Howard University

Faculty Senate

Report on Academic Renewal

Eric Walters, Chair
August 27, 2010
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOREWORD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIQUENESS, MISSION AND VISION</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC RESTRUCTURING</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a University Office of the Ombudsman For Institutional Integrity</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Reform and Action Regarding Salaries, Retirement, and Benefits for Current and Future Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Postdoctoral Scholars Association</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish “The Howard Institute”</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Investment to Promote Interdisciplinary Research Collaborations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Process for the Evaluation of Administration</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Unveil the Administration’s Strategy for Fundraising</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY SENATE RESPONSE TO THE PCAR REPORT</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formation of a Post PCAR Committee</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE DIRECTIONS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPENDIX</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOREWORD

A recurring and persistent challenge of the Faculty at Howard University is its inability, despite sustained efforts, to develop a collaborative and productive relationship with the Administration. In their persistence to secure such collaboration, the Faculty is complying with the substance of language that was crafted in major institutional documents that were jointly produced by both Faculty and Administration, and subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees. As guardians of the Academy in its local setting, and as the ultimate safeguard of the integrity and quality of academic life, the Faculty of Howard University take seriously its appropriate characterization in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (January, 1993) “as a partner with shared responsibility” (Article XI, Section C.1). The principle of shared governance, which mandates the collaborative efforts of Faculty and Administration, represents the fundamental condition, indeed, the sine qua non for ensuring that the best that we collectively have to offer will guide our discussions and, ultimately, our decisions for the benefit of our beloved Institution and especially, those who live, learn and labor in association with Howard University (Faculty Manifesto, p. 1).

Reclaiming the Academy begins with the affirmation of the Faculty role in re-claiming its primary responsibility (1) to be the guardians of the Academy in its local setting, and (2) to recognize that direct Faculty action in all matters related to the academic life of the Institution is prerequisite to the academic health and long-term welfare of the University. By virtue of what the Faculty does or fails to do in all academic matters, the character and quality of the Academy at Howard University depend. By acknowledging primacy in the Faculty for the integrity and strength of academic programs, the Faculty re-affirms its commitment to work to … collaborate with the Administration “as a partner with shared responsibility” as mandated by the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (Faculty Manifesto, p. 6).

UNIQUENESS, MISSION, AND VISION

Howard boasts of a multiethnic and multicultural faculty and student population. While other universities may make this claim, Howard transcends its peers by also providing an historic and multidisciplinary context (arts, divinity, humanities, law, medicine, social sciences, technology, etc.) for an academic mission that embraces justice and equality. As such, the vitality of our academy is deeply rooted in the African American struggle for liberation and freedom. Today, our challenge is to train future leaders who solve complex problems for the liberation of all peoples, with the understanding that liberation does not evolve from a sense of entitlement, but finds significance in service. Howard’s mission should be enacted through the affirmation that, “everyone can be great, because everyone can serve” (Martin L. King, Jr.). While the essence of service may lie within a heart full of grace, the enactment of service is strengthened and undergirded by the development of intellectual, relational, and ethical practices that are transmitted through the Faculty to our students.

The recent devastating earthquake in Haiti serves as significant bellwether to reorganize our academic landscape with a renewed emphasis upon the plight of disadvantaged persons. As we continue to fulfill the University’s mission, our commitment to Haitian relief should remind us that the Agricultural (farming communities, 1840-1900), Industrial (factory workers, 1900-1960), and Informational (skilled workers 1960-2010) Ages are not distant relics of the past. Each epoch matured with unparalleled intellectual advancements, thereby flattening the social, linguistic, and geographic barriers between groups. Contrary to common belief, these epochs remain timeless, because they are manifested cyclically throughout the world. Within this present Conceptual Age, we must train creative future leaders who recognize the limitations of orthodoxy and develop alternatives to solve persistent problems of the world with compassion and empathy.
There are many “big questions” that yet remain unaddressed and have global impact. In this regard, the legacy of Howard University’s historic past must serve as its prologue for the future (Walters, p. 7).

To this end, Howard University must envision itself as being:

- **AN AFRICAN AMERICAN HERITAGE UNIVERSITY**

  A vision of a replacement for the African American University is herein called the African American Heritage University. This is a worldview that looks less at that part of the African American experience worthy of escape but remembered so that it is not repeated, than that part which should be made a gift to the world. This is a worldview that looks less at helping African Americans “lift themselves up to equality by their boot straps” than joining with them as they seek to find and fulfill their destinies (Broome, “Change” p. 7).

- **A NEW COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY OF THE FIRST RANK**

  A new vision of the Comprehensive University of the First Rank is made from an add-on to its research agenda. Howard has always been a research university, albeit not a sponsored research university. The works of the giants among the faculty and alumni demonstrate this point. It is also demonstrated by the research done now known as REU, i.e. research experiences for undergraduates, and as institutional research focusing on Howard, e.g. the Thompson report. But, sponsored research of the first rank has always meant open pure research of the type funded by the NSF, NIH, NASA, etc. It has never meant closed applied research of the type funded by the military and business. Nevertheless, this vision includes entrepreneurial research management at the University making a means of prosperity for researchers (Broome, “Change” p. 7).

  As a comprehensive research university, a key distinction of Howard's mission is to address and solve problems; all of its other functions are subservient to this task. Let there be no misunderstanding: we are not simply here to teach students. We are here to address and engage in various research and scholarly activities as a means to solve our supporting communities' unsolved problems. The academic pursuits of the Faculty include the important dimension of teach students, yes, but not for the simple purpose of gaining degrees so they can obtain well-paying jobs. Any institution of higher learning can do that, and for Howard to make such a mistake means that we will have forgotten our origins and history, and aborted our Mission (Verharen, p. 5). Embodiment of the University’s Mission is accomplished by a familiarity of all students, undergraduate, graduate and professional, with its history of promoting equality, fairness and justice. This will ensure that all graduates are well trained to carry out Howard’s Mission.

- **A NEW NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

  A new vision of the National University is made, first, from a change of outlook on Howard’s Federal Appropriation: it is not a moral obligation the US Congress met by an Act of Congress that amounts to welfare; rather, it is a special relationship between the US Congress and Howard University that helps empower Congress to enforce its own laws. Second, it is made from the thesis that Howard University can stand as a national model of resistance to anti-intellectualism in higher education. This model has implications for the University’s research agenda and curriculum, and America’s image abroad (Broome, “Change” p. 7).

  To accomplish this, the Faculty Senate submits the following recommendations as a first step toward restructuring the academic landscape of Howard University.
FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC RESTRUCTURING

“The process of Academic Renewal, of which the Select Commission [PCAR] 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....The Academic Renewal Process will determine which programs best fit Howard’s mission, vision, priorities, and opportunities in the years ahead and lead to a more targeted and focused offerings, higher quality, and greater productivity” (Howard University 2009 Self Study Report, p. 31).

The Faculty Senate recommends the following:

1. ESTABLISH A UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN FOR INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY
2. CONSIDER REFORM AND ACTION REGARDING SALARIES, RETIREMENT, AND BENEFITS FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE FACULTY
3. ESTABLISH A POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS ASSOCIATION
4. ESTABLISH “THE HOWARD INSTITUTE”
5. TARGET INVESTMENTS TO PROMOTE INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS
6. ESTABLISH A PROCESS FOR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS BY FACULTY
7. DEVELOP AND UNVEIL THE ADMINISTRATION’S STRATEGY FOR FUNDRAISING

1. ESTABLISH A UNIVERSITY OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN (UOO) FOR INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY

The Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Standard 6 states the following:

1 Research Institutions with an Office of the Ombudsman:

Florida A&M University  [http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?ombuds](http://www.famu.edu/index.cfm?ombuds)
University of Pennsylvania (Ombudsman’s report 2010)  [http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v56/n19/ombudsman.html](http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v56/n19/ombudsman.html)
Harvard University  [http://www.universityombudsman.harvard.edu/](http://www.universityombudsman.harvard.edu/)
Cornell University  [http://ombudsman.cornell.edu/](http://ombudsman.cornell.edu/)
Stanford University  [http://www.stanford.edu/dept/ombuds/ethics.html](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/ombuds/ethics.html)
“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 intellectual and academic freedom” (Middle States, p. 10).

In response to MSCHE Standard 6, the 2009 Howard University Self-Study Report found the following:

1. There is insufficient inclusion of ethics and integrity as core components in the orientation process of 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 (Middle States, p. 64).

