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Overview of the 2011-12 Edition of the Howard Assessment Dashboard

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

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

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

It is vital for the University to perpetually maintain and monitor its student body. Defining classes/cohorts of students is important for admissions officers, enrollment management personnel, administrators, and other key stakeholders as they plan. It is also fundamental for continuous monitoring and assessment of student academic progress to occur for accountability and purposes of improvement. Student enrollment, retention and graduation are of paramount concern. This section graphically presents longitudinal information on student enrollment, retention and graduation.

**Enrollment**

**HU Undergraduate Student Enrollment by Gender, AY2011-12**

- 33.5% (2,511) Female
- 66.5% (4,987) Male

**HU Graduate/Professional Student Enrollment by Gender, AY2011-12**

- 38.7% (1,389) Female
- 61.3% (2,200) Male

Source: Data are from Registrar; graph created by OIAE.
Enrollment, Retention and Graduation Rates

HU Undergraduate Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status, AY2011-12

- United States Citizens: 93.7% (7,028)
- Permanent Residents: 3.4% (252)
- Non-Resident Alien: 2.9% (218)

HU Graduate/Professional Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status, AY2011-12

- United States Citizens: 84.6% (3,036)
- Permanent Residents: 6.4% (230)
- Non-Resident Alien: 9.0% (323)

HU Student Enrollment by Gender (All Levels), AY2011-12

- Female: 35.2% (3,900)
- Male: 64.8% (7,187)

HU Student Enrollment by Citizenship Status (All Levels), AY2011-12

- United States Citizens: 91% (10,064)
- Permanent Residents: 4% (482)
- Non-Resident Alien: 5% (541)

Source: Data are from Registrar; graph created by OIAE.
Howard University First-Time in College Student Enrollment by Cohorts 2000 to 2011

Source: Data are from HU Registrar; graph prepared by OIAE

Howard University First-time in College Student Enrollment by Gender from Cohorts 2000 to 2011

Source: Data are from HU Registrar; graph prepared by OIAE
Retention and Graduation Rates

Howard University Undergraduate Student Retention Rates from Cohort Year 1996 to 2010

Howard University Undergraduate Student Graduation Rates from Cohort Year 1996 to 2007

Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE)
Howard University Undergraduate Student 4-Year Graduation Rate by Gender from Cohort 2000 to Cohort 2008

4-Year Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE)

Howard University Undergraduate Student 6-Year Graduation Rate by Gender from Cohort 2000 to Cohort 2006

6-Year Graduation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE)
Howard University Undergraduate MALE Student Graduation Rate from Cohort 2000 to Cohort 2008

Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE)

Howard University Undergraduate FEMALE Student Graduation Rate from Cohort 2000 to Cohort 2008

Source: Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE)
Howard University Graduation Rates-Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years and Mean Rates for Private Not-for-Profit Four-Year or Above Institutions

Howard University Graduation Rates-Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years and Mean Rates for Research Universities (High Research Activity)

Data Source: IPEDS

Howard University Graduation Rates—Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Private not-for-profit 4-year or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: IPEDS

Howard University Graduation Rates—Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Howard University</th>
<th>Private not-for-profit 4-year or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: IPEDS

Howard University Graduation Rates—Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Research Universities (high research activity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: IPEDS

Howard University Graduation Rates—Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Year</th>
<th>Howard University</th>
<th>Research Universities (high research activity)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: IPEDS

Howard University Graduation Rates—Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years
Howard University Graduation Rates-Bachelor Degree Within 6 Years and Mean Rates for Private Not-for-Profit 4-Year or Above Institutions with Enrollment between 10,000-19,999

Data Source: IPEDS

Note: Six-year graduation rates presented in these graphs are taken from the IPEDS data set. This data are based on graduation rates for cohorts of first time in college, full-time students. Longitudinal data on 6-year graduation rates in an earlier graph in this volume are based on data collected from Howard University’s Office of the Provost.
2. Student Learning Outcomes

This section provides student learning outcome data. It includes undergraduate senior comprehensive exams for the College of Arts and Sciences. It also includes quantitative reasoning measured by performance on College Algebra I, College Algebra II and Pre-calculus final exams, and written communication measured by performance in English 003.

