, students study abroad for one semester, and have the earned credits applied to their Howard University transcripts. The College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Law, and the School of Business have well-organized and effective study abroad programs. In addition, the Graduate School offers students a number of academic and research international experiences related to their degree program. Several are funded from extramural sources.

Distance-Learning

The University does not have a well developed centralized distance learning program. Distance learning is offered through five academic units at the University. Below is a brief description of the University’s distance learning programs.

Division of Pharmacy

The Division of Pharmacy’s Non-traditional Doctor of Pharmacy (NTDP) program provides working pharmacy professionals on-line, self-paced courses that can be accessed via the Internet. Students are required to visit the campus twice during the program. This format has resulted in national and international enrollment. NTDP curriculum is learner- and competency-based and incorporates communication, problem solving, and critical thinking in all program phases (http://www.ntdp.howard.edu). All course content is developed and delivered (via Web Board) by an outside vendor and Howard faculty serve as preceptors, meeting weekly with students on-line to discuss clinical cases.
Clinical Laboratory Science

The Department of Clinical Laboratory Science (CLS) offers an on-line B.S. program to certified Clinical Laboratory Technicians and Medical Laboratory Technicians. The program prepares students for professional certification examinations at the technologist level.

Howard University Continuing Education (HUCE)

Established to maximize educational access for professional and personal development, Howard University Continuing Education (HUCE) provided educational opportunities for individuals and organizations in a variety of formats. The University recently decided to discontinue its Continuing Education program in its present form, effective November 1, 2009. Decisions are being made regarding organizational locations for its on-line offerings, grants and Language Institute. Recently, HUCE significantly increased its self-paced and instructor-led on-line offerings and now offers eight certificate programs on-line in paralegal studies, technology, management, and small business. Most HUCE distance learning instruction is designed and delivered by vendors, rather than by Howard faculty (see Supporting Document 16.5).

School of Business

In 1997, the School of Business launched an on-line MBA program with the aid of a grant from e-College. However, the on-line MBA program expired in 2003 because of low enrollment. Currently, the School of Business offers a few distance learning courses, mainly in the Department of Information Systems and Decision Sciences. Compared to the enrollment in courses taught on campus by the same instructors, enrollment in these courses has increased, while student attrition has decreased.

English Department

Since 2003, the Department of English has offered one or more sections of Freshman Composition, Technical Writing, or Pre-Law Writing on-line. Some of these on-line courses are very popular and often oversubscribed, enrolling more than 30 students instead of the official maximum of 20.

Opportunities for Enhanced Development of Distance Education

There are opportunities for the University to further develop its distance education offerings and infrastructure. Overall, Howard's DL offerings account both for less than 1% of the University's course offerings and 6% of enrollment (see Supporting Document 16.9). Howard currently offers only two on-line degrees (a Nontraditional Doctorate in Pharmacy and a new Bachelor's of Science in Clinical Laboratory Science), along with on-line certificates in paralegal studies, management, small business, and technology. There is a robust market of students for on-line education, especially among African Americans, the primary service population for Howard. The market is very competitive and the University will have to take aggressive steps within the context of its academic renewal initiative and program restructuring to take advantage of distance learning opportunities. Most of the universities that graduate more African Americans with master's degrees than Howard offer at least 7 master's degrees on-line (see Supporting Document 16.6). Nova Southeastern University, the
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overall top producer of African-American doctoral degrees, offers 15 doctorates on-line http://www.diverseeducation.com/Top100GraduateDegreeProducers2007.asp. Several HBCUs offer at least five on-line degrees, including the master’s and doctorate (see Supporting Document 16.7). Among Howard’s local peer institutions, George Washington offers seven on-line master’s degrees (see Supporting Document 16.8).

Despite its limited offerings, Howard can still attract more students seeking higher education. Supporting Document 16.10 and 16.11 revealed two noteworthy trends. First, the DL courses have attracted a larger percentage of students over the age of 24, specifically those aged 45 or older. Second, its graduate and professional Distance Learning students have lower Drop/Withdrawal/Failure (DWF) rates than undergraduate Distance Learning students. Together, these trends suggest that the University has the potential to attract and retain more nontraditional students through Distance Learning. In Fall 2008, after learning about the Self-Study Committee’s findings, the Department of Communication Sciences and Disorders began working with CETLA to accelerate its development of an on-line graduate program.

Distance Learning Infrastructure

The administration of Distance Learning offerings is decentralized. The Distance Education Policy designates the responsibilities for technical support to the central administration (Blackboard course management system and a help desk) via ISAS, with scheduling and oversight to the academic departments.

The central administration also provides on-line library services, registration and a Distance Learning Orientation for faculty and students offered by CETLA, but there is insufficient administrative support for student advising, tutoring and other services. Although CETLA offers Blackboard and Distance Learning certification programs, most department chairpersons do not require faculty to demonstrate proficiency in the use of Distance Learning technologies, course design, or management.
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Summary, Findings and Recommendations

The University is engaged in several supplemental activities that enhance the educational experience of its students. Through placement or diagnostic testing, Howard identifies and places students who require additional academic support and reinforcement in appropriate courses. The University has increased revenue from its continuing education and distance learning programs, but has missed some opportunities. Many for-credit programs could be offered and aggressively marketed. Additional administrative support should be provided to identify market needs in the area of continuing education and expeditiously develop curricula or partnerships to meet those needs. Faculty and departments should be encouraged to develop more Distance Learning courses, and additional support should be provided for existing efforts in this area.

The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 13:

Findings

1. Student academic placement data are not adequately coordinated and used to support student matriculation. Certificate program offerings and market value are not adequately evaluated.
2. There is inadequate administrative support for distance education.
3. There is an underutilization of new academic delivery and organizational arrangements and systems for teaching and learning, e.g., distance learning and learning communities.

Recommendations for Improvement

1. Establish a central placement office within Enrollment Management to administer placement tests, enforce the University’s placement policy, and track student progress.
2. Establish a process to determine what certificate programs should be offered that includes priorities from assessments of industry and federal sector training needs, occupational trends, and demographics of the University’s contiguous communities and target audiences. Create a strategy to increase public relations, marketing, and advertising certificate programs.
3. Establish a single point of contact to provide administrative support for distance education in order to (a) assist online students with services such as registration, financial aid, and graduation, and (b) assist departments proctoring exams and marketing their distance learning programs.
4. Offer incentives to enhance faculty proficiency in utilizing new strategies of delivery systems in support of teaching and learning.
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MSCHE Standard 14

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.

Introduction

Howard promotes successful student learning as a critical institutional outcome. All university units, directly or indirectly, provide experiences that support student learning. A comprehensive and coordinated approach to the assessment of learning outcomes reflects the complexity required to capture its multifaceted nature. Student learning is a fundamental component of Howard’s mission. Thus, the clear articulation of expected student learning outcomes at all levels and their assessment is necessary to achievement of the University’s mission and goals. Student learning outcomes assessment at Howard is mission-driven (Chapter 4), student-centered (Chapter 17), broadly defined (Chapter 14), collaborative (Chapter 10), and results-oriented.

This Chapter summarizes the progress that has been made in student learning outcomes assessment since the 1999 reaffirmation of accreditation by the Commission on Higher Education. In particular, this Chapter provides updates on outcomes assessment related to university programs, support systems, plans, activities, and measures. Data emerging from the assessments of student learning (direct and indirect) documenting outcomes achievement are highlighted. Additionally, case examples from various units are reported and recommendations for strengthening the collection and use of student learning assessment data are offered.

Statements of Expected Student Learning

Statements of expected student learning outcomes for Howard’s students are articulated at various levels, including the institutional, degree/program, and course levels. At the institutional level, although more general, expected student learning outcomes, are stated in various documents, including the Strategic Framework for Action II (see Supporting Document 17.1), the Student Reference Manual (see Supporting Document 17.2), annual reports, and the strategic plans of various units. Expected student learning outcomes at the school/college and department/program levels are consistent with the University’s mission and appropriate higher education and relevant disciplines. An example, articulating the relationship among the University’s mission, college/program instructional goals, and learning objectives, is found in the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science (see Supporting Document 17.3).

Typically, expected student learning outcomes are available on the school/college and department/program Web sites, in assessment plans, annual reports, and other relevant documents (e.g., Self-Study reports for accrediting bodies). Additionally, learning outcomes are communicated to students through course descriptions and syllabi, lectures, presentations, assignments, Blackboard and other web postings, and Faculty-student interactive discussions.

The placement of explicit statements of expected student learning outcomes in course syllabi is uneven as evidenced by examination of the course syllabi database, which is located on the CETLA Web site. Some course syllabi list clear and measurable expected learning outcomes, while others fall short in this area (see Supporting Documents 17.4, 17.5, 17.6, and 17.7).
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CETLA maintains an on-line syllabus tutorial for faculty use and sponsors an Exemplary Syllabus Award program with winning syllabi posted on CETLA’s Web site for all faculty to review as needed.

The University-wide Core Curriculum was initiated in 2001 as part of the SFA II to ensure that all Howard undergraduates acquire effective skills in language, mathematics, the use of computers, critical thinking, and communication. Detailed information on the General Education curriculum and its expected learning outcomes is provided in Chapter 15.

Documented, Organized, and Sustained Assessment Process

After the 1999 Middle States site visit, the University established a system to better ensure a documented, organized, and sustained assessment process for evaluating student learning. In 2001, a Task Force (of administrators, faculty, staff, and students) was appointed. In 2003, the Office of the Provost and the Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE) Committee implemented a University-wide professional development training course, “Writing an Effective Assessment Plan,” for deans, department chairs, directors of graduate studies, and assessment representatives from each school/college. During this training, a campus-wide assessment plan template was discussed and distributed for use by administrators, faculty, and staff. Many units now have formal mechanisms for assessment processes. Illustrated in Figure 17.1 is the School of Business student learning assessment framework, which shows the involvement of faculty, students, administrators and alumni in the School’s assessment process.