The plan to transition Howard toward a research intensive university obligates the University stakeholders to ensure that fairness and equity will be upheld to the highest standards. A UOO provides valuable insight and feedback to university stakeholders with regard to Standards of Best Practices to maximize ethical and professional practices across the university. An ombudsman is confidential, independent, and neutral. As an outsider, the UOO would be free of internal politics at the University and have no vested interest in the outcomes of dispute resolutions other than to serve justice and the public’s interest. A University Office of the Ombudsman would operate independently of the Board of Trustees, Administration, and Faculty, consistent with the code of ethics and standards of practice of the International Ombudsman Association.

The UOO would be accessible to all Howard University faculty, staff, fellows, students and retirees. The UOO would serve as an independent resource for research, investigation, data collection, and problem resolution to ensure that all members of the University community are treated equitably and fairly. It would provide confidential and informal assistance to help resolve issues related to workplace and academic environments. A visitor may choose to dialogue with the UOO under circumstances that retain anonymity, while considering possible options of resolution. The UOO would produce a confidential annual statistical report that summarizes the activity of the Office and may identify systemic problems.

Investigatory capacities include but are not limited to:

- Changes in computer security systems
- Safety programs
- Access and information regarding University Counsel
- Ethics cases
- Bullying cases
- Racial or sexual harassment cases
- Contractual disputes

2. CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING SALARIES, RETIREMENT, AND BENEFITS FOR CURRENT AND FUTURE FACULTY

The Faculty of Howard University is at a crossroads. Recommendations from the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal, if adopted by the Board of Trustees, will require faculty to take on more responsibility to develop innovative academic programming and interdisciplinary research and teaching. However, more than two-thirds of Faculty are at or
near retirement age and are among the lowest paid among faculties in area colleges and universities. The Faculty at Howard University needs to be considered as a valuable part of the University's infrastructure and as such, are deserving of thoughtful and immediate information on plans for increasing Faculty salaries, on benefits that provide the best quality of health care, and on retirement programs that allow Faculty to gradually retire while giving academic programs an opportunity to replace senior, retiring Faculty.

To that end, the Faculty Senate makes the following recommendations:

**A. Implement Yearly Salary Increases for All Faculty Performing at a Satisfactory Level**

Faculty who perform at the satisfactory level should receive yearly (fair market) adjustments to their IBS. Faculty who do not meet basic expectations of their duties will be ineligible for fair market adjustment to the base salary.

Faculty who exceed basic expectations of their duties should receive additional compensation. Any merit-based compensation should be determined subsequent to fair market adjustment to base salary.

It is recommended that the Administration, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, develop a 3-4 year plan for salary increases for current and future Faculty in order to bring salaries into compliance with salaries at the area universities (The planned 3% increase in August, 2010, while welcomed, does not ameliorate the loss of faculty salary increases since 2008.)

The August 18, 2010 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* published the "U.S. News Best Colleges" rankings. In the ranking methodology section, faculty salary was one of the most important components. Faculty salary was defined as (1) the average faculty pay, plus (2) benefits, during the 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years, adjusted for regional differences in the cost of living using indexes from the consulting firm, *Runzheimer International*. Howard University must stabilize its academy by providing competitive, market rate salaries for its Faculty. This will enhance recruitment and retention of its faculty and ensure that salaries serve to optimize 403b contributions toward retirement.

**B. Vet, Revise, and Implement the Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES)**

It is recommended that FPES, the process of review for subsequent merit-based increases, undergo analysis for reliability and validity this academic year, and that the evaluation be conducted at the beginning of the following academic year.

The Faculty Senate expects that the existing Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES) draft be piloted and vetted within Schools and Colleges (with appropriate feedback and revision) during FY2011, prior to its formal implementation in FY2012.

The use of the FPES as a tool for performance-based merit increases should be understood and implemented in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook* (1993).

**C. Review and Revise Variable Salary Component (VSC) Procedures and Policies**
It is recommended that clear criteria for VSC distribution for FY 2011 be established in consultation with the Faculty Senate, and clearly communicated to all Faculty.

Background:

- The 2007 Faculty Senate Task Force on University Salaries recommended that Faculty institutional base salary (IBS) be comprised of a one-time market adjustment, cost of living adjustments, merit increases, and performance bonuses. In response to this recommendation, the Administration implemented the use of the VSC as a means to reward Faculty grantsmanship activities. In the past three years, the policy regarding VSC compensation has become increasingly opaque.

- Despite repeated requests from the Faculty Senate, the Administration has failed to provide any information pertaining to the distribution of VSC funds, and its recipients, for FY 2010.

It is further recommended that criteria for distribution of the Variable Salary Component (VSC) should be reviewed again by the Faculty Senate to recommend changes before its future application. In the interest of transparency, information regarding criteria and eligibility for the VSC should be widely distributed to all Faculty at the beginning of each academic year. VSC should include factors related but not limited to:

- Grantsmanship
- Teaching
- Service
- Academic innovation
- Scholarship and research with national and global impact

D. Retirement

The Faculty Senate recognizes that more than two-thirds of the current faculty are at or near retirement age, and that many remain on the faculty past retirement age because of the high costs of health insurance and living expenses in the Washington, DC metropolitan area. Accordingly, the Senate recommends that a thoughtful program of phased-retirement be introduced to the faculty this Academic Year, 2010-2011 and that appropriate incentives, such as health care, tuition remission, emeritus status, access to the university's space and facilities, extra salary, at a minimum, be available to retiring faculty as a part of the retirement plan.

2007 AAUP survey data suggest that, although only 32 percent of the 567 responding institutions reported that they currently had a phase-retirement program, the number of phased-retirement programs in higher education has increased among both public and private institutions in the last ten years. For the survey, phased retirement was operationally defined as “a formal program that permits tenured faculty members to phase into retirement by working fractional-time (for prorated pay) on the condition that they waive tenure at a specified time”. More institutions reported implementing phased-retirement programs since 2000 (n=58) than between 1994 and 1999 (n=51). The advantages of phased-retirement programs are that faculty are allowed to step-down from teaching and advising responsibilities over a specified period of time while allowing programs to search for and mentor newer faculty to replace them. Most phased-retirement plans were reportedly made available to qualified faculty only for a specified time (Conley).

Retirement incentives have increasingly become accepted practice among institutions of higher education. These are designed to encourage tenured faculty members to retire prior to age seventy. From the AAUP survey, institutions
offering phased-retirement also offered contributions to health insurance (78%), partial retirements and salary (50%), extra retirement payments and credits (34%), extra salary (34%) and other incentives (23%). Other incentives included, but were not limited to, secretarial assistance, parking, library privileges, parking, access to computer networks, tuition remission, office and lab space, and emeritus status (Conley).

E. Benefits

It is recommended that an ad hoc Faculty committee be impaneled to review health benefits from the projected carrier, Cigna, and to recommend, if necessary, alternatives to their health provider. It is further recommended that the University continuously involve Faculty in decisions about health care providers in future.

On a somber note, we express our dissatisfaction with the process by which the recent changes to Faculty benefits was adopted and implemented. It was the understanding of the leadership and the general membership of the Faculty Senate that the present administration would establish and maintain the practice of “openness” and “inclusivity” with respect to all matters of interest to the Faculty, and to the University community at large. In the spirit of professed openness and inclusivity, there should have been communication to the Faculty regarding proposed changes, with the offered opportunity to discuss and provide input into the final form of changes in advance of their rather speedy adoption and immediate implementation.

We have learned from our Faculty Senate representatives on the Board of Trustees that the implemented changes to the faculty benefits package was the collaborative work of the Administration and the Finance Committee of the Board. Since Faculty Senate representatives are not members of this committee, even at the level of the Board, there was no opportunity for Faculty input into the discussion and adoption of the changes to the Faculty benefits program. The sordid legacy of discord that has characterized Faculty Senate-Administration relations has resulted directly from the continuance of the “closed” and “exclusive” decision making process, as is the case in our current discontent. Please note that our concern is not specifically with the content of the changes, but rather and more substantially with the closed and exclusive nature of the discussion and subsequent adoption of those changes.

3. ESTABLISH A POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS ASSOCIATION

Postdoctoral researchers contribute the bulk of hands-on investigation at major research universities. Establishing a research intensive campus will require that Howard University augment efforts, infrastructure and resources to increase the recognition and viability of postdoctoral researchers.

Postdoctoral researchers should become an integral force at Howard University and, as such, they will require representation and voice with regard to employment policies and needs. At the present time, issues that directly pertain to the unique status of postdocs are often undervalued and overlooked.