Spring 2012 Quantitative Reasoning

In Spring Semester 2012, the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) requested data of College Algebra I, College Algebra II, and Pre-calculus to measure the general education learning outcome, quantitative reasoning. “Competent” performance was defined as earning a question or final examination score of at least 60%.

College Algebra I

Institutional results show that 121 of 363 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 171 of 363 or 47.1% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher. Out of the 242 valid cases, 171 or 70.7% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAA Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Interpreting mathematical models such as formulas, graphs, tables, and schematics, and draw inferences from them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Using arithmetical, algebraic, geometric and statistical methods to solve problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing College Algebra I Competency (Institutional Results), Percent of Valid Cases Scoring 60% or Higher on MAA Category 1 and 3](chart)
College Algebra II

Institutional results show that 66 of 259 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 147 of 259 or 57% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher. Out of the 193 valid cases, 147 or 76% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher.
Pre-calculus

Institutional results show that 32 of 181 original enrollees withdrew or had no score, and 90 of 181 or 49.7% of the original enrollees earned a score of 60% or higher. Out of the 149 valid cases, 90 or 60.4% of the students earned a score of 60% or higher.
Pre-Calculus Competency (Institutional Results), Percent of Valid Cases Scoring 60% or Higher on the Final Exam

- 2009: 56% (N=135)
- 2010: 25% (N=87)
- 2011: 58% (N=117)
- 2012: 60% (N=149)
Spring 2012 Written Communication

The Department of English collected data for student writing performance in English 003. During the semester, students were required to compose four essays in the areas of Style Analysis, Definition, Investigative, and Solution. An analytic rubric was used for grading each essay based on five criteria:

- **Organization**: Organizes ideas and connects them with clear transitions.
- **Development A**: Identifies and analyzes important features of the argument and supports the main points of the argument.
- **Development B**: Explains opposition and refutes it; uses documentation.
- **Style**: Control of language, including diction and syntactic variety.
- **Grammar/Mechanics**: Facility with conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics).

For each criterion, a score, with a maximum of 20 points, is given in one of six levels: **Strong** (18-20 pts), **Satisfactory** (16-17 pts), **Passing/Acceptable** (14-15 pts), **Failing, Inadequate** (12-13 pts), **Failing, Seriously Flawed** (1-11 pts), and **Total Failure** (0 pts).

For Spring Semester 2012, two studies were conducted on the English 003 essay data. Study 1 focused on the effects of writing revisions of essays on the improvement of students' writing skills. Study 2 focused on the effects of writing multiple essays, without revisions, on the improvement of students' writing skills. See 2011-12 Assessment of General Education Outcomes in Written Communication Report for more information.

### Study 1

Students in one section of English 003 were assigned a research essay and submitted subsequently two revisions. Student performance on 5 criteria of “original essay” was compared with performance of two revisions. (N= 36 observations)

#### Descriptive Statistics of Original Essay and Its Revision by Grading Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Original Essay</th>
<th>First Revision</th>
<th>Second Revision</th>
<th>Original Essay</th>
<th>First Revision</th>
<th>Second Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development A</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>17.75</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>17.83</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>15.69</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86.86</td>
<td>88.67</td>
<td>89.08</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean scores increase reflects an average improvement for the class. The progress of student writing performance through this revision exercise can be seen more clearly by individual student score. The following histograms show how total score improvement through revision. There are 8 students scored between 75 and 84 after submitting the original essay. After first revision, only two students remain in this score range and six more students increase their scores to the range of 85 to 89. The number of students in the range of 90 to 94 remains the same. After second revision, the number of student who scores in the range of 90 to 94 increase from 15 to 22, a net increase of 7, or a 47% increase. The number of students in the range of 85 to 89 reduced from 19 to 13. Only one student actually lowered his/her score after second revision.
Study 2

The following table presents the descriptive statistics by each criterion for Study 2 in which students wrote essays without submitting revisions. There were a total of 187 valid observations. The scores of the original essay used in Study 1 are also included in Study 2, but scores of the revision essays from Study 1 are excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development A</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development B</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.04</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81.93</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means for Each Criterion for English 003 - Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development B</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development A</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score range for each criterion: 0-20