All units at the University submitted assessment plans and processes to the Office of the Provost. The Work Group’s examination of the units’ assessment plans (Office of the Provost’s restricted Web site https://www.howard.edu/assessment/restricted/plans/index.htm) revealed that the plans varied in their scope and depth. The examination also found that the process of assessment of student learning outcomes is primarily decentralized, usually under the purview of individual programs,

![Structure for the Assessment of Student Learning](source: School of Business)
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departments, and schools/colleges. Further, it was clear that some units, particularly those focusing on preparation for professional practice such as dentistry, divinity, engineering, architecture, law, medicine, allied health sciences, nursing, pharmacy, social work, and teacher education, have well-defined plans and procedures of gathering data on student outcomes and using the results for improvement. This is driven by university expectations and external accreditation requirements.

The depth of assessment data collected is uneven across the non-professional units, such as College of Arts and Sciences, the largest academic unit on campus. Significant progress in outcomes assessment planning and implementation, however, has been made in these units over the past decade.

Student Achievement of Key Learning Outcomes

Assessment of key student learning outcomes occurs at all levels of the University (vertical) and at different points of the students experience (horizontal). Howard collects and/or uses assessment data from incoming students, in part, to assist in placing students in appropriate courses in their first year of matriculation. Likewise, incoming undergraduate students’ verbal and mathematical skills are assessed in order to place them in appropriate courses of these types during their first year of matriculation. New entrants and transfer students who have not received college credit for mathematics must take the Mathematics Placement Exam, which is on-line. The results of this examination are utilized to facilitate placement in mathematics courses (e.g., Basic Mathematics, College Algebra).

The Freshman Writing Program collects post-test assessments (in English 002 and English 003) to gauge student learning. The two-semester sequence of Freshman Composition is designed to fulfill, in part, the component of the University-wide Core Curriculum related to proficiency in language and communication skills. The post-test results reported for AY 2005-2006 were quite encouraging (Table 17.1) with the overwhelming majority of students successfully passing the department’s post-test assessment in English 002 and English 003.

The Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, an interdepartmental, interdisciplinary program, aims to assist students to “learn to write” and “write to learn” through promoting writing across the disciplines. WAC courses seek to ensure that students master the professional conventions of a particular discipline, while reinforcing skills learned in Freshman English. The courses foster active learning within a discipline since writing encourages careful reading, observing, listening, and thinking. Coordinated by the English Department, the WAC Program originated in the College of Arts and Sciences in 1991. However, since merging with the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA) in 2003, the WAC program has served the entire university. The WAC program has both faculty and student support, as revealed by the results of a survey of nearly 2,000 students who completed WAC courses at Howard University. Results indicated that more than 90% of the students rated the courses highly, especially

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Semester</th>
<th>%/Number Students Passed</th>
<th>%/Number Students Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English 002 (Fall 2005)</td>
<td>93.9% (1,221)</td>
<td>6.1% (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 003 (Fall 2005)</td>
<td>84.4% (135)</td>
<td>15.6% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 002 (Spring 2006)</td>
<td>95.0% (133)</td>
<td>5.0% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 003 (Spring 2006)</td>
<td>91.5% (985)</td>
<td>8.5% (62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Howard University Department of English
as a tool for careful reading and critical thinking.

One sustained measure of student learning outcomes is grades, which are subsequently translated into cumulative grade point average (GPA). While at one level, grades provide a measure of how much students have learned, it must also be recognized that the fidelity of grades, as a valid learning outcomes assessment measure, depends upon the rigor of the examinations and assignments that are utilized as evidence of student learning and the systematic nature of the grading system employed.

Howard requires its undergraduate students to earn and maintain a cumulative minimum GPA of 2.0 for good academic standing. However, some professional programs (e.g., Divisions of Pharmacy and Allied Health Sciences) require a higher overall or major GPA. Graduate students are required to earn a minimum GPA of 3.0 for good standing. Table 17.2 illustrates Spring 2008 GPA by school/college, level, and gender. The results indicate that undergraduate and graduate students’ cumulative GPA is well above the minimum requirements.

Student learning outcomes also are directly measured in many undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs through use of standardized tests of disciplinary knowledge and tests of general educational performance. An example of a standardized test used to assess student outcomes at the undergraduate level is the ETS Major Field Test in Business, utilized by the School of Business. Business students took this standardized examination for the first time in April 2005. The Dean of the School reported that although student performance at that time did not meet the School’s expectations, the results provided valuable perspectives on student achievement. Students who had been exposed to a greater number of comprehensive examinations throughout their course of study (i.e., students with academic concentrations in Accounting and Finance) performed at a higher level on the examination.

At the professional school level, the metric that has been the primary focus of the School of Law’s strategic planning is first time bar passage rate (72% for Howard law students vs. 75% first time national average).

Table 17.2: Average Cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA) by School/College, Level, and Gender: Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS/COLLEGES</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Grad/Prof</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Architecture/</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy/Nursing/Allied Health</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table excludes data for students enrolled in the College of Medicine and School of Law since their GPA is calculated on a different metric than students in other schools/colleges at the University.

Source: Howard University Department of Enrollment Management
The College of Medicine requires students to pass the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) Step 1 (mastery of sciences basic to the practice of medicine) as a prerequisite for promotion from the sophomore to junior class. Further, medical students must pass USMLE Step 2 (clinical knowledge and skills) in order to graduate.

As a private research university, Howard is the leading producer of on-campus African-American Ph.D. recipients. Time-to-degree for doctoral level students is another set of student outcome data routinely collected and monitored. The University has witnessed some positive results in this area. During the three year period from 2005-2007, the mean time-to-degree for completion of the Ph.D. decreased from 7.8 years (in 2005) to 5.5 years (in 2007). Since 1999, the majority of completers in each cohort year obtained a Ph.D. degree in five years across all disciplines. Other indicators of student outcomes include retention and graduation rates (see Chapter 11—Student Admission and Retention for a detailed discussion of retention and graduation rates).

While assessment planning, timing, metrics for documenting student learning, and use of assessment results in program improvement operates at multiple levels, responsibility falls on individual programs, departments, schools/colleges. Assessment of student learning outcomes at the school/college and program/course is widespread and the methodologies diverse. There exist examples of assessing: (a) cognitive outcomes, or those involving the learning of knowledge of the discipline, including key theories, concepts, and applications (e.g., senior comprehensives); (b) behavioral learning outcomes, or those involving the ability to demonstrate a specific set of identified skills or abilities, usually within a specific domain-related context (e.g., performances in fine arts, observations of student teaching, internship/practicum evaluations); and (c) affective outcomes, or those involving the development of students’ attitudes, beliefs, and values (e.g., student surveys).

Assessment of student learning outcomes at the school/college and program/course level is widespread and the methodologies utilized are diverse. Despite variations across disciplines, there are some commonalities among various programs in the types of student assessment utilized (e.g., course-embedded assessments such as tests, student portfolios, comprehensive exams, capstone experiences) (see Supporting Document 17.8).

In the senior year, all students in the College of Arts and Sciences must pass a comprehensive examination or approved option in their major field as a requirement for graduation. Student outcomes on the senior comprehensive examination for AY
2007-2008 indicate that the majority of students pass the senior comprehensive examination (see Supporting Document 17.9). In Fall 2008 Senior Undergraduate Comprehensive Examinations sample, student outcomes show that the passing rate was high in all disciplines except in Chemistry (see Supporting Document 17.10).

Exit interviews and surveys of students, as well as alumni perceptions and attitudes, are other ways to assess student outcomes particular to their attitudes and values. Here, students are often asked to reflect upon their learning and other benefits as a (direct or indirect) result of their educational experiences at Howard University. In Spring 2008, the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation conducted a survey of students, faculty, administrators, and staff. The student survey participants were 651 Howard University students.
Their responses to the items on the student survey, except for questions about facilities and the utilization of student feedback, were fairly to extremely favorable. Results from selected items are provided in Table 17.3.

The University’s Career Services Office collects student outcomes data on job placements for graduating seniors. Based on data collected through an on-site survey at graduation, year-round on-line survey, and to a limited extent employer reported data, the vast majority of Howard’s graduates either have job placement or graduate school acceptance upon graduation (Table 17.6).

Communication of Learning Assessment Information

There is evidence at various levels that student learning information is shared and, in many instances, acted upon to make improvements aimed at enhancing teaching and learning. Administrators disseminate student outcome data in documents such as Self-Study reports, annual reports, unit strategic plans, and on program Web sites. In terms of the explicit and specific use of student outcome data for making curricula improvements, the evidence was mixed. While the documents reviewed often made very general statements of using assessment data for improvement; listed below are some more illustrative specific examples:

- Based upon longitudinal student outcomes data related to retention and graduation rates, an important strategic goal of the University is to increase the graduation rate so that it exceeds the national graduation average. To accomplish this goal, undergraduate schools and colleges were charged with assessing barriers to student retention and graduation and developing intervention strategies. Increased attention was given to student placement and remediation through the Center for Academic Reinforcement.

- Based upon assessment data (i.e., bar pass rates), a major effort is aimed at improving law students first time pass rates, including the hiring of a visiting professor to teach a bar preparation course entitled *Maryland Law in National Perspective*.

- During the AY 2004-2005, the Office of the Provost, in conjunction with the University’s Academic Excellence Program, awarded a grant to the chairperson of the School of Business’s Academic Planning Committee to evaluate the skill sets of seniors completing the undergraduate program. The Committee recommended to the faculty that the School administer the ETS Major Field Test in Business, a standardized examination designed to measure students’ comprehension and retention of fundamental business concepts. Students took the examination for the first time in April 2005. A focus group was held whereby students provided feedback on the content of the ETS Major Field Test, their individual and group performance, as well as other academic matters. As a result of student learning outcome data, as well as other student feedback, curricula enhancements were implemented. The specific strategies to enhance student learning in core courses vary across departments. For example, the Department of Marketing has revised both the *Principles of Marketing* and *Business Communication* courses by substantially increasing the number of writing assignments and oral presentations required of students, whereas the Department of Accounting has increased the number of problem-based exercises used in class and instituted mandatory study sessions in Accounting I and Accounting II courses. In the Spring 2008 semester, the Business Law faculty sponsored discussion groups comprised of students from different sections in which they provided extended feedback on examination issues and discussed successful learning strategies and techniques. Since these changes, increases in student performance on the ETS Major Field Test have been evident.