Awareness of the need of postdocs to network and have significant representation within various research and scholarly environments is demonstrated by the vast network of postdoctoral organizations (http://www.phds.org/postdoc/grad-student-and-postdoc-organizations/postdoctoral-associations/) within governmental, public, and private institutions.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY MUST:
Develop guidelines and practices for postdoctoral candidates
Develop policies that draw clear distinctions between postdoctoral fellows, postdoctoral appointees, postdoctoral research assistant/associates, national and international postdocs
Provide targeted, competitive funding and support of postdoctoral candidates within strategic areas
Develop policies that clearly define employment benefits
Establish formal integration of postdoctoral representation within the University framework
Establish postdoctoral representation on various University committees
Maximize infrastructure to allow postdocs to compete for extramural funding in efforts to expand research base
Maximize recruitment efforts and potential for postdoctoral transition into research- and tenure-track faculty status in professoriate
Establish professional and career development for postdocs

4. ESTABLISH “THE HOWARD INSTITUTE”^2

The challenges put to Howard University in the twenty-first century by a flattened Congressional Appropriation, the global economy, competition for students, and new research funding necessitate greater involvement of Faculty on administrative and governance issues. Chief among these issues is a clear if not altogether shared vision of the University. This is a pathway for the life of the University that acknowledges its past and keeps it on track out of harm’s way of vacillation and chaos. There is a need at Howard University for its Trustees and President to make a symbolic gesture of their common desire for greater and sustained scholarship at the highest degrees from the Faculty on issues of vision. That symbol is The Howard Institute. The Howard Institute will be a think tank located at Howard University. The responsibilities of the Institute shall include the following:

- Publish the Institute’s vision and opinions on existing and openly proposed University policies
- Organize seminars and workshops on vision issues for the Howard University community
- Maintain a library on visions of Howard University and opinions on them.

The Howard Institute shall seek to be consistently evaluated by the Howard community as having the most influential, the most quoted, and the most trusted independent opinions on Howard University policy and foreseeable futures.

5. TARGET INVESTMENTS TO PROMOTE INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH COLLABORATIONS

The Faculty Senate envisions that our process of Academic Renewal must be defined on the basis of shared goals and priorities that originate from the Faculty. This is of most significance with regard to scholarship and research goals and initiatives. To this end, the Faculty Senate has proposed five broad categories of Research Initiatives (5 pillars) to serve as a guide to train students, our most precious resource, for the future. The Faculty Senate encourages vigorous debate about these initiatives in an effort to reshape the academic landscape at Howard in fulfillment of its mission.

^2 Broome, Taft. “The Howard Institute” (May 13, 2010)
RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

- Funding and investment (fiduciary, personnel) for interdisciplinary initiatives is derived from:
  - Infrastructure efficiencies
  - Academic renewal: innovation, conflation, restructuring, elimination
  - Phased separation: retirement incentives, post-retirement affiliation
- A coordinator to be in charge of each pillar
- Portfolio investment for each pillar ($1.5 million minimum per pillar)
- Competitive interdisciplinary seed grants
- Incorporation within the Budget Advisory Council process

6. ESTABLISH A PROCESS FOR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS BY FACULTY

The purpose of the evaluation process is to begin a regular, ongoing and constructive review of the performance of the Deans and other administrators. This constructive evaluation will enable Faculty members to substantively participate in shared governance of their own academic units and of the University and to provide a mechanism of documenting achievements and progress.

The Howard University Faculty Senate is committed to the principles of shared governance enshrined in the Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Senate Constitution. It is the Senate’s strongly held belief that the academic environment of the University is the responsibility of its Faculty, which should hold each administrator accountable for his/her performance. To this end, the Faculty of each unit of Howard University is asked to review and evaluate the performance of Deans and Administrators by focusing on the key components of successful and productive administration including Leadership, Faculty and Program Development, Fairness and Ethics, Communication and Administration.
GOALS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS:

- Document the achievements and progress of administrative units
- Provide a framework for strategic planning and periodic review and re-evaluation of the goals and priorities of administrative units
- Foster continuous improvement of programs and services of the administrative units
- Provide helpful feedback to administrators regarding their performance vis-a-vis faculty expectations
- Inform the administrators of the views and needs of the Faculty
- Provide Faculty advice and counsel to administrators
- Serve as a basis for dialogue between administrators and the Faculty

7. DEVELOP AND UNVEIL THE ADMINISTRATION’S STRATEGY FOR FUNDRAISING

“While the constant level of federal support actually has provided some stability during the period of the economic downturn, the University knows that it must increase revenue from other sources in order to maintain and strengthen its programs and to accommodate inflation…. Howard has identified a set of actions that are aimed at: addressing its financial realities; instituting adequate financial controls for effective management of institutional resources, assessing the University's financial performance and position and maintaining its financial health; and positioning Howard to realize its aspirations for moving forward. This will require that the Institution: prioritize; improve the efficiency and quality of services provided to students, faculty, and staff; and increase its overall level of financial resources” (Middle States, pp. 4-5).

The PCAR report places much emphasis upon evaluation of programmatic activity, which includes data pertaining to research and scholarly productivity. Notwithstanding a healthy research infrastructure (grantsmanship, fiduciary accountability, resources/core facilities), the University Administration must also contribute to the support of the academic environment by expanding the Institution’s private support so the University may continue to grow as a national research university. The Faculty Senate makes the recommendation that:

- The President, Provost/Chief Academic Officer and Senior Vice President of Health Sciences develop fundraising goals
- The Administration develop a strategy to increase alumni giving
- The Deans of Schools/Colleges be charged and empowered to develop and enact fundraising goals
- All administrators provide regular updates to the University community of its plans for fundraising, and the status thereof
- Fiduciary information/data of fundraising revenue and activities be shared with University community and its contributors
- The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) ensure that there is transparency in how funds are disbursed
President Sidney Ribeau appointed the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal (PCAR) with representative membership that includes Howard faculty, staff, students, administrators, and external members. Over and against the claim that PCAR is a “faculty-driven” process, the Faculty Senate notes that PCAR is a Presidential, not a faculty commission. Its members are appointed by the President. The Faculty Senate was not consulted or provided a formal opportunity to determine the charge or design of the broad PCAR agenda. It is important to note that despite the PCAR being appointed on October 27, 2009, the Commission did not initially convene until December, 2009.

The Faculty Senate agrees that a University-wide review of academic programs is an essential and regular part of a progressive, innovative, and growth-oriented academy. The commitment and hard work of the faculty members within the various sub-committees/working groups of PCAR—Graduate Programs, Professional (Health Sciences) Programs, Professional (non-Health Science) Programs, Undergraduate Studies—should be applauded for completing the charge of evaluating the multiple (approximately 181) programs within the HU academic landscape. The data collection, interviews of faculty, students and program heads is unprecedented and worthwhile. PCAR dynamics have enriched the dialogue amongst individuals across disciplines, adding depth, perspective, and insight to how the faculty fulfills the mission of Howard. Moreover, the PCAR report illuminates the comprehensive expertise, commitment, and success of Howard University faculty who have excelled in the face of the persistent challenges and deficiencies of infrastructure, resources, and support systems. The Faculty Senate asserts that the context and plan for “academic renewal” going forward must be undertaken with a commitment to address such deficiencies immediately.

The Faculty Senate reminds the reader that the impetus for the existence of PCAR was based upon the claim that the University could no longer “afford” to support the existing 180+ academic programs. Thus, the claim of a structural deficit obliged the PCAR to make informed recommendations for academic renewal based upon data outlining program-specific costs. Consistent with this is the fact that the MSCHE site team expressed its support for the Academic Renewal Process, with the following recommendations:

“The site visit team has several suggestions for advancing initiatives already under way aimed at increasing long-term financial stability.

The Academic Renewal Process should include an in-depth analysis of the financial impact of each strategy and initiative including its implications for operations and infrastructure and facilities. This includes setting specific targets in such areas as enrollment and research funding, including analyses of financial feasibility. For example, the financial dynamics of undergraduate programs differ significantly from those of graduate programs. An assessment of the budgetary implications of rebalancing undergraduate and graduate enrollments in terms of the implications for both revenue and expenditures is essential.

The programmatic review conducted under the Academic Renewal process should be accompanied by a complementary process to address administrative and service functions. Such a review should have the aim of defining service levels necessary to support the University’s programmatic objectives and appropriate models for providing those services and resources required. Another important objective is the identification of potential efficiencies that could lead to cost savings. Attention should be devoted to services that are duplicated in different parts of the University that are candidates for a higher degree of collaboration or consolidation” (Middle States, p. 5).