Passing Rate by Criterion for English 003 - Spring 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Passing Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development B</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar/Mechanics</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development A</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Passing cut score for each criterion: 70% (14 of 20 pts)
Comparison of Criterion Means for English 003

- Grammar/Mechanics
  - Development B: 2010 (N=794) 14.9, 2011 (N=2135) 15.2, 2012 (N=187) 15.1
  - Development A: 2010 (N=794) 15.4, 2011 (N=2135) 16.0, 2012 (N=187) 16.0
  - Organization: 2010 (N=794) 15.9, 2011 (N=2135) 16.9, 2012 (N=187) 17.3

Score range for each criterion: 0-20

Comparison of Passing Rate for English 003
Spring 2010, 2011 and 2012

- Development B: 2010 (N=794) 71%, 2011 (N=2135) 71%, 2012 (N=187) 85%
- Grammar/Mechanics: 2010 (N=794) 76%, 2011 (N=2135) 84%, 2012 (N=187) 87%
- Development A: 2010 (N=794) 88%, 2011 (N=2135) 83%, 2012 (N=187) 88%
- Style: 2010 (N=794) 95%, 2011 (N=2135) 90%, 2012 (N=187) 89%
- Organization: 2010 (N=794) 93%, 2011 (N=2135) 86%, 2012 (N=187) 90%

Passing cut score for each criterion: 70% (14 of 20 pts)
3. Institutional Surveys

Opinions matter. How satisfied are the stakeholders? Surveys of Howard stakeholders provide information on their views of various university issues. The results of the surveys also provide valuable feedback for an array of university units and information that can inform further operational, instructional and policy improvements. We have selected a few items from each survey and presented the results here. For complete results, refer to the corresponding report for each survey.

2012 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collects information annually from samples of first-year and senior students about the nature and quality of their undergraduate experience. Since its inception, more than 1,000 institutions have used NSSE to measure the extent to which students engage in effective educational practices that are empirically linked with learning, personal development and other desired outcomes such as student satisfaction, persistence and graduation. NSSE created five **Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice**: These benchmarks categorize survey items into the following areas to form subscales.

**Level of Academic Challenge (LAC):** Assesses the level of institutional promotion of academic achievement and expectation for student performance; it employs aspects of Bloom’s Taxonomy in the consideration of coursework.

**Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL):** Assesses the level of student involvement in their education and with each other in solving the types of problems they will face in college and beyond.

**Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI):** Assesses the degree to which students learn firsthand about how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside of classrooms.

**Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE):** Assesses the opportunities afforded students to learn from complementary experiences that involve diversity, technology, internships, community service and senior capstone courses; also chances for students to integrate and apply knowledge.

**Supportive Campus Environment (SCE):** Assesses the degree to which the institution embodies commitment to student success and cultivates positive working and social relations among stakeholders on campus.

In the figures that follow, Howard University mean student ratings on each benchmark area are compared to three comparison groups of institutions, as well as to above-average institutions (top 50% of the distribution) and high performing institutions (top 10%).

Maximum score for each benchmark is 100.
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for **First-Year Students**

--- Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Peers/Aspirants</th>
<th>Selected HBCU</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 50%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

---

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for **Senior Students**

--- Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Peers/Aspirants</th>
<th>Selected HBCU</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 50%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for First-Year Students
-- Active Collaborative Learning (ACL)

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for Senior Students
-- Active Collaborative Learning (ACL)

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

Criteria (12 private research universities [high research activity]): Baylor University, Brigham Young University, Catholic University of America, Clarkson University, Drexel University,
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for First-Year Students
-- Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for Senior Students
-- Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

Criteria (continued): Illinois Institute of Technology, Lehigh University, Loyola University Chicago, Polytechnic Institute of New York University, Stevens Institute of Technology, Syracuse University, and University of Denver.
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for First-Year Students
-- Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for Senior Students
-- Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)

Peers/Aspirants (6 institutions): American University, Case Western Reserve University, Emory University, Polytechnic Institute of New York University, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and University of Miami.
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for *First-Year* Students
-- Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Peers/Aspirants</th>
<th>Selected HBCU</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 50%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for *Senior* Students
-- Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Howard</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Peers/Aspirants</th>
<th>Selected HBCU</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 50%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012 Top 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

**HBCU** (7 institutions): Dillard University, Fisk University, Grambling State University, Morgan State University, Norfolk State University, Tennessee State University, and University of Maryland-Eastern Shore.
Scores between 2009 and 2012 are quite consistent across all five benchmarks.