- Based upon student outcomes from the PRAXIS I examination, in 2002, the School of Education created new courses, taught by faculty in the Center of Academic Reinforcement (CAR) entitled Basic Math I PRAXIS, CAR Verbal PRAXIS, and CAR Reading PRAXIS.
In the College of Dentistry, assessments serve as an analytical and advisory tool to all departments and programs. Assessments are proactively utilized to: (a) assess and provide guidance in the revision of the academic mission and goals of the College; (b) analyze academic programs and recommend changes based on requirements by accreditation agencies and student and program director self-evaluations; (c) evaluate student didactic, clinical, and laboratory learning experiences and influence positive change; and (d) examine instructional/teaching methods and practices and recommend changes. Data obtained from assessment efforts have been used in the development of probability-based models to measure the effectiveness of operations in the College.

Given national and university student outcomes data related to time-to-degree for completion of the Ph.D., the Graduate School has undertaken concerted efforts aimed at improvements in this area. In 2005, the Graduate School was selected to join 21 major U.S. and Canadian research universities to participate in a $2.6 million three-year Ph.D. Completion Project. In May 2007, the Council of Graduate Schools announced that Howard was continuing to participate in the second phase of the grant extending to 2009.

Students on probation in the School of Communication are required to attend a minimum of four workshop sessions designed to strengthen their study skills and provide counseling services, as needed.

After CETLA assisted the Department of Clinical Laboratory Science in soliciting students’ opinions about the curriculum, CETLA conducted a series of instructional design workshops for the entire Clinical Laboratory Science faculty to address the issues that emerged in the curriculum survey.

CETLA advised the School of Pharmacy about adopting the IDEA Center’s course evaluation instruments, which it subsequently did. After reviewing the IDEA survey results, the School of Pharmacy requested CETLA to develop a training agenda that would strengthen teaching in the areas where the IDEA surveys revealed a need for improvement. As requested, CETLA tailored instructional design and technology workshops to the faculty’s needs. In response, the faculty organizer wrote, “Overall, thank you very much for two successful workshops for our faculty. We now have another piece of evidence to demonstrate application of our assessment data. I will follow up with faculty at the end of the Spring semester to determine how many have incorporated some of these principles.”

Professional Development Opportunities

Information obtained from interviews with the Provost and Chief Academic Officer (CAO) and the Chair of the Board of Trustees’ Academic Excellence Committee indicated that senior-level University officials recognize the importance of student learning assessment data and the need for such data to be part of the total structure for promoting institutional effectiveness. Since its 1999 Middle States reaffirmation, Howard University has supported a number of units and activities for faculty members to improve their knowledge and
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skills related to assessing student learning, to improve their curricula, and improve their teaching. Some activities previously cited in this report include: development and maintenance of an Outcomes Assessment Web site, under the Office of the Provost and CAO, which includes a variety of links to general resources, handbooks, guides, and review articles; and implementation of a University-wide professional development training program in 2003 on “Writing an Effective Assessment Plan” designed for deans, department chairs, directors of graduate studies, and assessment representatives from each school/college.

One of the most widespread and sustained campus-wide strategies to systematically assist departments and faculty in improving student learning and implementing and utilizing student learning assessment is through the work of the Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (CETLA). CETLA strives to empower the faculty to teach more effectively, especially with technology, and to utilize more effective techniques for evaluating their teaching. Faculty participation in CETLA’s workshops has been strong, suggesting faculty support of the student learning assessment process and their desire to strengthen their skills in the area. Faculty evaluations of these teaching and learning workshops have been favorable.

The recently created Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) is providing added support to faculty, staff, and students regarding student outcomes assessment. The OIAE is expected to provide programs and services that: (a) elicit faculty, staff, and student involvement in the development of assessment techniques, strategies, methods and tools to enhance learning, teaching and scholarly productivity; (b) provide information that is used to improve program quality, efficiency and effectiveness; and (c) provide feedback to units to enhance effectiveness of the University’s programs and services.

The University’s Professional Development and Leadership Academy also provides professional development for faculty, staff, and administrators around a variety of issues, including assessing student learning outcomes. In Fall 2000, the Professional Development and Leadership Academy sponsored a two day course on “Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.” The workshop, which was offered four times, was taught by a School of Education faculty member within the School of Education experienced in outcomes assessment. This workshop was discontinued after the implementation of outcomes assessment workshops in CETLA.

Summary, Findings and Recommendations

Howard has made substantial improvements in the assessment of student outcomes and the use of data for improvement. It is evident that assessment of key student learning outcomes occurs at all levels of the University and at different points of the student’s experience. Assessment of student learning outcomes is largely decentralized, mostly under the purview of individual programs, departments, and schools/colleges. Despite variations across disciplines, some commonalities exist among various programs in the types of student assessments that are utilized. Some units, particularly those focusing on preparation for professional practice, have well-defined plans and procedures of gathering data on student outcomes and using the results for improvement. This is driven by university expectations and the external accreditation requirements for these professions.

Howard collects and uses assessment data of incoming students, in part, to assist in placing students in appropriate courses in their first year. There is evidence at various levels that student learning information is shared and acted upon to make improvements aimed at enhancing teaching and learning. Administrators disseminate student outcome data in documents such as Self-Study reports, annual reports, unit strategic plans and program Web sites. In addition, Howard has supported workshops, web resources, and mini-grants for faculty to improve their knowledge and skills related to assessing student learning, to improve their curricula and to improve their teaching.

Based upon the review of assessment of student learning outcomes at the University and within various schools/colleges and departments/programs, the collection and use
of student assessment data at the University, while growing, can be strengthened. The following findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of the University’s status relative to MSCHE Standard 14:

**Findings**

1. Despite many improvements in assessing student learning outcomes, the University has not comprehensively implemented a university-wide strategy for assessing undergraduate student learning in each of its schools and colleges.

2. There is insufficient institutional budgetary and personnel support to ensure a continuous, systematic, and coordinated process for conducting student outcomes assessments across all units within the University.

3. There is unevenness in the databases related to student learning outcomes.

4. There is insufficient linkage between student outcomes assessment data and institutional planning.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Appoint a task force, consisting of faculty, students, administrators, and staff charged with drafting a coherent set of University-wide learning outcomes that all undergraduate students are expected to demonstrate by the time they graduate from Howard University and a methodology for their assessment.

2. Ensure more systematic and coordinated collecting, reporting, and usage of student learning outcomes assessment data related to general education and the implementation of university-wide Core Competencies beyond individual course-level assessments.

3. Maintain ongoing institutional budgetary and human support and leadership to ensure a continuous, systematic, and coordinated process for conducting student learning outcomes assessment across all undergraduate schools/colleges.

4. Ensure that all academic units maintain an up-to-date database related to student learning outcomes and that this be subsequently collected, housed, and maintained centrally in the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation.

5. Create a more deliberate link between student learning outcomes assessment data and institutional planning and communicate this in such key documents as strategic plans and annual reports.

**Supporting Documents**
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17.10 Fall 2008 Sample of Results for the Senior Undergraduate Comprehensive Examinations for Departments in the College of Arts and Sciences
Introduction

In 1988, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in its Classification of Institutions of Higher Education designated Howard University for the first time as a Research I University. With this designation, Howard joined 88 other universities, only 25 of which were private like Howard University. In 1988, Howard was the only Historically Black College/University (HBCU) with that designation.

In 2000, when Carnegie revised its ranking system, Howard was classified as a Doctoral/Research Extensive University, its highest classification for research universities. The classification was based upon the University’s level of extramural research funding, the level of its Ph.D. production, and the overall size and range of its undergraduate and graduate instructional programs. Howard was 1 of 151 universities classified in this category, and again was the only HBCU to be so classified.

In 2005, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching substantially revised its classifications. Howard is now classified as a High Research Activity (RU/H) university, the second tier classification, and joins 103 other private and public universities so designated. Universities with this classification must award at least 20 doctorates annually and perform at the required level in terms of extramural research activity.

This chapter discusses the following issues related to research at Howard University: extramural and intramural research, undergraduate and graduate research, research infrastructure and facilities, institutional support for research and publications.

During the last decade, Howard University has given focused attention to its research agenda and made a number of organizational, personnel and facilities adjustments to enhance its research profile. Many challenges remain as faculty continues to express strongly the need for more investments in the University’s research enterprise.

Extramural Research

The University recognizes the importance of extramural research and has given it priority in the recently revised mission statement. President Ribeau has articulated his goals of restructuring the University to facilitate additional graduate and professional education and sponsored research. Achieving the extramural research goals will not be done at the expense of general research among faculty and graduate and undergraduate students.

During the past decade, faculty submitted an average of 425 extramural research proposals annually. The average number of proposal that were funded annually during the past decade was 278. Approximately 65% of the proposals submitted were funded. The yearly proposal and award statistics are presented in Figure 18.1.

The number of proposals submitted peaked at 569 in 2003 and declined until 2008 when there was an increase. Awards have also decreased steadily since a high of 361 in 2004. The most recent FY 2008 figures reflect the fewest number of awards received over the past 10 years attributable perhaps partially to the decline in Federal funding. Figure 18.2 shows the total amount of funds received during the period between FY 2003 and FY 2008.

As shown in Table 18.1, sponsored activity at Howard is concentrated in six schools/colleges. In percentage terms, over a six-year period (FY 2003-2008), the largest total funds awarded was in the College of Medicine.

The University’s largest supporter of extramural research is the Federal government, which accounts for approximately 90% of the total amount of extramural funds received from FY 2003-2008. As Table 18.2 shows, Federal research dollars declined every year since 2004, after reaching a peak of $68,162,522.