Systemic degeneration of academic programs at Howard is a consequence of multiple factors that have persistently undermined faculty productivity (i.e., neglect of physical infrastructure, shortage of staff support, failures in grants...
management, salary compression/under-compensation of faculty). This raises serious questions regarding the moral responsibility and culpability of the Board of Trustees to ensure the health of the Academy. It is the Faculty Senate’s position that the ‘structural deficit’ is less related to the number of academic programs, but more a symptom of the ill-management of University resources. In this vein, the Faculty Senate remains skeptical of the Board’s capacity to interpret the PCAR report and to make sound decisions regarding Howard’s academic future:

“Allegations about the Board of Trustees’ financial mismanagement call into question its moral authority or competence to make changes to academic programs without the fully informed advice and consent of the faculty. ‘Fully informed’ means faculty access to all budget data down to department, program and staff levels, physical plant, capital holdings—in short a complete inventory of the University’s liabilities and assets, revenue and shortfall projections, accurate endowment figures, status of pension funds, and any other financial information relevant to assessing Howard University’s capacity for solving the comprehensive ranges of its justifying communities’ problems” (Verharen, p. 7).

The Faculty Senate asserts that key stakeholders (Board of Trustees, Administration, Faculty) will better execute the University’s mission through its academic programs with a complete and transparent inventory of the University’s resources and liabilities (which include unproductive, unqualified, and deficient members of the Board of Trustees). The reader should be reminded that the charge of PCAR was restricted to assessment and evaluation of programs, with less if any endeavor to identify the dreams and visions of the faculty, schools/departments, and programs. We must now see the PCAR report as a starting point for a broader discussion with the Faculty—the chief guardians of the academy—whereby the visions and dreams of Faculty can be fulfilled in unprecedented research and scholarly pursuits as we execute a unique Mission. The Faculty Senate expects that President Ribeau and the Academic Excellence Committee of the Board of Trustees commit to an open and transparent post-PCAR (P-PCAR) cooperative dialogue with the Faculty Senate in response to the PCAR recommendations.

The Faculty Senate reiterates what was stated in the 2009 Howard University Self-Study Report to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education:

“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” (Middle States, p. 52).

PCAR has recommended multiple programmatic changes. At this point, it is necessary to determine who will be responsible for initiating direct dialog and interaction amongst specific faculties within programs that will be affected. These interactions will serve to confirm the validity of proposed PCAR recommendations, and to offer specific perspectives and suggestions for refinement. The lack of sufficient time for the Faculty to vet and deliberate PCAR recommendations prior to: 1) final submission to President Ribeau and 2) President Ribeau’s (September 23, 2010) presentation of recommendations for academic renewal to the Board of Trustees contrasts with the processes recommended by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education Site Team when commenting on the complexities of the Academic Renewal Process at Howard:

“In light of all of these dynamics, the team has two suggestions.

The newly appointed Academic Renewal Commission should be sure to solicit representative feedback from faculty and students in each college and school, mindful of the fact that academic renewal means
different things to different people in different disciplines. The team took note of some very good initiatives and programs already on-going at the college level that are designed to promote interdisciplinary and experiential approaches to Howard’s educational offerings. We encourage continued dialogue among faculty, administrators, and students, making the process of aligning and adjusting educational programs optimally transparent and productive.

The Academic Renewal Process should be tightly coordinated with the other two “legs of the stool” referred to in the opening of this report: parallel institution-wide efforts to reform business processes and communication across the institution. None of these three can be successful without each of the others” (Middle States...Report, p. 17).

The data on clinical faculty revenue potential, workload, research, and scholarship from the Howard University Hospital, the Dental Clinic and other Health Sciences services should be considered during the pre-implementation phases of the PCAR recommendations. Restructuring of academic programs associated therewith requires a thorough analysis to assess faculty productivity and function within the health sciences. Any reorganization of programs will impact: 1) faculty welfare; 2) faculty productivity in research, teaching, scholarship and; and 3) capacity to maintain/enhance revenue from clinical services.

The Faculty Senate recommends that assessments include, but not be limited to:

- Necessary balance of teaching, research, and clinical responsibilities of the faculty (workload assessments)
- Positive and negative fiduciary impact of current infrastructure on clinical revenue (billing, physical facilities)
- Salaries and compensation (practice plans, promotions, etc.)
- Grants and contracts management
- Achieving and understanding balance and jurisdiction amongst “enterprise-related” and “academic-centered” divisions of the University

The Faculty Senate presents the following outline as a strategy for restructuring our academic landscape in an effort to uphold and illuminate: a) a cooperative, transparent process; b) inclusiveness of faculty input; c) a system of checks and balances; d) maximum buy-in for all university stakeholders. The suggested plan is consistent with the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Standard 10, which states the following:

“The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals” (Middle States, p. 52).

**FORMATION OF A POST-PCAR (P-PCAR) COMMITTEE**

Post-PCAR planning and subsequent implementation of PCAR recommendations should be conducted in accordance with the principles of shared governance and transparency.

**A. COMPOSITION:**

- The P-PCAR Committee should consist of faculty, staff, students, administrators, and alumni.
- The membership of this committee would be developed via consultation amongst the Administration and the Faculty Senate.
B. **CHARGE:** THE COMMITTEE'S CHARGE WOULD INCLUDE BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO:

- Aligning clinical-related Faculty activities with PCAR objectives
- Refining proposed recommendations after consultation with Faculty
- Prioritizing the implementation of planned recommendations
- Establishing timelines, benchmarks and completion schedules
- Monitoring implementation of planned recommendations
- Consulting with the BAC to ensure budgetary feasibility of academic restructuring
- Reporting regularly to Faculty and University community
- Ensuring that mission-centered objectives are addressed
- Ensuring that the restructuring process is consistent with the *Faculty Handbook (1993)*
- Documenting all activities for historical preservation and reporting to external agencies

C. **IMPLEMENTATION AND PLANNING:**

**PHASE I. IDENTIFY CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS TO DEFINE NEW RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY PURSUITS**

- Define program-specific goals
- Identify similarities and priorities amongst programs
- Identify mission oriented objectives
- Interface and dialog with senior academic officers (Provost and Senior VP Health Sciences)

**PHASE II. ENCOURAGE FACULTY TO ESTABLISH PARTNERSHIPS FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLABORATIONS**

- Intramural and extramural partnerships
- Scholarship and research focused toward underrepresented groups and issues
- Grantmanship and funding

**PHASE III. INVEST FOR THE FUTURE: P-PCAR AND BAC DELIBERATIONS TO ALIGN BUDGET PRIORITIES WITH RECOMMENDATIONS**

- Physical infrastructure supports
  - Concrete—buildings
  - Core facilities and services
  - Centers

- Personnel Infrastructure Supports
  - Secretarial/administrative staff
  - Faculty
  - Post-doctoral researchers
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

At Howard University each professor finds his or her academic responsibilities and the academic freedoms needed to fulfill them in three authority structures. One authority is the Howard University Faculty Handbook (1993), which locates professors in the administrative chain of command. Another authority is the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (1993), which locates them in the governance system. The third authority is, ultimately, the Constitution of the United States of America (adopted 1787), which applies to professors qua citizens and/or otherwise through the University’s Article of Incorporation in the District of Columbia.

It is important to remind the Administration that it was the continuance of dynamics such as the ones described in the “benefits” section that brought the Faculty to such frustration with the Administration that the historic and momentous Faculty Manifesto was written, presented to the membership of the Faculty Senate, thoroughly discussed, and thunderously adopted in 2007. We re-affirm the statement made in that document, and draw specific attention to the tone of responsible faculty advocacy and, if necessary, faculty activism. We take the position that, in part, one share’s responsibility for how one is treated. And, for that reason, the Faculty Manifesto frames a faculty commitment to never again collaborate with its exclusion and dismissal from substantive involvement in matters of significance to the Faculty. To do so would undermine the Faculty Manifesto as a framing document, and of equal importance, would foster a self-image of powerlessness and complicit silence in the presence of injustice.

In keeping with the purpose of this Report and in the spirit of shared governance, the Faculty Senate provides its recommendations with the expectation that:

- The President communicate to the Faculty Senate whether he will consider the wisdom and advice presented above in the preparation of his report; and that

- The President communicate to the Faculty Senate which, if any, parts of that wisdom and advice he took and which he did not take, and why.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Who are we? How did we get here? Where shall we go? How shall we get there? Howard University has, since its founding, had three brands: an African American university; a comprehensive university of the first rank; and a national university. At the founding of Howard University (1867) these brands were in disunity. In becoming law the Congressional Appropriation to Howard (1928) brought them into unity. However, Howard’s response to Brown v. Board of Education (1954), as articulated in the so-called Thompson report (1966), put them again into disunity. Today, the appointment of Sydney A. Ribeau to the 16th Presidency of Howard University (2008) is an opportunity for Howard to re-unify its brands. Change Howard is a proposal for seizing this opportunity. Change Howard as follows:

1. Change its African American University brand to an African American Heritage University brand.

2. Add an entrepreneurial research management dimension to the research support plan of its Comprehensive University of the First Rank brand.