Senior had higher scores than first-year students in all areas. The difference is particularly large in the areas of Active Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Enriching Education Experiences.
2009 and 2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison
-- Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)

Source: 2009 and 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

2009 and 2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison
-- Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

Source: 2009 and 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE
2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for First-Year Students

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE

2012 NSSE Benchmark Comparison for Senior Students

Source: 2012 NSSE Survey, OIAE
2012 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) complements the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). FSSE measures faculty members’ expectations of student engagement in educational practices. It also collects information about how faculty members spend their time on professorial activities, such as teaching and scholarship, and the types of learning experiences their institutions emphasize. In 2012, 538 faculty members were invited to participate in FSSE survey and 144 faculty members responded.

Percentage of faculty who reported that they place quite a bit or very much emphasis on the following in their courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FSSE Item</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Very Much or Quite a Bit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memorizing</strong> facts, ideas, or methods from your course and readings</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyzing</strong> the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesizing</strong> and organizing ideas, information, or experiences</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making judgments</strong> about the value of information, arguments, or methods</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applying</strong> theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UD</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lower Division (LD) courses are taken mostly by first-year and sophomore students.

Upper Division (UD) courses are taken mostly by junior and senior students.
In the Lower Division, 44% of faculty respondents were male, and 56% were female. In the Upper Division, 60% of faculty respondents were male, and 40% were female.
In the Lower Division, 78% of faculty respondents hold Doctoral degrees and 22% hold Master’s degrees. In the Upper Division, 77% of faculty respondents hold Doctoral degrees and 14% hold Master’s degrees.
2012 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey

The 2012 Howard University Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey is administered annually to prospective candidates for graduation who are enrolled in all of the University’s undergraduate programs. The primary purpose of the survey is twofold: (1) to obtain information about students’ satisfaction with a range of academic and co-academic experiences during their matriculation at the University, and (2) to inquire about their plans for the future. The survey is administered by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) through a web-based format with the assistance and cooperation of faculty and staff in the various schools and colleges. There were 950 respondents.

![Undergraduate Respondents by Gender](image1)

![Undergraduate Respondents by Citizenship Status](image2)

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
The pie charts provide key demographic information on the survey respondents. Included in these charts are gender, citizenship status, first-time student status, first-generation status, and full-time and part-time status. In addition, a chart reporting whether or not the respondents would recommend Howard to a prospective student is included.
While at Howard University, you were employed primarily:

- 43.1% Full-time Off Campus
- 23.8% Part-time On Campus
- 20.4% Never Worked
- 18.9% Full-time On Campus
- 9.5% Part-time Off Campus
- 3.3% Never Worked

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

Approximately 70.1% of the respondents worked full time, 66.9% worked part time, and 20.4% never worked.

GPA Distribution for Undergraduate Respondents

- 35.9% 3.00-3.39 GPA
- 24.7% 2.50-2.99 GPA
- 18.9% 3.40-3.59 GPA
- 15.3% 3.60-4.00 GPA
- 4.7% GPA Not Applicable
- 0.4% GPA Not Applicable

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

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

Please indicate the primary way you plan to give back to Howard as an alumna/alumnus

- 28.9% Making Financial Contributions
- 26.9% Recruiting New Students
- 15.9% Volunteering
- 8.5% Other
- 16.7% No Plan to Contribute
- 3.1% Fundraising

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**Overall Quality of the Educational Experience**

- Very Satisfied: 14.1%
- Satisfied: 71.2%
- Dissatisfied: 12.0%
- Very Dissatisfied: 1.8%
- Don't Know: 0.8%
- N/A: 0.0%

*N= 947

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**Customer Service in Administrative Offices of Your School or College**

- Very Satisfied: 14.1%
- Satisfied: 43.5%
- Dissatisfied: 21.7%
- Very Dissatisfied: 20.3%
- Don't Know: 0.4%
- N/A: 0.0%