Historically, the largest provider of Federal funding to the University has been the National Institutes of Health (NIH), followed by the National Science Foundation (NSF).
**Figure 18.1:** Number of Proposals Submitted and Awarded, FY 1999-2008  
*Source: Office of Sponsored Program/Research Administration*

**Table 18.1:** Total Funds Awarded by School/College for FY 2003-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School/College/Other</th>
<th>FY2003</th>
<th>FY2004</th>
<th>FY2005</th>
<th>FY2006</th>
<th>FY2007</th>
<th>FY2008</th>
<th>Total FY03-08</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>$27,901,166</td>
<td>$34,026,445</td>
<td>$25,094,310</td>
<td>$21,978,194</td>
<td>$27,615,260</td>
<td>$22,660,471</td>
<td>$159,275,846</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>9,644,930</td>
<td>12,170,157</td>
<td>8,194,911</td>
<td>6,939,237</td>
<td>7,383,712</td>
<td>4,709,474</td>
<td>49,042,421</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Architecture, Computer Science</td>
<td>8,792,460</td>
<td>8,116,667</td>
<td>9,552,753</td>
<td>6,898,578</td>
<td>4,600,106</td>
<td>4,535,251</td>
<td>42,495,815</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>3,238,490</td>
<td>3,409,845</td>
<td>2,650,418</td>
<td>8,482,740</td>
<td>2,593,897</td>
<td>3,548,468</td>
<td>23,923,858</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,055,006</td>
<td>8,829,656</td>
<td>4,113,285</td>
<td>2,209,765</td>
<td>2,471,543</td>
<td>2,240,077</td>
<td>23,919,332</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy, Nursing, Allied Health</td>
<td>5,099,511</td>
<td>3,092,398</td>
<td>4,395,822</td>
<td>4,038,701</td>
<td>$1,819,906</td>
<td>2,107,136</td>
<td>20,553,474</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (WHUT-TV, Ralph Bunche International Affairs Center, etc)</td>
<td>1,245,757</td>
<td>1,817,039</td>
<td>4,330,878</td>
<td>1,156,555</td>
<td>4,261,230</td>
<td>557,750</td>
<td>13,369,209</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Provost</td>
<td>2,350,001</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,465,224</td>
<td>1,652,128</td>
<td>1,830,500</td>
<td>1,519,493</td>
<td>11,817,346</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>856,019</td>
<td>3,843,528</td>
<td>543,200</td>
<td>511,995</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1,155,100</td>
<td>6,959,842</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>247,434</td>
<td>79,449</td>
<td>222,169</td>
<td>2,447,910</td>
<td>295,910</td>
<td>1,931,826</td>
<td>5,224,698</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,129,713</td>
<td>1,749,954</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149,474</td>
<td>3,034,141</td>
<td>3,034,141</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>826,292</td>
<td>677,375</td>
<td>591,924</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>2,540,591</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>966,975</td>
<td>358,336</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>114,142</td>
<td>277,200</td>
<td>96,350</td>
<td>1,838,003</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>718,191</td>
<td>245,279</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>161,797</td>
<td>551,509</td>
<td>115,030</td>
<td>1,811,806</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the VP for Health Sciences</td>
<td>692,433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>817,433</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,823,373</strong></td>
<td><strong>76,033,799</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65,563,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>$59,519,071</strong></td>
<td><strong>$54,342,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>$45,840,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>$367,123,815</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Administration*
Table 18.2: Total Funds Awarded by Sponsor Type for FY 2003-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Corporate / Private</th>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>State/Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>$61,123,126</td>
<td>$2,278,880</td>
<td>$1,235,253</td>
<td>$1,087,592</td>
<td>$98,522</td>
<td>$65,823,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>68,162,522</td>
<td>1,141,942</td>
<td>4,543,945</td>
<td>616,803</td>
<td>1,568,587</td>
<td>76,033,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>59,755,819</td>
<td>3,063,938</td>
<td>659,190</td>
<td>1,334,679</td>
<td>750,349</td>
<td>65,563,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>52,196,669</td>
<td>1,282,628</td>
<td>3,431,582</td>
<td>598,058</td>
<td>2,010,134</td>
<td>59,519,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2007</td>
<td>48,708,787</td>
<td>636,173</td>
<td>1,345,388</td>
<td>1,142,731</td>
<td>2,509,618</td>
<td>54,342,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2008</td>
<td>40,725,744</td>
<td>2,514,131</td>
<td>1,517,254</td>
<td>874,096</td>
<td>209,675</td>
<td>45,840,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FY 03-08</td>
<td>$330,672,667</td>
<td>$10,917,692</td>
<td>$12,732,612</td>
<td>$5,653,959</td>
<td>$7,146,885</td>
<td>$367,123,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Funds</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Administration

The slight decreases in NIH and NSF funding in FY 2008 are noteworthy, especially when contrasted with the growth in funding observed in earlier years during the decade (Figure 18.3). A continuation of this decrease over time will prove especially challenging for the University as it seeks to strengthen its research productivity and enhance its reputation as a research university. For 2009, the trend is distinctly upward in both the number of proposals and the dollars.

**Intramural Research**

The University administers seven intramural grant programs through the Offices of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences. The total amount of funds available for these intramural research programs varies from year-to-year. The Office of the Provost receives $1.56 million to assist with four intramural programs. Of the funds awarded by the Office of the Provost, $150,000 per year is for the University-Sponsored Faculty Research Program in the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education; $400,000 is earmarked for the Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Awards, $400,000 is designated for the New Faculty Research Start-up Fund, and $606,000 is allotted for the Fund for Academic Excellence Grants.

The Health Sciences support for intramural research is provided to each of the Health Sciences colleges based upon specific requests by the Dean. For AY 2008-2009, the funds awarded were as follows: Medicine—$2,128,145; Dentistry—$127,500; Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences—$162,393.
Over the past five years, the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences intensified their efforts to assist departments and schools in providing start-up funds for new faculty, particularly in the STEM areas. These two-year-long start-up packages range from $25-50,000.

The University’s pool of discretionary funds available for faculty start-ups, particularly in the STEM areas, pales in comparison to the level typically provided at peer and aspirational research universities. The relatively low level of faculty start-up funds is a major source of discord among new faculty members, who generally need access to specialized and expensive facilities and equipment. Continuing faculty who are between research grants or who are in need of funds to jump start new research initiatives have few internal sources of support, aside from the Fund for Academic Excellence, the Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Research Fund (typically for interdisciplinary research efforts) and the University-Sponsored Faculty Research Program in the Social Sciences, Humanities, and Education. Each of these initiatives offers a limited number of small awards ranging from $5,000-$50,000 annually, but because of limited resources only a small number of faculty can be supported annually. During the past two to three years, the Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Awards program has been dormant and the funds have been unofficially transferred into the New Faculty Research Start-up Fund, in order to provide greater research incentives for new hires. The lack of start-up and other intramural research funding is a serious impediment and disincentive for faculty research productivity.

**Undergraduate Research**

Undergraduate research is a valuable and integral component of the undergraduate academic experience at Howard. Undergraduate students in several departments are heavily involved in research activities even though most of these activities are not extramurally funded. Some support for undergraduate research is funded from Federal grants, and some departments and schools designate small allocations for undergraduate research. In some cases, faculty members reportedly support undergraduate research with their personal funds. Unfunded student research activities are located prominently in humanities, social sciences, and fine arts programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, though they are common throughout the other schools and colleges.

The recently established Program in Undergraduate Research (PUR) is a valuable component of the undergraduate academic experience at Howard. Sponsored by the Office of the Provost, this initiative was established in the Fall of 2005 and recognizes not only the overall benefit of engaging the entire campus in higher order thinking activities, but also has the advantage of preparing highly competitive undergraduate students to become successful graduate students.
The quintessential activity of the Office for Undergraduate Research is the annual undergraduate research symposium, *Posters on the Hilltop*. Modest awards are distributed for most outstanding presentations. The Office of Undergraduate Research, through a few external funding mechanisms, also provides travel awards to national and regional conferences for Howard University undergraduates who have participated in original research. Other activities provided by this Office include workshops on developing PowerPoint poster presentations and providing large format poster printing services—at no cost to the student.

In addition to *Posters on the Hilltop*, the College of Arts and Sciences is hosting for the fourth year the *Symposium on Undergraduate Research*. This two-day event gives undergraduate students in the College’s four Divisions—Fine Arts, Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences—an opportunity to present their research findings through poster and oral presentations.

It is noteworthy to mention that among the Howard undergraduate students who participated in the National Conference on Undergraduate Research (NCUR), 28 and 29 of the participating students’ essays were accepted for publication, respectively, in the faculty refereed NCUR Journal for 2008 and 2009, respectively. The University has been the most published academic institution in the journal for two years in a row (see Supporting Document 18.1). The University currently houses several funded extramural undergraduate programs, which provide tuition and stipends to undergraduate students. Highlighted below are some of the undergraduate research programs:

- **NSF-Howard University Science, Engineering and Mathematics Program (HUSEM)** is a multidisciplinary program involving nine departments in the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences and the College of Arts and Sciences.
- **NSF-Washington/Baltimore/Hampton Roads Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LS-AMP)** focuses on seeking to increase the number of underrepresented minorities who choose careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields.
- **NSF-Undergraduate Mentoring in Environmental Biology** provides stipends and research support to early undergraduate biology majors to encourage more participation in careers in environmental biology.
- The Howard Hughes Medical Research Scholars program is in its second year and focuses on the early introduction of freshman and sophomore students to research and training at off-campus research-intensive universities during the summer. A senior in the Howard Hughes program was one of five recipients nationwide of the prestigious Gilliam fellowship for Advanced Study ($250,000 over 4 years) to pursue graduate study at any university in the world—a first for Howard.
- The former MBRS, now Support for Continuous Research and Excellence (SCORE), program has historically provided more research training for undergraduates than any other program at the University.
- The former Fogarty Minority International Research Program (MIRT), now Minority Health International Research Training Program in Health Disparities (MHIRT), has provided global research opportunities studying tropical and infectious diseases for students from Howard and universities throughout the world.
- Additionally, several undergraduate summer programs are in existence, which prepare students for graduate school, namely:
  - McNair Program offers undergraduate students an opportunity to participate in a 6-week summer research program.
  - The Howard University Amgen Scholars Program (HUSAP) offers students...
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Enrolled in four-year colleges and universities throughout the United States, Puerto Rico and other U.S. territories, the chance to participate in a science and biotechnology summer program at Howard University.