3. Re-conceptualize the justification for Howard’s Appropriation and re-negotiate its National University brand as a national model of resistance to anti-intellectualism.

4. Create an institute sponsored by the Office of the President with a fourfold mission:
   - Operate as a think tank advising the President on Howard’s mandates for change and visions of change;
   - Advise the President on the coordination of existing activities and the initiation of new activities that nurture the K-12 pipeline of students to Howard, as well as recruit faculty, who would fit into the university’s new brands;
   - Develop and propose curricula and such other educational initiatives as would illuminate for students—undergraduates and graduates alike—as well as faculty, staff, trustees and alumni, their roles in the new brands; and
   - Manage the Intellectual Capital Initiative (ICI) for the University.
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FOREWORDS

Who are we? How did we get here? Where shall we go? How shall we get there? Howard University has, since its founding, had three brands: an African American university; a comprehensive university of the first rank; and a national university. At the founding of Howard University (1867) these brands were in disunity. In becoming law the Congressional Appropriation to Howard (1928) brought them into unity. However, Howard’s response to Brown v. Board of Education (1954), as articulated in the so-called Thompson report (1966), put them again into disunity. Today, the appointment of Sydney A. Ribeau to the 16th Presidency of Howard University (2008) is an opportunity for Howard to re-unify its brands. Change Howard is a proposal for seizing this opportunity.

THE NATION

A society is a collectivity of persons having a robust history, i.e. a history exhibiting patterns that can be projected into an apparent future. Three general principles of social order tell that a society is held intact insofar as:

- Its members see that their memberships serve their individual self-interests;
- It has leaders presiding over a common cause the members set higher than self-interests; and
- It has leaders empowered with forces and pressures backed up by force to regulate the members and protect them from regulation by others.

Hobbes’ Leviathan (1651), Locke’s Second Treatise on Civil Government (1689) and Rousseau’s The Social Contract (1762) created and adapted specialized forms of these principles to France and England.

In the USA, the self-interest principle includes the primary goods that John Rawls treated in Justice As Fairness (1971), e.g. food, shelter, protection from enemies and, most importantly, self-esteem. The higher cause might once have been Christianity and would seem to be democracy except that the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian versions of democracy remain at war. And the principle of force derives principally from the military and the making and enforcement of laws.

So that the ordinary members and their leaders might adapt these principles to cases, the society produces narrative histories and a mythology personifying these principles as heroes and their antitheses as anti-heroes, and putting them all into situations having universal significance. Around 3,000 BC Menes the Fighter unified Upper and Lower Egypt under these principles, which later personified Pharaoh, citizen and High Priest in Egyptian myth by the Sacred Triad: Osiris, Horus and Isis. By 325 AD Constantine the Great had reunified the Roman Empire under these principles as personifying Emperor, citizen and Pope in Christian myth by the Trinity: God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.
A well-ordered society adheres to all three principles of social order, and the means of adhering to these principles do not conflict. A society that is well-ordered over time occasionally suffers tensions over its means of order, but such tensions prove healthy inasmuch as they prevent any one order from dominating the other two. If the USA is ill-ordered by reason of a weak common higher cause, it is over-ordered by reason of its promise of individual wealth. If China is ill-ordered by reason of individual poverty, it is over-ordered by reason of powerful leaders who are at once leaders of its common higher cause, namely, Confucianism, and leaders of its regulatory and protective forces.

AN ESSENTIAL UNIVERSITY

The Venerable One

Once, when a young assistant professor, I took part in what became for me an unforgettable discussion about ideals and essences of a university. Animated and academically diverse, the discussants were taking much pleasure from their lunch, and from one another, in our faculty dining room when I arrived at their table. They were discussing academic program cutbacks:

I asked, "How far can a university be cut back, yet there remains a university?"

The venerable one at the table replied, "Until there remain students and a library."

I did not ask him what happened to administration in his model. Instead, I asked "What happened to the faculty?"

Without flinching the venerable one replied, "In the Ideal, you can't distinguish students from faculty, since both would be teachers and both would be learners."¹

A university can be cut back and yet remain a university if it retains its essences: a society that is learned at the highest degrees; a body of learning; and relationships between them that order the society and cultivate the body of learning. This is an idea of an essential university, and it is ordered as follows:

- The academic common higher cause can be divided into three tasks: the dissemination of its body of learning to all mankind, i.e. teaching; the preservation of that body for new generations of mankind, i.e. academic service; and the enlargement of that body towards truth, the good, and a record of wisdom in action, i.e. research.
- The academic self-interest principle is academic freedom qua necessary means of self-determination and the quest for individual destiny.
- The academic force principle is academic responsibility, which derives from the university’s articles of incorporation. This puts the power of the state behind the university’s leaders, namely, its trustees or reagents who vest it in their presidents. Incorporation also enables the university to receive as well as disburse money and other assets. This is the source of pressure in the forms of incentives and disincentives.

THE ESSENTIAL HOWARD UNIVERSITY

The mission of a particular university is an attempt to summarize its narrative history and mythology in a few words. There exists the official mission of the university or its raison d’être which is issued by its corporate officers, namely, board of trustees or regents. There exist, moreover, various scholarly statements said to be the “true” missions of a university or its raisons d’être. The brand of the university is a mission-like statement summarizing the perception of the university held by the so-called public. Hereinafter, its true missions and its brands are assumed to be the same. Howard University, from its day one, has had three brands, namely, to be:

- **An African American University**
  
  “It was to assist these agencies already at work educating the ignorant and alleviating personal suffering in the District of Columbia and in the country at large that Howard University was founded.”

- **A National University**
  
  “But there was another purpose,—another occasion for the University. Howard University was to be an evidence of a change in race relations in the United States.”

  “Let it be remembered, too, that in this institution (Howard) as in no other in the land, it is believed, the Anglo-Saxon, the Celts, the Indian, the Mongolian, the Greek, and the African already sit, side by side on the same benches. All races and both sexes have here in the pursuit of knowledge a fair and equal favor.”

- **A Comprehensive University of the First Rank**
  
  “The careers of the Negro representatives and senators during the 70’s and 80’s inspired the Negro youth in large numbers to prefer to stand on the floor of the House or Senate fittingly attired than to stand in the door of a blacksmith shop in leathern apron.”

  “When the College of Liberal Arts of the University opened formally on September 21, 1868, it opened with one student in a class of Greek and Latin. And for more than thirty years, the classics were emphasized primarily. It is surprising to learn this. That a university for ex-slaves should emphasize Greek and Latin seems today very, very, foolish. There were two reasons for emphasis being put upon the classics by the founders of Howard University. In the first place, they were themselves graduates of Princeton, Yale, Andover, Dartmouth and Bowdoin—all classical schools. In the second place, the founders of the University were not unmindful of the opinion generally held at that time that when a Negro learned to read Greek that accomplishment alone proved his equality with white men.”

---
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“The climax came a week or two later, during a visit of certain members of the Appropriation Committee of the House of Representatives to the University. On this occasion the Honorable Arthur Mitchell, the representative from the state of Illinois, who had been invited to join the Committee because he was the only Negro representative in Congress, spoke freely in the presence of the president of the University and the students against the tendency of the University toward Communism. He intimated that the United States would not support Howard University if it insisted on its right to such freedom of speech. The members of the visiting committee were not all of the same opinion. One or two supported President Johnson, the others were of the opinion of Representative Mitchell. However, when the committee left the University, no one of them was in doubt as to the attitude of President Johnson toward academic freedom at the University. In substance he said it would be better that Howard University close its doors or struggle along as best it can without congressional support than to surrender the right of academic freedom.”

UNITY & DISUNITY

The founders of the University were divided as to whether Howard should be an African American university, i.e. HBCU, or a mixed-race national university. But Howard’s first students demanded a comprehensive university of the first rank. In fact, all three brands were necessary to a well-ordered Howard: the African American university provided the academic freedom that majority universities provided but did not honor, e.g. teaching black students; the comprehensive university of the first rank provided the range of study never matched by other HBCUs; and the national university assured the Congressional force that the other two brands did not promise. Inasmuch as these brands did not form a coherent whole, the University was dysfunctional:

“Dignify and glorify common labor. ... It is at the bottom of life that we must begin, not at the top.” ........................................................ B.T. Washington, 1895.

“Unless the American Negro today, led by trained men of broad vision, sits down to work out by economics and mathematics, by physics and chemistry, by history and sociology, exactly how and where he is going to earn a living and how he is to establish a reasonable life in the United States or elsewhere, unless this is done the university has missed its field and function and the American Negro is doomed to be a suppressed and inferior caste in the United States for incalculable time.” .................................................................W.E.B. DuBois, 1933.