*N= 945

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**Faculty Professionalism**

- Very Satisfied: 65.9%
- Satisfied: 21.3%
- Dissatisfied: 9.5%
- Very Dissatisfied: 2.5%
- Don't Know: 0.6%
- N/A: 0.1%

*N= 945

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with: 
Level of Intellectual Stimulation in Courses

- Very Satisfied: 16.8%
- Satisfied: 64.9%
- Dissatisfied: 15.3%
- Very Dissatisfied: 2.7%
- Don't Know: 0.3%
- N/A: 0.1%

N= 943

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

- Very Satisfied: 15.9%
- Satisfied: 51.2%
- Dissatisfied: 21.8%
- Very Dissatisfied: 7.3%
- Don't Know: 2.6%
- N/A: 1.2%

N= 935

Rate the level of satisfaction with: 
Access to Mentoring

- Very Satisfied: 11.7%
- Satisfied: 45.4%
- Dissatisfied: 22.1%
- Very Dissatisfied: 6.1%
- Don't Know: 10.8%
- N/A: 3.9%

N= 941

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following: (N=940)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%)Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate leadership</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1 (95.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work skill development</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2 (94.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of interpersonal skills</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>3 (94.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of ethics</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4 (93.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of critical thinking and analysis skills</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6 (92.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in verbal communication</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5 (93.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of life skills (e.g., prioritization, time management, etc.)</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>7 (92.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of African American culture</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6 (92.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in written communication</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>60.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>8 (91.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the humanities (languages, history, philosophy, literature, arts)</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>10 (88.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the social sciences</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>9 (90.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skill development</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>12 (86.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about personal health and nutrition</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>13 (85.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of American Culture</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>11 (86.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural knowledge</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>230.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>15 (81.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of African culture</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>14 (82.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of contributions of the African Diaspora to your major field of study</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>18 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in computer applications</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>17 (76.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of mathematics</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>19 (74.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the physical sciences</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16 (77.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of global policies and issues</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>20 (73.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE

Items are listed in descending order by “satisfaction rating,” which is the percentage of respondents who were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied.” Rankings and percentages of satisfaction (in parentheses), excluding “N/A” responses, are listed in the last column of the table.
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**Overall Living Conditions in Residence Halls**

- Very Satisfied: 2.1%
- Satisfied: 27.1%
- Dissatisfied: 27.7%
- Very Dissatisfied: 31.3%
- Don't Know: 3.9%
- N/A: 7.8%

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
**iLab and Campus Computer Laboratories**

- Very Satisfied: 12.1%
- Satisfied: 56.7%
- Dissatisfied: 19.7%
- Very Dissatisfied: 9.6%
- Don't Know: 1.1%
- N/A: 0.9%

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

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

- Very Satisfied: 5.7%
- Satisfied: 46.5%
- Dissatisfied: 31.7%
- Very Dissatisfied: 14.3%
- Don't Know: 1.6%
- N/A: 0.2%

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Graduation Clearance Process

N= 935

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

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

N= 946

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with:
Overall Condition of University Buildings

N= 937

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Undergraduate Exit Survey, OIAE
The table above shows the levels of overall student satisfaction with the student support offices. The offices are listed in descending order based on their satisfaction ratings which are the percentage of respondents who were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied.” Due to large amounts of respondents who selected “Don’t Know” or “N/A” regarding some of the offices, it may be best to consider results which exclude those respondents. *Therefore, rankings of the units and satisfaction percentages are listed in the last column of the table. These percentages were calculated having made that adjustment. The percentages of satisfaction ratings computed are listed in the parentheses.
### 2012 Graduate and Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey

The *Howard University Graduate and Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey* is administered annually to prospective candidates for graduation enrolled in all graduate/professional programs. The primary purpose of the survey is to obtain information about students’ satisfaction with a range of academic and co-academic experiences during their matriculation and to inquire about their plans for the future. The survey was administered by the Office of Institutional Assessment and Evaluation (OIAE) through a web-based format. There were 660 respondents. More detailed information can be obtained from the 2012 *Graduate/Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey Report* (HU-OIAE, 2012).