- Howard University NOAA Center for Atmospheric Sciences (NCAS) offers an 8-week summer research internships to outstanding students who are motivated for future graduate study in the physical sciences, mathematics, or engineering.

- Leadership Alliance, an academic consortium of 33 institutions of higher learning including leading research universities and minority serving institutions, develops underrepresented students into outstanding leaders and role models in academia, business and the public sector, with an emphasis on providing them with an intensive summer research experience as a mechanism to prepare them for future graduate and professional school enrollment.

An initial Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis, examining the feasibility of a campus-wide PUR, revealed the following strengths: access to a cadre of talented, underrepresented minority students; a university-wide commitment to research excellence; a plethora of externally-funded training programs that featured undergraduate research; and an administrative commitment to developing an all-inclusive program in undergraduate research for the campus. Weaknesses of particular concern included a high mentee to mentor ratio and a paucity of financial and technical support and incentives for faculty mentors.

Graduate Research

In 2008, Howard celebrated its 50th year of doctoral production. Through its 29 Ph.D. programs, Howard continues to be the largest on-campus producer of African-American Ph.D. recipients in the United States. The University has a stated goal of developing a culture of research that has its underpinning in (a) one-on-one mentoring by committed and funded faculty, (b) partnerships with research intensive universities nationwide and institutions in the Washington metropolitan area, and (c) opportunities to participate in research workshops and interact with distinguished seminar speakers from universities and industry. The University encourages global research experiences that enhance the cultural and academic growth of students. In addition, Howard promotes the early introduction of students to research and the integration of research into interdisciplinary programs.

In addition to the laboratory and major research centers throughout the University, graduate and professional students are involved in research as an integral part of their academic experience. Through several federally funded training programs, a number of graduate students are actively engaged in research in many fields. One such program is the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) in which Howard has joined with the University of Texas–El Paso (UTEP) to form a unique partnership committed to increasing underrepresented, minority doctoral students in STEM fields. With a $2.5 million grant from the National Science Foundation, the partnership represents the first major endeavor in graduate education to join a Research-Extensive Historically Black College and University (HBCU) with a Research-Intensive Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) to address the severe underrepresentation of African-Americans and Hispanics in STEM doctoral education. The combined strengths of the two institutions are a particular advantage of the partnership. This alliance expands the range of doctoral disciplines offered by Howard’s AGEP program to include the STEM disciplines of computer engineering, environmental science and engineering, and geological sciences offered at UTEP.

The Howard University Atmospheric Sciences Cooperative Science Center (CSC) was established to study some of the critical national and global environmental issues. The University was one of four Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) awarded a combined grant of $15 million by the U.S. Department of Commerce in 2001. In 2006, Howard was awarded an additional $12.5 million by the U.S. Department of Commerce to continue its research and training efforts. The NOAA Center for Atmospheric Sciences (NCAS) consortium consists of: Jackson State University, the University of Texas at El Paso, the University of Puerto Rico at Mayaguez, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and the State University of New York at
Albany. Atmospheric Sciences is a relatively new and growing program. Enrollment in the Ph.D. program has increased from 2 in 1999 to 20 in 2009; Master’s level enrollment has decreased since 2000, reflecting an emphasis on the Ph.D. program. Student/faculty ratios approach 3.5:1. Since the inception of the program, 10 students have graduated from the program. The seven-year graduation rate for Ph.D. students of approximately 50% is typical for the department. Currently, the program has 20 graduate students who are fully funded through extramural funds.

Despite recent increases, stipend levels for graduate students at Howard remain non-competitive. While Johns Hopkins University, Harvard University, and the University of Maryland, College Park, for example, provide tuition and graduate stipend support from $25,000–$35,000, Howard provides graduate stipends of $16,000–$18,000, with a limited number of stipend/tuition packages in the $30,000-$35,000 range. The low stipend level places serious hardships on graduate students living in the high cost Washington metropolitan area.

Research Infrastructure
Reorganization of Research Administration

During the last decade, research administration at the University has undergone two major restructurings. In 2003, the University reorganized the responsibilities for research administration and created the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. Graduate School Dean Orlando L. Taylor, Ph.D. was appointed as the Vice Provost for Research to provide oversight and coordinate all aspects of university research policies, priorities, and administration. These responsibilities resided under this Office until 2006 when the second restructuring commenced.

Responding to the National Science Foundation (NSF) audit report of 2006, the University improved internal controls over management of NSF funds. In June 2006, the University’s Board of Trustees approved a new cabinet level position of Vice President for Research and Compliance (VPRC) and a new organizational structure for extramural research administration. The VPRC works with the Provost, who retains primary responsibility for research overall. The creation of this position provides the University with a single cabinet-level executive having full accountability for the University’s research administrative infrastructure. The establishment of this cabinet-level position represents the University’s commitment to promoting and fostering research activities for the University community while maintaining compliance with Federal, state, local, and University regulations governing research.

In the structure approved by President Swygert in 2006, the VPRC has two direct reports—Associate Vice President for Research Compliance and Associate Vice President for Sponsored Programs. The Associate Vice President for Research Compliance oversees the new Research Compliance Office, consisting of administrative support for institutional committees such as the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC), and the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC). The Associate Vice President for Sponsored Programs oversees the following units: (1) Research Administration, responsible for all extramural pre-award and non-financial post-award functions; (2) Post Award Services, responsible for facilitating travel transactions, human resources, and purchasing in relation to research and sponsored programs; and (3) Research Education and Technical Assistance, a new office at Howard, which provides training and technical expertise to the research community (abolished June 30, 2009). It is important to note that this new structure approved by the President, called for Grants and Contracts Accounting (a fourth department), which was to encompass Restricted Fund Accounting—to be established not under the Office of Sponsored Programs, but to remain under the Office of the Controller. The University is considering the merits of moving the functions of Grants and Contracts Accounting to Sponsored Programs.

The streamlining of the functions was intended to move the University forward in its research enterprise and to realize greater efficiencies. While this was an important action, there are still many details in the structure below the VPRC position that need to be more fully developed to create the
robust infrastructure needed to support the University’s current and projected volume of research activity.

In early 2006, former President Swygert appointed Don Coleman, Ph.D. as the Interim Vice President for Research and Compliance. The University engaged a consulting firm to assist with the implementation of the new organizational model for research. The consultant team also assisted with the development and implementation of new policies and procedures for sponsored programs. From Dr. Coleman’s effective appointment date through the end of Fiscal Year 2006–2007, Dr. Coleman led implementation of the new research and compliance structure and vetted 37 new policies to govern all aspects of extramural research administration, which are available at http://ovprc.howard.edu/. Two off-campus retreats involving over 500 faculty and staff were conducted during the summer of 2006 to lay a comprehensive foundation for compliance. Speakers at the retreats covered the University’s strategic intent and addressed all phases in the “life cycle” of a sponsored award. Dr. Coleman’s tenure ended after the appointment of Oliver G. McGee, Ph.D. as the University’s first permanent Vice President for Research and Compliance on July 1, 2007. Dr. McGee resigned his position after serving for one academic year, and Florence B. Bonner, Ph.D. Associate Vice President for Compliance, was appointed Acting Vice President for Research and Compliance in August 2008.

Facilities to Support Research

Research infrastructural excellence is apparent at several University sites. Exceptional standards are found in the Materials Science Research Center of Excellence ($1 million per year), the CReSt Nanotechnology labs ($1 million per year), and the High Energy Electrical Engineering labs ($500,000 per year) in the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Science. Underpinning these labs is a constant source of extramural and intramural funding. In these facilities “clean” labs, high-tech instrumentation and service maintenance contracts support state-of-the-art research infrastructure comparable to any RU/H university nationally.

The Special Neurosciences Research Program (SNRP) (Physiology Department) and the Howard Hughes Collaborative Core Lab (Biology) represent the only two managed Collaborative Core Units (CCUs). These facilities provide instrumentation not available in stand-alone research labs and in these high tech equipment is manned and managed by specially trained technicians. CCUs enhance collaboration between faculty and students, allow quality control of research output, and provide hands-on training activities for undergraduate and graduate students. Also CCUs are expensive and costs must be met jointly by faculty extramural research grants and the University’s own funds. Several millions were spent in 2005–2007 to upgrade instructional laboratories in the biology, chemistry, and physics departments. Upgrades included the replacement of lab tables and benches, and installation of a sprinkler system, and a self-controlled heating/AC system. The renovated facilities are adequate for instructional purposes, but are largely inadequate for state-of-the-art STEM research. While science research laboratories and facilities generally are in need of major renovation or replacement, the situation is equally severe in buildings housing the arts, humanities, and social sciences. Many of the buildings housing the STEM disciplines are more than 60 years old and are not suitable for today’s cutting-edge research. High-tech instrumentation is not on par with leading research universities. The University is planning its capital budget to begin to address these kinds of infrastructure issues.

Research Centers and Institutes

A wide array of centers and institutes engage faculty and students across the University in research. Additionally, academic departments sponsor numerous other research labs and programs to advance the University’s research mission. Table 18.3 provides examples of some of the research centers currently in operation.

Institutional Support for Research

Office of Sponsored Programs

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), under the auspices of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Compliance,
Research encompasses the departments of Research Administration (RA), Research Education & Technical Assistance (RETA), and the Post Award Services Unit (PASU). The Research Education & Technical Assistance department was abolished in June of 2009. OSP provides both pre- and post-award non-financial administrative as well as training services for sponsored research to the University community.