Later, two threats to the University were perceived to result from Brown v. Board of Education: (1) loss of excellent black students to majority institutions; and (2) invalidation of the Congressional Appropriation.

From 1867 until 1928 Howard subsisted mainly on a federal appropriation for which it applied annually, but O.O. Howard attempted an entrepreneurial solution that ended in scandal and the trustees attempted B.T. Washington’s moneyed industrialism that ended in 1928 when Howard’s appropriation was made into law.

“The basic justification of Federal support of Howard University was that, in view of the inequitable educational opportunities afforded Negro citizens, the

---
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Federal government had an obligation to help make up for this discrimination by developing Howard University into a first-class university."\(^8\)

Now, with Howard’s Federal Appropriation a law, the W.E.B. DuBois position prevailed and the national mission dropped the mixed-race imperative. Instantly, all three of Howard’s brands made a coherent whole, and the university would prosper, as a consequence, in what Rayford Logan called “The Golden Years.”

“Up to 1954, there is no question that the assumptions underlying Federal aid to the University were obviously valid. The critical question since the 1954 Supreme Court decision (Brown v. Board of Education) has been whether the present trend toward educational integration has been sufficiently advanced, or appears that it will be in the foreseeable future, as to invalidate the premises upon which this special function of the University is predicated.”\(^9\)

“In answer to the questions concerning the raison d’etre of Howard University and the special emphases and functions which give or should give it a distinctive character or personality of its own, the respondents (especially faculty) were not only articulate but were all but unanimous in the view that the University should still perform its historical compensatory function ….”\(^10\)

Predictably, the Comprehensive University of the First Rank brand was threatened by loss of black students of the first rank to majority institutions, and the National University brand was threatened by a possible invalidation of the Congressional Appropriation. The establishment in 1969 of the Howard University Center for Academic Reinforcement signaled for many the end of the Golden Years. President James E. Cheek re-invigorated the Comprehensive University of the First Rank brand with a growth to eighteen schools and colleges and the new Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and with increased Appropriations. Then, the Dark Ages set in at Howard as succeeding Presidents and Boards chipped away at Howard’s comprehensiveness, admitted more struggling students, and let the Appropriation flatten in 2001.

**Mandates for Change**

- Collegiality is a necessary component of every university; but taken too far it subordinates the brands of the University to itself. Professor Leroy Wells taught that, at Howard, power relationships often suffer from a confusion of service with servitude.
- Alumni giving is problematic at Howard. Often, it is attributed to a so-called “welfare mentality” brought on by the security of the federal appropriation, and to “bad” treatment given students in the administration building. This problem is perhaps better understood in the context of Howard’s brands. Alumni are aware of the importance of a conspicuous career that advances one or another of these brands, and their potential gifts are not seen as meaningful in comparison. Here is an opportunity for change.
- *Brown v. Board of Education* invites pre-college students and their parents to choose a university that is “the best university that I can get into.” Howard might prosper more from a brand that makes Howard “the best university for you.”

---
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• Faculty Senate maintains fierce resistance to the “Notwithstanding” clause of *The 1993 Faculty Handbook* threatening tenure.
• Departmentalism is a focus on a single learned discipline to the exclusion of all other learned disciplines. It is the natural enemy of multi-disciplinary research.
• Cronyism appeared in American universities in the early 1970s. It was not part of the wave of women and African Americans into the universities who embraced the intellectualism of a liberal education as well as the intellectual and creative aspects of a practical education. Cronyism, however, a trait of a new wave of students, rejected intellectualism and they changed higher education by means of highly organized numerical pressure. While this change resulted in great damage to the American university, Howard University did not exhibit such symptoms.

**VISIONS OF CHANGE**

• An African American Heritage University

  A vision of a replacement for the African American University is herein called the African American Heritage University. This is a worldview that looks less at that part of the African American experience worthy of escape but remembered so that it is not repeated, than that part which should be made a gift to the world. This is a worldview that looks less at helping African Americans “lift themselves up to equality by their boot straps” than joining with them as they seek to find and fulfill their destinies.

• A New Comprehensive University of the First Rank

  A new vision of the Comprehensive University of the First Rank is made from an add-on to its research agenda. Howard has always been a research university, albeit not a sponsored research university. The works of the giants among the faculty and alumni demonstrate this point. It is also demonstrated by the research done now known as REU, i.e. research experiences for undergraduates, and as institutional research focusing on Howard, e.g. the Thompson report. But, sponsored research of the first rank has always meant open pure research of the type funded by the NSF, NIH, NASA, etc. It has never meant closed applied research of the type funded by the military and business. Nevertheless, this vision includes entrepreneurial research management at the University making a means of prosperity for researchers.

• A New National University

  A new vision of the National University is made, first, from a change of outlook on Howard’s Federal Appropriation: it is not a moral obligation the US Congress met by an Act of Congress that amounts to welfare; rather, it is a special relationship between the US Congress and Howard University that helps empower Congress to enforce its own laws. Second, it is made from the thesis that Howard University can stand as a national model of resistance to anti-intellectualism in higher education. This model has implications for the university’s research agenda and curriculum, and America’s image abroad.

**ON THE SHOULDERS OF GIANTS**

The faculty of Howard University wears three hats. First is the hat authorized by the *Howard University Faculty Handbook (1993)*. Accordingly, faculty are defined as offi-
cers of the university and located in its administrative chain of command. Second is the hat authorized by the *Constitution of the Faculty Senate of Howard University (1993)*. Here, the faculty is located in the governance structure of the University. And third is the hat of the “at-large” faculty who act individually or in self-selected groups and openly but outside the chain of command and governance structure. Authorized by the First Amendment, they use methods of collegiality and diplomacy, and apply scholarly pressure without the backing of force, to advance the University’s agenda. They publish their views and seek direct access to the president of the university without lower administrative approvals and without Senate recommendations. *Change Howard* is a proposal from a member of the at-large faculty.

The proposed means to the realization of these visions is the creation of a Howard University think tank, e.g. the Harvard Institute for International Relations or the Aspen Institute, namely, the Howard Institute. The Institute would be supported, in part, by the Office of the President and with a fourfold mission:

- Operate as a think tank advising the President on Howard’s mandates for change and visions of change;
- Advise the President on the coordination of existing activities and the initiation of new activities that nurture the K-12 pipeline of students to Howard, as well as recruit faculty, who would fit into the university’s new brands;
- Develop and propose curricula and such other educational initiatives as would illuminate for students—undergraduates and graduates alike—as well as faculty, staff, trustees and alumni, their roles in the new brands; and
- Manage the Intellectual Capital Initiative (ICI) for the University.

**AFTERWORDS**

*Change Howard* is a proposal for the Sydney A. Ribeau administration to re-unify Howard’s brands. This proposal recommends changes in Howard’s brands and an institute for realizing them. The promise is a new Howard that exists not as a radical change from the past but as a logical extension of it.
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Executive Summary

ICI is Here
An Economic Stimulus Package for Howard University
Chapter 1: The Intellectual Capital Initiative (ICI)

Can the faculty raise more money for the university? The traditional roles of the faculty in the business affairs of the university are teaching, research and service, and the development of their abilities to play out these roles ever more effectively. Accordingly, ideas for raising more money for the university have focused on increasing grant-supported research activities through merit pay incentives, and the main means of merit pay is currently called the Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES).

A proposed new role for the faculty is called the Intellectual Capital Initiative (ICI). The ultimate goal of the ICI is more money for the university, but its immediate goal is an academic environment that attracts and nurtures more outstanding faculty and students. The main means of the ICI are: pride of place, through recognition of individuals perpetuating a so-called Howard University Faculty Hall of Fame; a mutual admiration society, through recognition of collective faculty achievements having national and international dimensions; and support for faculty who exemplify All that one can be. The keys to these means are (1) a capital investment in a faculty recognition program; and (2) a collaboration of faculty with administrative experts on public relations and recruiting.

Forward

This is a proposal for an Intellectual Capital Initiative, but it comes at a time in the history of Howard University when Howard faces a serious financial challenge to its existence. At first this proposal would seem untimely: the affordability of ICI pay for faculty is in question; the faculty may not want the public image of “employees demanding more money from their employer when it is in a desperate struggle to get more money for its survival.” This is not the first time Howard has found itself in a desperate financial struggle for its survival. Perhaps the past provides a lesson for the present.

In 1935 the Appropriations Committee of the United States Congress intimated that it would withdraw Howard’s appropriation so long as a particular book on communism was kept in its library. Resolved to keep it, then President Mordecai Wyatt Johnson said in substance to the Committee, “It would be better that Howard University close its doors or struggle along as best it can without congressional support than to surrender the right of academic freedom.” Johnson’s refusal was supported by the faculty, the administration and the students. The lesson we might learn from this bit of history is that faculty and administration should find common ground on our common financial problems.