---

**Graduate/Professional Respondents by Gender**

- 70% (460) Male
- 30% (200) Female

**Graduate/Professional Respondents by Citizenship Status**

- 87% (572) U.S. Citizen
- 13% (88) Non U.S. Citizen

**First Time Status**

- 36.7% (242) First Time Graduate Student
- 5.6% (37) First Time Professional Student
- 57.7% (381) Transfer Student

**First Generation Graduate/Professional Student (in your family)**

- 56.0% (290) First Generation
- 44% (290) Not First Generation
The pie charts above provide key demographic information on the survey respondents. Included in these charts are gender, citizenship status, first-time student status, first-generation status, full-time and part-time status, and classification by degree. In addition, a chart reporting whether or not the respondents will recommend Howard to a prospective student and a chart reporting whether or not the respondents lived on campus are included.
While at Howard University, You Were Employed Primarily:

- Full-time Off Campus: 18.4%
- Part-time Off Campus: 37.3%
- Full-time On Campus: 3.9%
- Part-time On Campus: 17.6%
- Never Worked: 22.8%

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

Of 659 respondents, 22.3% worked full time, 54.9% worked part time, and 22.8% never worked.

GPA Distribution for Graduate and Professional Respondents:

- 3.60-4.00: 38.0%
- 3.40-3.59: 19.1%
- 3.00-3.39: 25.3%
- 2.50-2.99: 9.1%
- 2.00-2.49: 0.2%
- Not Applicable: 8.3%

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

Cumulative GPAs of 3.0 and above were reported by 82.4%.

Please Indicate the Primary Way You Plan to Give Back to Howard University as an Alumna/Alumnus:

- Making Financial Contributions: 26.3%
- Recruiting New Students: 19.5%
- Fundraising: 2.6%
- Volunteering: 20.0%
- Other: 10.3%
- No Plan to Contribute: 21.4%

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE
Institutional Surveys

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

N= 658

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Customer Service in Administrative Offices in Your School or College

N= 658

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Faculty Professionalism

N= 657

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Level of Intellectual Stimulation in Courses**

- Very Satisfied: 21.5%
- Satisfied: 64.7%
- Dissatisfied: 10.7%
- Very Dissatisfied: 2.4%
- Don't Know: 0.3%
- N/A: 0.5%

N = 657

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

**Your Preparation for Employment in Your Major**

- Very Satisfied: 20.1%
- Satisfied: 54.8%
- Dissatisfied: 13.8%
- Very Dissatisfied: 5.7%
- Don't Know: 3.4%
- N/A: 2.3%

N = 652

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

**Your Preparation for Further Education or Advanced Training**

- Very Satisfied: 18.9%
- Satisfied: 59.2%
- Dissatisfied: 7.4%
- Very Dissatisfied: 3.1%
- Don't Know: 6.3%
- N/A: 5.2%

N = 652

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following: (N=656)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of ethics</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1 (95.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking and analysis skills development</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3 (93.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to demonstrate leadership</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2 (94.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on life skills (e.g., prioritization, time management, etc.)</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>5 (92.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work skill development</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4 (93.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building on interpersonal skills</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>7 (92.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural knowledge</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>6 (92.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in verbal communication</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>8 (90.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in written communication</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>9 (87.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research skill development</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>10 (86.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of global policies and issues</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of contributions of the African Diaspora to your major field of study</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>12 (81.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in computer applications</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>13 (78.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE

The table above lists various general skills, knowledge, training, and abilities that students are intended to develop or obtain before graduation from Howard University. Items are listed in descending order by “satisfaction rating,” which is the percentage of respondents who were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied.”