**Research Administration**

It is recognized that research projects and other sponsored programs are crucial for the success of academic disciplines while through research the University extends the frontiers of knowledge in all disciplines. Additionally, extramural funding is a potential source of significant revenue for the University. The Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Administration (OSP-RA) provides essential support that enables the University and its individual researchers to manage the conduct of research at the University. The main purpose of OSP-RA is to assist faculty in obtaining extramural funds, provide them administrative assistance in the pre-award and post-award stages of the grant process.

**Research Education and Technical Assistance**

The Office of Research Education and Technical Assistance (RETA) established in October 2006, under the auspices of the Office of Sponsored Programs, was charged with assessing and addressing the education and information needs of central office staff, Principal Investigators, Project Directors, departmental personnel, and others in the University's research community who are involved with sponsored programs activities. This office was abolished June 30, 2009, and the responsibilities were restructured into the Research Compliance Office.

The Office of Sponsored Programs/RETA developed and implemented the Sponsored Research Internal Certification program, entitled Research Education and Compliance Training (REACT), which covered the lifecycle of an award; created education resources and materials for both internal and external awards; and conducted education sessions, seminars, and workshops for the research community. In Spring 2007, classroom certification sessions was provided in face-to-face format, while in Spring 2008 the certification program was made available both in classroom format and via Blackboard. The classroom sessions were discontinued in August 2008 and training remained available through Blackboard until December 2008. Table 18.4 presents the total number of faculty and staff who participated in seminars, workshops, and the certification program conducted by OSP/RETA during the period January 2007-August 2008.

To disseminate information to the research community regarding funding opportunities, certification classes, workshops, and seminars, the following media proved successful: OSP/RETA list-serv, HU Communications, Interdepartmental/Campus mail, and email messages from the Provost's office.

**Post Award Services Unit**

Post Award Services is responsible for monitoring post-award expenditures, sub-recipient monitoring, and facilitating Human Resource transactions as they relate to sponsored awards.

**Research Compliance Office**

The Research Compliance Office (RCO), a division of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Compliance is responsible for maintaining regulatory compliance for the University. The RCO ensures compliance with sponsored research and training programs. This includes compliance with the A-21 and A-133 circulars, as well as internal and external audits of sponsored research. The following regulatory committees operate under RCO:

- The Institutional Review Board (IRB) for research involving human participants;
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centers/Programs</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Hereditary Prostate Cancer (AAHPC) Study Network</td>
<td>The AAHPC is a linkage study of hereditary prostate cancer. The aim is to enroll 100 families with prostate cancer in which at least four men are affected in each family and there are four other (unaffected) relatives available for the study. DNA from these families will be studied to determine if there is linkage to a known hereditary prostate cancer locus on chromosome 1 or other locations.</td>
<td>Howard University Cancer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric Sciences Cooperative Science Center</td>
<td>The Howard University Atmospheric Sciences Cooperative Science Center (CSC) was established to research some of the critical environmental conditions occurring nationally and globally. The Center has developed a primary research theme: “Improving our Understanding of Climate Variability and Weather Prediction through Integrated Observations, Models and Data Analyses.” Underneath this theme the Center defines core activities that largely demonstrate integrated efforts involving multiple partner institutions in the areas of observations, modeling, and data analysis.</td>
<td>Beltville Research Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Center</td>
<td>The mission of the Howard University Cancer Center (HUCC) is to reduce cancer morbidity and mortality in the local and underserved community, primarily African-Americans, and to have a positive impact on malignant diseases in the population. Several projects underpin the research objectives of the HUCC.</td>
<td>Howard University Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Drug and Alcohol Research</td>
<td>The Center for Drug and Alcohol Research strives to increase the participation of Howard University faculty and students in drug abuse research. The Family Life Center uses Howard University students to serve as volunteer-mentors for elementary school students who are at risk of being perpetrators or victims of antisocial behaviors. Their goal is to enhance the social skills and the academic abilities of these students through the implementation of Youth Empowerment Program components.</td>
<td>Howard University College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Drug Abuse Research</td>
<td>The Center for Drug Abuse Research was established to increase the involvement of HBCUs in federally supported research and other programs of high priority in the federal government. CDAR strives to increase the participation of faculty and students in drug abuse research at Howard University and at the Region 1 HBCUs. In addition to faculty investigators, a multidisciplinary team of researchers, graduate research assistants, and administrators staff CDAR.</td>
<td>Howard University College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Urban Progress</td>
<td>The Center for Urban Progress (CUP) is an interdisciplinary center comprised of faculty, staff, and students that mobilizes the Howard University community to address urban crises—locally, nationally, and globally—through the development of academic programs and community leadership training.</td>
<td>Howard University College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Franklin Frazier Center for Social Work Research</td>
<td>The Frazier Center for Social Work Research fosters collaborative research projects with community agencies such as the U.S. Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Education, and Health and Human Services. Past research has spanned multiple disciplines, from Fetal Alcohol Syndrome to violence prevention and its effect on the cost of public health care. The Center also supports leadership training for young women, assists homeless families with children in need of shelter in the Washington D.C. area, and studies the resettlement of Afghan refugee families in Afghanistan. Through its emphasis on excellence in inquiry, the Center promotes theory building, prevention, treatment, and policy research, as well as program evaluation.</td>
<td>Howard University School of Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers/Programs</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan/Howard University AT&amp;T Collaborative Access Team</td>
<td>The University of Michigan and Howard University along with Lucent Technologies have formed a collaborative access team. Its goal is to develop a sector for real-time X-ray studies at Argonne National laboratory’s Advanced Photon Source. This theme encompasses a range of topics that lend themselves well to the unique characteristics of high brilliance, high transverse-coherence, and favorable timing structures in single bunch mode. It is envisioned that the sector developing into an international gathering point for scientists and engineers with strong interests in time-resolved structural studies.</td>
<td>Howard University AT&amp;T Labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic AIDS Education and Training Center</td>
<td>MAAETC DCLPS at Howard University was established to provide HIV/AIDS-related training in the Washington, D.C. area. MAAETC DCLPS is a part of a multistate consortium of academic institutions and health care agencies. This consortium is one of fifteen AIDS Education and Training Centers (ETCs) established through a cooperative agreement program of the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) of the US Public Health Services, Department of Health and Human Services. MAAETC DCLPS is responsible for providing multi disciplinary HIV/AIDS education programs for targeted health care providers in the District of Columbia and surrounding areas. The MAAETC DCLPS is also working closely with metropolitan area hospitals, clinics, public health agencies, and local HIV/AIDS organizations to provide a variety of educational opportunities.</td>
<td>Howard University College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moorland-Spingarn Research Center</td>
<td>The Moorland-Spingarn Research Center (MSR)</td>
<td>Howard University Founder's Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanotechnology and Nanoscience</td>
<td>Its collections include more than 175,000 bound volumes and tens of thousands of journals, periodicals, and newspapers; more than 17,000 feet of manuscript and archival collections; nearly 1000 audio tapes; hundreds of artifacts; 100,000 prints, photographs, maps, and other graphic items. Scholars, museums, students, and other researchers from Howard University and throughout the world use the collections. Information provided by the MSRC is regularly used in exhibitions, video productions, news programming, and a wide range of publications. For the arts, humanities and social sciences, Moorland-Spingarn is a most valuable resource for research and analyses in these fields.</td>
<td>Howard University Materials Science Research Center of Excellence; CREST Nanotechnology Labs; and the High Energy Electrical Engineering Labs in the School of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Human Genome Center</td>
<td>The National Human Genome Center at Howard University is a comprehensive resource for genomic research on African Americans and other African Diaspora populations, distinguished by a diverse social context for framing biology as well as the ethical, legal, and social implications of knowledge gained from the human genome project and research on genome variation. The vision for the NHGC is founded upon Howard University’s history of providing leadership for America and the global community in the critical areas of education, health, and social justice.</td>
<td>Howard University Cancer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Neuroscience Research Program</td>
<td>The Specialized Neuroscience Research Program focuses on cutting-edge research dealing with the cellular and molecular mechanisms responsible for aging, Alzheimer's disease, and neurorespiratory problems. This interdisciplinary program has helped to enhance the quality and quantity of research, the interdisciplinary collaboration between faculty and students, and training of graduate students in this field at Howard.</td>
<td>Howard University College of Medicine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18.4: Participants in the Seminars, Workshops, and Certification Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total # of Faculty or PIs</th>
<th>Total # of Staff or Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total # Sessions Conducted</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Session Registrants</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Session Attendees</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># React Modules Conducted</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># React Module Registrants</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># React Module Attendees</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Exams Passed</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Certifications Completed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Seminars or Workshops Conducted</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Seminar or Workshop Registrants</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Seminar or Workshop Attendees</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Education and Technical Assistance

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for research involving vertebrate animals; and

The Institutional BioSafety Committee (IBC) for research involving hazardous materials, select agents or recombinant DNA.

University Regulatory Committees

Howard is committed to protecting the rights and welfare of human research participants and to complying with Federal and local regulations governing human participant research. The University’s IRB reviews and approves all research protocols involving use of human participants or analysis of data gathered from humans. Engaging in research activity involving human participants without prior approval may result in disciplinary action up to and including the termination of research privileges and/or academic appointment.

Howard demands the highest standards of humane care in the use of laboratory animals and assures compliance with Federal and local regulations and accreditation guidelines. Animals may not be used in research, testing, or teaching without prior approval from the IACUC. The University Animal Care Facilities are monitored regularly by a licensed veterinarian who, jointly with the IACUC, determines that all vertebrate animals are maintained under humane conditions. The Howard IACUC has maintained continuous accreditation by the Association for Assessment. If necessary, investigators contemplating the use of laboratory animals in research, testing, or teaching must undergo prerequisite training and acquire a copy of the IACUC Information and Guidelines for Investigators Using Animals in Research or Teaching from the Animal Care Office.

It is University policy to comply with all Federal and local regulations, and Howard’s Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approved license when ordering, receiving, storing, handling, transferring, or disposing of any radioactive material (RAM). Any activity involving RAM must comply with NRC regulations, the authorized user’s guide, and the University’s policy. All investigators using radioactive materials in their research must enroll in a Radiation Safety course that is taught biannually.