Today, Howard’s fiscal woes derive from (1) a flat appropriation from the US Congress, (2) Howard’s apparently unanswered challenge of maintaining a strong faculty and outstanding student body in the wake of Brown v. Board of Education, and (3) the present global economic meltdown. In its traditional role of producing money for the university, the faculty would respond to these woes with increased performance in the areas of teach-
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ing, research, service and development. The Provost’s Draft proposal seeks to play out this role by applying APT methods of evaluating faculty performance to fiscal challenges using specific metrics and rubrics. It is not clear that this proposal will lead to more money for the university unless sponsored research is particularly emphasized. Such emphasis, however, serves to divide the faculty and pit it against administration.

The ICI requires collaborations of the faculty and administration at all levels of its conception and implementation. It requires an investment from the president in the form of pay, and it places responsibility upon the faculty to make good on its promise of increased university wealth.

**Intellectual Capital Initiative (ICI)**

The *raison d’être* of the ICI is to produce more university wealth. As the ICI is not connected to the APT system of evaluation, as is the Provost’s Draft FPES, it is governed by the *Faculty Handbook* only where the production of wealth is indicated.

**Theory**

*Raison d’Être*

Wealth consists in various forms: money, real estate, endowments, investments in stocks, bonds, etc. Simplistically speaking, the monetary form of the university’s wealth resides in a bank account from which the CFO writes checks in accordance with an approved budget, and the budget consists in line items one of which being faculty salaries or pay.

Capital is “wealth in any form employed in or available for the production of more wealth.” Stocks are examples of investment capital. Bonds that are purchased by the university are examples of investment capital while bonds that the university puts up for sale or “floats” are income. The means of production may be many and varied, offering choices to the owners of capital. A choice may not always be the means to the end of greatest increase in wealth, and some means may not be considered appropriate to the owners. For example, one would not expect Howard University to purchase stock, however lucrative, in a public relations firm publishing racist materials. One would expect Howard to refrain from the purchase even if the materials were generally thought to present no threat to Howard’s wealth.

Another example, one central to this Report, is called intellectual capital. The quotes laid down below define it and articulate the growing sense of its importance:

- **Thomas Stewart, Editor of the *Harvard Business Journal* (2008):** “At its core is the simple observation that organizations’ tangible assets cash, land and buildings, plant and equipment, and other balance-sheet items are substantially less valuable than the intangible assets not carried on their books. Among these are “hard” intangibles like patents and copyrights, information-age assets such as databases and software, and—most important of all—“soft” assets such as skills, capabilities, expertise, cultures, loyalties, and so on. These are knowledge assets—intellectual capital—and they determine success or failure.”

---

3 Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary.  
- **Alan Greenspan, Former Chairman, U.S. Federal Reserve (2000?):** “The quintessential manifestations of America’s industrial might earlier this century—large steel mills, auto assembly plants, petrochemical complexes and skyscrapers—have been replaced by a gross domestic product that has been downsized as ideas have replaced physical bulk and effort as creators of value. Today, economic value is best symbolized by exceedingly complex, miniaturized integrated circuits and the ideas—the software—that utilize them. Most of what we currently perceive as value and wealth is intellectual and impalpable.”

- **Baruch Lev, Professor of Accounting at NYU (2003):** “The importance of intangible assets is magnified by the fact that they are not restricted to the high technology sector, but are instead dominant in every well-run enterprise. A recent ranking of the fifty US companies with the largest intangible capital (Fortune magazine, April 2001) contained not just ‘new-economy’ firms, such as Microsoft, Intel, America Online, and Cisco Systems, but also twenty-eight ‘old-economy’ companies such as General Electric, Wal-Mart, DuPont, Coca-Cola and Alcoa. Examples of other non-tech companies with valuable intangibles are British Petroleum, Goldman Sachs, and Unilever. In today’s economy, intangible assets are pervasive across virtually all business sectors and in every major industrial country.”

- **Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter (NY Times, January 7, 1948).** “They (universities) are important if the institutions specially charged with the accumulation of the intellectual capital of the world are important to a society.”

Intellectual capital, then, is intangible: in many ways it resists quantification; and whether it is a cause whose effect is increased wealth is difficult to establish objectively. Thus, its assessment is necessarily as much qualitative and subjective as quantitative and objective. Insofar as Howard is concerned intellectual capital is a form of university wealth employed in or available for the production of more university wealth. The primary source of intellectual capital resides in the individual scholar, specifically, in his or her intellect, creative inspiration and skill. Its secondary sources reside in the relationships individual scholars cultivate with others, and in available tools and administrative support.

The ICI recommendation of pay to faculty is a means of producing more intellectual wealth. It is not an achievement award. Rather, it informs faculty how they might use their academic freedoms to produce more intellectual wealth in ways that administration can, in turn, produce more university wealth. We assume that the faculty so informed will act accordingly. We assume, moreover, that investment capital exists in the form of a line item in the university’s budget which is employed in or available for the production of more intellectual wealth by means of faculty pay, and that intellectual wealth becomes intellectual capital when it is employed in or available for the production of more university wealth. There remain the tasks of identifying general means of producing more university wealth and the specific tools and methods of implementing those means.

The justifications for the ICI argue that it is appropriate to the owners of Howard’s wealth, namely, the Howard University Corporation, and that its method promises more intellectual wealth. These justifications are now treated in detail.

**Justification of Appropriateness**

The Mission of Howard University is the first standard for judging the appropriateness of the method of allocating ICI pay. Legal, moral and other standards are implicitly assumed but considered explicitly herein where the context requires it.

---

5 [www.knowledgesystems.org](http://www.knowledgesystems.org) (Speech in Grand Rapids, Mich., date unknown.)

Mission

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 on the provision of educational opportunities to promising black students. Further, the university is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who, through their teaching and research, are 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. (1993 Howard University Faculty Handbook, § 1.2)

This Mission statement affirms that Howard University is indeed a university and that it is a unique kind of university. While this statement can accommodate many but perhaps not all defensible theories about the nature of a university and about the nature of Howard University, surely a few traits of Howard can be observed in common that bear upon the intents of an ICI pay program for faculty. A few of them are observed below.

The method of allocating ICI pay is not intended as a reward to faculty for their accomplishments. Rather, it is a means to the production of more intellectual wealth among the faculty. As such, it is an appeal to external agencies to contribute to that wealth. Not all good work of the faculty can be made so appealing.

The method of allocating ICI pay is not intended as an incentive to individual faculty to do their duty. Duty is a professional responsibility and a contractual obligation. Rather, the method informs the faculty of options for doing their duty.

The method of allocating ICI pay is not intended as a means of controlling the sense of a faculty member’s self worth. Clearly, some faculty who are dissatisfied with their pay feel devalued by it. Some of them will seek allies in positions to rectify their pay. In rectifying it by reason of self worth, such allies act illegally, thus they must act secretly with hidden agenda. Here is the beginning of cronyism in a university led by a self-appointed messiah of a hidden so-called moral cause. It is in secrecy that cronyism violates openness, a fundamental test of what is said and done at a university.

The method of allocating ICI pay is not intended as an egalitarian effort, but it respects fairness. This is a multi-cultural environment grounded in US American culture with a historically black Mission. The ability to navigate that environment requires special skills. There is no provision in the allocation of ICI pay to account for disparities of such skill.

The method of allocating ICI pay is not intended as an effort to divide the faculty into an elite class and a peasant class; but it could conceivably contribute to such a division. The process of dividing the faculty into academic ranks could likewise conceivably contribute to such class divisions. The division of administrative and non-administrative positions might also be a contributor.

Justification for the Promise

An outstanding faculty is the key ingredient in maintaining academic excellence. The faculty serves to help create a university environment that demands the best from all its participants. Additionally, a well-qualified and productive faculty helps to attract other well-qualified individuals—faculty and students—who show promise for future achievement. (1993 Howard University Faculty Handbook, § 2.4)
The one-time US Army slogan “Be all you can be” expresses a pathway in life that a faculty member can follow to help create a university environment that demands the best from all its participants. In Aristotle (384-322 BC) eudæmonia or human flourishing refers to a special kind of self-realization, i.e. development of the possibilities of the self involving (physical) activity and the exercise of one’s reason, accompanied by pleasure. In the early nineteenth century the German research universities were founded and gave impetus to a new conception of what higher education can do for society. The ideal that animated the educated was the notion of cultivation or Bildung rather than the concept of scholarship or Wissenschaft. For Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), founder of the University of Berlin, the true aim of man was “the highest and most harmonious development of his mental and physical faculties.” Bildung was not a means to a better life but an end in itself, an unfolding of the personality to its full potential. Here was the model for the research university in the USA.