*Due to the large amount of respondents who selected “N/A” regarding some of the items, it may be best to consider results which exclude those respondents. Responses of “Don’t Know” are included in the computation as they were considered as an evaluation other than satisfaction. *Therefore, rankings of the units and satisfaction percentages are listed in the last column of the table. These percentages were calculated having made that adjustment. The percentages of satisfaction are listed in parentheses. Excluding “N/A” responses, “Knowledge of ethics” and “Ability to Demonstrate Leadership” have the greatest satisfaction ratings of 95.7% and 94.1%, respectively. “Training in Computer Applications” still has the lowest satisfaction rating of 78.5%.
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:
Access to Wireless Internet Connection on Campus

N= 656

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

N= 656

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

N= 655
Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Opportunity for Students to Formally Assess Academic Programs**

N= 658

<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>13.2%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Provision of or Access to Institutional Assessment Information (e.g., Survey Results, etc.)**

N= 658

<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>9.9%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE

Rate the level of satisfaction with the following:

**Overall Condition of University Buildings**

N= 655

<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>4.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Exit Survey, OIAE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Support Office</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>*Rank (%Satisfied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Admissions</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>62.10%</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>4 (81.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Accounts</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>20.60%</td>
<td>14.40%</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>12 (62.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Health Service Center</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>19.30%</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>11 (64.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Enrollment Management</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>50.10%</td>
<td>12.10%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>10 (73.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Security (Police)</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>47.70%</td>
<td>10.60%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
<td>8 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Financial Services (other than Office of Financial Aid)</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>45.50%</td>
<td>18.80%</td>
<td>17.20%</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>13 (58.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Financial Aid</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>43.20%</td>
<td>21.60%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td>14 (52.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Services/Counseling in your college or school</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>33.90%</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>9 (77.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Life</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>6 (80.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAR Center- HU Office of Career Services</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>36.70%</td>
<td>27.40%</td>
<td>2 (83.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Counseling Service</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>22.90%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>36.50%</td>
<td>27.10%</td>
<td>7 (79.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Special Student Services</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>34.30%</td>
<td>32.30%</td>
<td>2 (83.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Office of International Student Services</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>32.10%</td>
<td>39.40%</td>
<td>1 (86.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School - International Student Services</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>31.20%</td>
<td>42.40%</td>
<td>5 (81.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2012 Graduate/Professional Graduating Student Exit Survey, OIAE

The table above shows the levels of overall student satisfaction pertaining to the student supporting offices. The offices are listed in descending order based on their satisfaction rating which is the percentage of respondents who were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied.” Due to the large amount of respondents who selected “Don’t Know” or “N/A” regarding some of the offices, readers may be interested in an alternative satisfaction rating which excludes these respondents. Therefore, the last column of the table lists the rankings of the offices, followed by the adjusted ratings (in the parentheses).
4. Special Topics

2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

The CIRP (Cooperative Institutional Research Program) Freshman Survey collects information that provides for a snapshot of what incoming students are like before they experience college. Sections of the CIRP survey ask questions about academic preparedness, expectations of college, student values and goals, and concerns about financing college.

Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: Academic Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest 10%</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Lowest 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: Creativity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Howard University</th>
<th>Comp1</th>
<th>Comp2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey
Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: **Drive to Achieve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Howard University</th>
<th>Comp1</th>
<th>Comp2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: **Leadership Ability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Howard University</th>
<th>Comp1</th>
<th>Comp2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest 10%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

Comp1: Private HBCUs
Comp2: All HBCUs

The five scales used are “Highest 10%,” “Above Average,” “Average,” “Below Average,” and “Lowest 10%.”
Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: **Ability to See the World from Someone Else's Perspective**

- Howard University: 28.2%, 50.2%
- Comp1: 26.0%, 41.4%
- Comp2: 24.0%

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: **Ability to Work Cooperatively with Diverse People**

- Howard University: 53.9%, 34.7%
- Comp1: 45.8%, 37.6%
- Comp2: 41.5%, 38.4%

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey

Rate yourself on each of the following traits as compared with the average person your age: **Self-Understanding**

- Howard University: 28.4%
- Comp1: 34.9%, 35.1%
- Comp2: 35.4%, 35.2%

Source: 2011 CIRP Freshman Survey
4-Year STEM Major FTIC Graduation Rates

4-Year STEM Major (with Psychology) FTIC Graduation Rates

In this section, emphasis is given to STEM major on-time graduation rates.

Source: Data are from Registrar; graph prepared by OIAE.
4-Year Majors: Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, and Physics
5-Year Majors: Architecture, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Computer Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Systems & Computer Science

Source: Data are from Registrar; graph prepared by OIAE.