Office of the Controller

The Office of the Controller provides an accounting of all University transactions and ensures timely and accurate payments to employees and vendors as well as performs financial reporting, to include consolidation of Hospital financial results.

Restricted Fund Accounting

Restricted Fund Accounting (RFA) is located within the Controller’s Office. It is primarily responsible for the financial management of sponsored project funds. Responsibilities include controlling, processing, accounting, preparing and filing financial reports, billing for awards, and coordinating the annual A-133 audit. RFA also establishes and administers financial policies and procedures that will ensure compliance with government regulations. Additionally, RFA prepares, submits, and negotiates the University’s facilities and administrative (indirect cost) and fringe benefit rates with the Federal government.

Restricted Fund Accounting office reviews restricted funds on a monthly basis for actual to budget comparisons, for grants expiring or being extended, for the drawdown of government funding under Letters of Credit, and the collection of payments on behalf of the research community to ensure receipt of payments. The RFA staff is organized into teams assigned
to support specific schools and departments. The teams work closely with the appropriate Research Administrators to improve service to Principal Investigators, faculty, and extramural research administration staff. Each accountant is responsible for the financial management of assigned awards as they move through the grant's life cycle, for managing work load, for complying with requirements, and for meeting the specific financial reporting terms of the agreement. The supervisory and management authority for RFA is not currently within the Office of the Vice President for Research and Compliance. However, the University is reviewing the merits of moving supervisory authority from the Controller’s Office to better serve faculty conducting extramural research.

Materials Management – Purchasing

The University operates a central Purchasing Activity which procures all materials and services to include certain professional services for the University. The responsibilities and authorities of the Materials Management Department (MMD) are defined in a manual that sets forth purchasing policies and practices to be followed by all University departments. Like RFA, supervisory and management authority for the MMD is not currently found within the Office of the Vice President for Research and Compliance. The University is also reviewing the merits of moving supervisory authority for the MMD to better serve research faculty.

Publications

During the 2007-2008 academic year, faculty and mentored students have demonstrated productivity and remarkable creativity in the advancement of new knowledge. Evidence of research productivity is provided by the significant number of publications in refereed journals in the natural and social sciences, arts, and humanities. Faculty publications are discussed in Chapter 13 - Faculty.

Comparison with Peer and “Aspirational” Universities

Subsequent to a critical review and assessment of the research program at Howard University, an evaluation was conducted to examine Howard’s programs relative to peer and “aspirational” institutions. Table 18.5 shows the 10 peer and aspirational universities utilized for comparison with Howard.

Howard University has consistently generated $20-$40 million annually in Federal research funding. This performance places Howard, along with St Louis University in the lowest tier among the peer and aspirational peer universities. The predominant faculty perception is that Howard’s administration is not cognizant of the requirements for state-of-the-art research and consequently does little to facilitate or enhance grant writing. However, the Administration has, in fact, made significant allocations in the FY 2010 budget to address these issues. For example, the FY 2010 budget includes targeted professorships, enhanced research funding in academic affairs and health sciences, enhanced funding for research laboratories, and enhanced funding for research equipment.

Assessment of the Research Enterprise

Until 2006, the University held the Carnegie Foundation’s designation as a “Doctoral/Research University-Extensive,” 1 of only 151 such universities in the nation and the only Historically Black University so designated in the top tier. Today, Howard is classified as a “RU/H: Research University (High Research Activity),” 1 of 103 universities so designated and 1 of 4 Historically Black Universities in this tier, which represents a decline from the first to the second tier of research universities. This present designation was based on data from 2003-2004.

Table 18.5: Peer and Aspirational Peer Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Research Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Emory University</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>George Washington University</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>St. Louis University</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Washington University of St. Louis</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Howard University
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Table 18.6: Federally Financed R&D Expenditures at Universities and Colleges, Ranked by Expenditures FY 1999-2007 – Dollars in millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Wash Univ.</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>U Miami</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Tufts</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>GWU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>St Louis U</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Rank based on All R&D expenditures in 2007. Source: National Science Foundation

Howard has undertaken various initiatives over recent years to enhance its research enterprise. A variable pay program for extramurally funded researchers was instituted recently as one element of a compensation plan to encourage faculty to seek extramural funding (see Chapter 13—Faculty for discussion on variable salary).

In 2003, the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, as described earlier in this chapter, was established to oversee and coordinate the various dimensions of university research policy, priorities, and administration, which then included only pre- and post-award non-financial administration. The University recognizes the inextricable relationship between research and graduate education. Responsibility for extramural research administration and graduate education thus was situated under the leadership of the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. The Vice Provost for Research also served as Dean of the Graduate School. Under this structure, actions were taken to minimize or eliminate administrative barriers in processing research applications and post-award funding drawing input from an informal 13-person Faculty Research Advisory Council.

As previously mentioned in this discussion, the audit initiated by NSF in 2005 concluded that the University needed to do more to establish and maintain a system of sound internal controls to manage, account for, and monitor grant funds in accordance with Federal and agency grant requirements. Hence, the Board of Trustees approved the aforementioned new organizational structure for administering the research enterprise, which not only includes the pre-award office but all post-award functions. To date, the new organizational structure has not been fully established because of remaining issues for resolution, including the complete integration of the Post Award Service Unit and Grant and Contract Accounting departments.

A recent examination of the University’s trends in extramural research productivity (i.e., number of proposals submitted, number and dollar amounts of awards received) within schools/colleges revealed that only a few schools/colleges could be characterized accurately as actively involved in extramural research and that most schools/colleges failed to meet their established extramural research targets. This finding may account, in part, for why the University failed to reach its established goal of $100 million in extramural research funding by 2007.

Howard’s research activity, quality, and productivity qualify it for designation as a RU/H University. However, continuing challenges in its research infrastructure and administration have no doubt contributed to the lack of robustness of faculty and unit efforts in applying for and obtaining extramural funds to
support research activity. In the Fall of 2007, the Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Education and Technical Assistance conducted two surveys (Faculty Research Survey and a Research Needs Assessment Survey) to identify the issues that affect faculty research productivity, gain a better understanding of the immediate needs of the research community, and design more customer-oriented services and solutions.

Results obtained from 230 faculty members responding to the 2007 Faculty Research Survey showed that 17.20% of faculty indicated that their interests lie “very heavily in research;” while 45.8% indicated that their interests lie in both teaching and research, “but leaning towards research.” Although taken together this suggests a high level of faculty interest in research, faculty members also identified the challenges that impede their research productivity. Most faculty (79.7%) reported that their departments did not grant release time to prepare proposals for externally funded projects, although over half (53.7%) of faculty surveyed reported this as a very important activity for grant seeking (see Supporting Document 18.2).

In addition, faculty expressed high levels of dissatisfaction with several central administration units in managing funded research projects in FY 2007: these units included Accounts Payable (36.7%); Employment (29.0%); Human Resources (27.9%); Material Management Department (31.3%); Payroll (38.6%); Physical Facilities Management (42.3%); Restricted Fund Accounting (34.6%); Office of the Controller (30.9%); and Purchasing (34.0%). Specifically, the Faculty reported several internal barriers to the conduct of sponsored programs. Table 18.7 lists the reasons identified by faculty as internal impediments.

Faculty who did not apply for external funds noted several reasons for not applying for external funds (Table 18.8).

### Table 18.7: Impediments to the Conduct of Sponsored Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting the paperwork through the system</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>78.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining the appropriate signatures</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing equipment and supplies</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space to conduct research</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the expenditures</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring personnel to work on the project</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying personnel who worked on the project</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative personnel in my department</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting financial reports on time</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting technical reports on time</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting my subcontract agreement executed</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from central offices</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having to perform administrative duties</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007 Faculty Research Survey

### Table 18.8: Faculty Reasons for Not Applying for Research Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many horror stories from current PIs</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many administrative duties</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of financial incentives</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from the University’s central offices</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too time consuming</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate university facilities</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007 Faculty Research Survey

### Summary, Findings and Recommendations

Research is a major commitment and component of Howard. Funded from a variety of extramural and internal sources, research by the University’s faculty and its undergraduate and graduate students are a critical attribute.
in Howard’s quest for elevation into the top ranks of the nation’s research universities.

The University continues to have an active sponsored research portfolio, with its highest extramural support coming primarily from the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), including the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). At the same time, the robustness of the sponsored research portfolio lags significantly behind those peer and aspirational research universities that also have medical and engineering schools, and universities with the full array of STEM disciplines, such as Howard. To increase its sponsored research portfolio, a key component of any research university’s reputation, Howard will have to significantly enhance its research infrastructure and improve administrative and financial support of faculty research, as well as graduate assistantship stipends. The University is now devoting increased and focused attention to these matters.

Based on extramural support, primarily from NIH and NSF, the University presently is classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a Research University with High Research Activity (RU/H), the second highest research classification. Our examination found that the trend over the last four years was a decrease in proposals and dollars though this now appears to have been reversed. A variable pay program for extramurally funded researchers was instituted recently as one element of the plan to encourage faculty extramural funding activity. Support for extramural research at the University is a high priority within the academic portfolio assessment initiative and the new Budget Advisory Committee process.

During the last decade, extramural research administration at the University has been reorganized twice. In 2003, the University reorganized the responsibilities for extramural research administration and created the Office of the Vice Provost for Research. In June 2006, the Board of Trustees approved a new cabinet-level position of Vice President for Research and Compliance (VPRC) and a new organizational structure for extramural research administration. The following major findings and recommendations for improvement emerged from the review of this area of special emphasis for Howard:

**Findings**

1. There are insufficient funds for new faculty startups, particularly in the natural sciences, and for the internal support of research for continuing faculty, graduate student stipends, and undergraduate research.

2. The Office of Sponsored Programs/Research Administration (OSP/RA) does not have sufficient resources, inclusive of staff, to meet the needs and expectations of faculty members who are engaged in sponsored research.

3. Despite recent improvements and administrative reorganization in research administration, a significant percentage of faculty researchers report continued challenges in conducting sponsored research, particularly with respect to issues associated with accounting, personnel, and materials management.

4. There has been insufficient investment in technological and physical infrastructure to support research.

**Recommendations for Improvement**

1. Provide increased internal support for new faculty startups, particularly in the natural sciences and for investigators who wish to develop interdisciplinary research.

2. Increase internal support for undergraduate research, graduate student stipends, and for postdoctoral appointments.

3. Reconsider the desirability of placing all sponsored research administration functions, including accounting, personnel, and purchasing, under a single, seamless administrative unit, the OVPRC.

4. Provide the necessary resources to enhance a customer responsive climate within the Office of Sponsored Programs that meets the needs and expectations of faculty members who are engaged in sponsored research.

5. Provide sufficient resources to enhance University-wide technological and physical infrastructure to support research.

**Supporting Documents**

18.1 Summary of the National Conference on Undergraduate Research

18.2 2007 Faculty Research Survey Summary
This Self-Study has provided a candid look at the progress made by the University over the past ten years, where the institution stands today, and more importantly, where new journeys and pathways can and will lead in the future. It has also provided major findings and recommendations for enhancing institutional and educational effectiveness.

The Self-Study reveals that Howard is in compliance with the Characteristics of Excellence as defined by the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges and is eligible, therefore, for reaffirmation of its accreditation. The Self-Study has revealed further that the University has made considerable progress in addressing the issues raised in the 1999 MSCHE reaffirmation of accreditation and the concerns raised in the 2004 Periodic Review Report (PRR). At the same time, the University, like virtually all other similar institutions in the United States, faces significant challenges, many of which are associated with rising costs in the midst of the current domestic and global economic downturn which has affected virtually all aspects of its operations, including faculty/staff salaries, the maintenance of physical facilities, and the academic/research infrastructure. Despite this, the University is poised to pursue aggressively its aspiration to climb systematically into the top echelon of research universities in the United States.

Somewhat independent of a focused attention on fiscal issues, the Self-Study was conducted at the same time that the Board of Trustees and the University’s leadership was engaged in a review of the quality, breadth, and depth of Howard’s academic programs with an eye toward streamlining those offerings, enhancing quality and determining niche areas where the University can assume national and international stature in teaching and research. It recognizes the need to launch new academic initiatives as an element of its continuing academic portfolio assessment.

The Self-Study sought to address several issues attendant to the MSCHE standards with the goal being to enhance the quality of its administrative functions and especially its academic and research programs. Some of these issues were: Does the University’s existing mission statement accurately reflect who we are? Does the existing vision statement accurately capture our aspirations? How does the University wish to be perceived in the external world and to the national academic community? What kind of students do we want to attract in view of the institution’s mission, vision, core values, and legacy? How can we institutionalize a culture of assessment in such a way as to consistently use outcome measures to improve programs leading to enhanced student learning and institutional effectiveness? The Self-Study process has contributed to the dialogue on these and many other such issues and will continue to do so in the future.

The Self-Study coincided in part with the search for and appointment of a new president to replace H. Patrick Swygert, who presided over the institution during nine of the ten years since the last reaffirmation of accreditation. President Ribeau has sought to build upon Howard’s history and legacy to advance the institution to even greater heights by focusing on student services and building an enhanced sense of community with all of the university’s constituent elements, particularly the faculty. President Ribeau has ushered in a new era of transparency and participation by all segments of the university community on many issues, including the University’s budget, plans and performance. Early signs suggest a strengthened collegial atmosphere within the community which can enable progressive change and help the University pursue its priorities.
The assessment of the institution, through the lens of the 14 MSCHE Standards and the additional Research Emphasis section, has provided a framework through which the University examined itself, confronted its assumptions and evaluated its plans for its future. The Self-Study helped the University focus on such critical areas as planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal; leadership and governance; institutional effectiveness; student services; and assessment of student learning and academic offerings – all of which translate our mission and goals into meaningful realities for our students, faculty and the wider university community.

The University’s mission was refined and approved by the Trustees to reflect its classification as a research university and its commitments to global learning and internationalization, interdisciplinarity and attracting both highly talented students and students with high potential for academic achievement. It has also established a long-term enrollment management goal for restructuring its mix of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to bring the mix in line with its peer and aspirant institutions. Enhanced attention has been given to the University’s core curriculum for undergraduates. The University has begun to implement a comprehensive university-wide assessment plan. It established a centralized Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation to lead and coordinate the University’s assessment agenda on student learning and institutional effectiveness, collecting and organizing data to inform decision makers regarding institutional policies, budget plans, curriculum and teaching/learning strategies. These efforts will continue to be a focus of the University in the years ahead.

The University has also significantly enhanced its research infrastructure and appointed a cabinet level officer to provide oversight for the research enterprise with an eye toward significantly raising the University’s level of extramural funding for research. It has also stabilized its financial situation as reflected in its improved bond rating and the creation of a presidentially appointed Budget Advisory Committee chaired by the Provost and Chief Academic Officer, building on the work done by the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Long Range Financial Planning. The University’s new budget process is designed to assure that Howard’s financial resources are properly aligned with its academic, research and service priorities.

In the midst of these advances, the University continues to respond to concerns raised by the university’s Faculty Senate with respect to its role in university governance. President Ribeau has made significant efforts to reach out to the Faculty Senate, as well as to the faculty across all the Schools and Colleges, in an effort to engage the faculty meaningfully and transparently in University decision-making. Faculty Senate members are a part of the President’s newly formed Budget Advisory Committee, and the Self-Study Steering and Executive Committees. The President and Provost meet regularly with Faculty Senate leadership. There are positive signs that this effort and others will mitigate long standing tensions between the University’s administration and its Faculty Senate.

Based on this current assessment, the institution faces a number of contemporary challenges, which include:

- Increased expectations and requirements for Howard, like all institutions, to provide more documentation on student learning and institutional effectiveness through ongoing assessment, and to use these assessments systematically to guide program improvement.
- Increased competition from Traditionally White Institutions (TWIs) and HBCUs for the best and brightest of African-American students—Howard’s core constituency at the undergraduate, graduate and professional student levels.
- Graying of the professoriate which requires the development of succession plans for the faculty—and the University’s leadership—to attract new individuals to sustain institutional core values and legacy, while bringing new ideas and perspectives to meet changing times and student needs.
- Increasing tuition rates, partly linked to the University’s economic situation, to keep pace with the cost of education while simultaneously increasing need-
based financial aid to meet the requirements of talented students who are otherwise compromised in their ability to enroll and remain at the University.

- Evolving priorities in research funding at the national level, thereby requiring a possible realignment of research and academic priorities in order to increase extramural support and indirect cost recovery.

The Self-Study process has resulted in a number of recommendations that are designed to advance the University's mission, legacy, core values and aspirations. In general, these recommendations will continue Howard's advancement into the upper echelon of American research universities. They are also intended to strengthen the curriculum, increase extramural funding, produce a more data-driven decision making paradigm, improve faculty life and strengthen the student experience at Howard. The major recommendations promulgated herein include:

- Review and assess the impact of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal initiatives on a periodic basis.
- Align the University’s resources and budget with academic priorities resulting from program reviews and portfolio assessments and campus deliberations.
- Continue to intensify efforts to increase revenues from non-government sources to complement federal support.
- Revisit the Provost and Chief Academic Officer/Senior Vice President for Health Sciences administrative model in consultation with the various University constituencies.
- Revise the 1993 Faculty Handbook to reflect current policies and processes.
- Develop an explicit university-wide strategy, with supporting budgetary and
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infrastructure priorities, to achieve the desired undergraduate to graduate/professional student mix.

- Enhance access to a Howard education by increasing need-based student financial aid.
- Implement the recommendations promulgated by a recent Task Force on Library Resources to improve the quality of University Libraries.
- Provide support and expansion of the Students First Campaign to all departments and student support functions at all levels, including space utilization.
- Establish a dedicated faculty recruitment and retention fund to attract and retain additional nationally recognized scholars, and promote the development and retention of the University’s young and promising faculty.
- Evaluate academic offerings and streamline, modify or augment offerings in response to changing times with special emphasis on expanding interdisciplinary and experiential learning.
- Appoint a body of faculty, students and staff to review the current Board-approved University-wide core competencies and to recommend strategies to schools and colleges for revising, updating and assessing curricula to implement the competencies.
- Offer professional development and incentives to enhance faculty proficiency in utilizing new strategies and delivery systems in support of teaching and learning.
- Appoint a University-wide task force to craft a coherent set of learning outcomes for all Howard undergraduates and a methodology for assessment.
- Provide sufficient resources to enhance University-wide technological and physical infrastructure to support research.

Howard University has been described by many as a national treasure and by others as being both unique and irreplaceable. At this stage in the history of the United States, Howard certainly remains an important institution for contributing to the national goal of fulfilling the American dream of full inclusion of all of its citizens into American life. Howard today continues to be the nation’s largest producer of African-American Ph.D. recipients by a research university, as well as the largest producer of African-American undergraduates who go on to earn a Ph.D. Howard is among the nation’s leading producers of African Americans in medicine, the fine and performing arts, law, dentistry and many other professions. In an era where the nation needs to replenish its workforce with new talent in order to remain a world leader, Howard continues to be a major contributor to preparing a multicultural group of men and women for the nation’s workforce and the professions. In the global and increasingly interconnected world of today, Howard’s strong international constituency of students, faculty and alumni, as well as its connectivity with many countries in the developing world, especially in Africa and the Caribbean, positions it as a special place with respect to addressing national and international needs and goals.

Finally, this Self-Study was conducted in a manner that allowed for a thorough and candid look at where the institution has been over the past ten years, where the institution is today and, perhaps more importantly, where its new journeys and pathways will lead.
2400 Sixth Street NW
Washington, DC 20059
202-806-2550
www.howard.edu/selfstudy