According to its Mission, Howard University is a research-oriented university. It would seem, then, that a method of allocating ICI pay supporting faculty who seek to be all they can be would hold the promise of more intellectual wealth for Howard in the form of research.

That our universities have grave shortcomings for the intellectual life of this nation is by now a commonplace. The chief source of their inadequacy is probably the curse of departmentalization. …The need for breaking down sterilizing departmentalization has been widely felt. (Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, NY Times, January 7, 1948)

Surely the greatest obstacle to such a method of allocating ICI pay is the notion that what counts in a faculty member’s research is what contributes to his or her department’s discipline. Nonetheless, the Faculty Handbook makes no such requirement. Thus, the method should make provisions against this obstacle.

Who are the well-qualified and productive faculty? President Ribeau has set the task for the faculty of putting Howard among the top-fifty research universities in the USA. For him, then, the answer to our query is a faculty exhibiting certain profiles of the faculties at top-fifty universities. Can such a faculty attract to Howard other well-qualified individuals—faculty and students—who show promise for future achievement? Of course, the challenge here is to argue that if we should achieve top-fifty status we will keep it or something close to it. No one wants to ride a shooting star that will fall before their career ends. Our answer to that query must lie in our faculty’s Hall of Fame: Nobelist Ralph Bunche, Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, Spingarn Medalist Charles Drew, et al. For Howard, then, a well-qualified and productive faculty is populated with individuals belonging or following pathways to our Hall of Fame.

According to its Mission, Howard University is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who, through their teaching and research, are committed to the development of distinguished and compassionate graduates. It would seem, then, that a method of allocating ICI pay supporting faculty who seek a place in the Howard University Fa-

---

8 Reese, p. 159.
ulty Hall of Fame would hold the promise of more intellectual wealth for Howard in the forms of teaching and research.

Surely the greatest obstacle to such a method of allocating ICI pay is the sentiment among faculty who feel no attachment to that Hall of Fame and that the accomplishments of the “Great Ones” should be undermined and left to history. Accordingly, the University should launch an annual program celebrating a Howard University Faculty Hall of Fame. The aim of the program might be Pride of Place, a sentiment of belonging for all faculty, a sentiment accepting Howard’s heroes as one’s own irrespective national origin.

Remarks

The definition of ICI pay as a means to the production of more intellectual wealth among the faculty and thus to intellectual capital producing more university wealth leads to a method for allocating pay and justifications for that method which cannot be used in APT or post-tenure review processes. Tenure is tied to the university’s wealth only insofar as financial exigency is concerned. APT and post-tenure review processes inevitably compare faculty to one another by argumentation that is intended to appeal only to those faculty. The method laid down above compares faculty to external agencies on appeal to those agencies.

A major challenge for a university-wide performance evaluation is to assure parity in quality across the many disciplines in the university. The method laid down above seeks to meet this challenge by means of an agreeable common standard of quality, namely, the Howard University Faculty Hall of Fame. While a common standard for scholars of architecture and the scholars of engineering might be elusive, we can all agree on which architects and which engineers, and which physicians and which poets, belong in the Hall of Fame and which do not.

Use of the Hall of Fame to evaluate candidates for ICI pay avoids symptoms often suffered in APT evaluation processes. While winners of APT decisions often prove competitive, they just as often prove mediocre. Winners and losers engage in bitter status debates with equally defensible arguments on both sides, and when cooler heads prevail the winners and the losers compare to one another much as high grades of F compare to low grades of F. The method laid down above should make good on its promise.

Finally, whereas the APT evaluation system is naturally contentious, i.e. it is contentious among faculty as well as between them and administration, the ICI pay evaluation system, if it is to succeed, must exhibit more than a modicum of collegiality among its faculty and between them and administration. Can the ICI pay system succeed? The contention is rooted in the presumption that each member of the faculty possesses unique expertise in service to the academic higher causes. Thus, the faculty member’s self evaluation stands on par with evaluations of his work by his colleagues and administration. In the ICI pay system, the faculty member’s self evaluation is weighed against the expertise of his colleagues on ICI pay qua means of producing intellectual wealth as well as the will of administration to risk the university’s investment wealth on his self evaluation and their expertise on making intellectual capital out of intellectual wealth thus to produce more university wealth. The ICI pay system can succeed because its pool of evaluators has a collective will and expertise that outweighs individual will and expertise.
The tools for allocating ICI pay consist in a public relations campaign brochure and three evaluation categories for citing faculty and their works in that brochure.

Brochure

The brochure is structured to include (1) citations—by name—of the Howard University Faculty Hall of Fame, (2) citations of the combined performance of the faculty, e.g. research dollars awarded, honors won, positions of leadership held, etc., and (3) citations—by name—of faculty demonstrating that the Howard University environment inspires everyone to be all they can be.

Category-1: Historic Contribution

The applicant for ICI in this category shall make the compelling case that he or she belongs, should belong, or is near the end of a pathway to membership in the Howard University Faculty Hall of Fame.

Category-2: Well-Qualified & Productive

The applicant for ICI pay in this category shall make the compelling case that his or her professional standing and performance are or should be included in the section of the brochure citing the combined performance of the faculty.

Category-3: Inspirational

The applicant for ICI pay in this category shall make the compelling case that his or her professional standing and performance are or should be included in the section of the brochure citing faculty demonstrating that the Howard University environment inspires everyone to be all they can be.

Remarks

If in 2009 a faculty member applies for ICI pay in the category of historic contribution and submits the citation that she wrote a book that won the Pulitzer Prize in 1995, that submission should count in 2009 if it is still being used by administration to attract new faculty and students. The same goes for published papers, albeit an expected rarity.

According to the NSF “Special Report” *U.S. Doctorates in the 20th Century*, Howard University’s undergraduate program is first among all undergraduate programs in producing African Americans who receive doctorates in science and engineering. Accordingly, this result would be an item for the brochure in category-2, and a member of the faculty could apply for ICI pay in that category on the strength of his or her contributions to undergraduate teaching at Howard.

**METHODS**

ICI pay is a means of transforming investment wealth into investment capital by producing more intellectual wealth, and a means of transforming intellectual wealth into intellectual capital by producing more university wealth. Accordingly, a two-stage process for evaluating the applications of faculty for ICI pay is recommended.

The president gives due and timely notice to the faculty of his offer of ICI pay. The notice will include appropriate dates and a sample brochure for recruiting outstanding faculty and students.

Faculty members, in accordance with section 2.6 of the *Faculty Handbook*, the *Faculty Workload Policy*, and other applicable authorities, compose their applications for one
of the categories discussed above. These applications are evaluated by the first of two panels.

The first panel consists of faculty from the school or college of which the applicant is a member together with professional administrative staff from the public relations and recruiting areas of the university. This panel consists of a plurality of faculty, and their evaluations comprise a method for transforming investment wealth into investment capital by producing more intellectual wealth. The evaluations aim for inclusions in the final brochure.

The second panel consists of faculty from across the entire university together with professional administrative staff from the public relations and recruiting areas of the university. This panel consists of a plurality of staff, and the evaluations comprise a method of transforming intellectual wealth into intellectual capital by producing more university wealth. Using the evaluations from the first panel, the second panel makes recommendations for inclusions in the final brochure.

A schematic of the process for ICI pay is shown in Figure 2.

**Remarks**

A review of the Provost’s Draft FPES revealed several egregious errors. First, it violates the provisions of section 2.4 of the 1993 Faculty Handbook inasmuch as it rewards mediocrity in favor of excellence. Accordingly, it assures that President Ribreau’s goal of a Top 50 US Research University will never be attained. Second, it is one-sidedly quantitative, omitting the qualitative assessments necessary to consistency with the University’s mission and the inherent predictive nature of performance of tenured faculty. Third, it fails to adequately incorporate the artistic dimension of faculty performance into its assessment process. Fourth, it fails to distinguish between scholarly productivity and grantsmanship, and to justify grantsmanship as an item for ICI pay. Lastly, the Provost’s Draft FPES serves the dual purpose of assessing ICI pay and post-tenure review. The Intellectual Capital Plan does not serve the purposes of post-tenure review.
Appendix: Schematic of the Review Process

Faculty Accomplishment

Recommended by Chair / DEAN

Evaluation by University Committee
- Level 1 Evaluation
- Level 2 Evaluation

AWARDS:
- HISTORIC CONTRIBUTION
- WELL-QUALIFIED CONTRIBUTION
- INSPIRATIONAL CONTRIBUTION
At Howard University each professor finds his or her academic responsibilities and the academic freedoms needed to fulfill them in three authority structures. One authority is the *Howard University Faculty Handbook*, which locates professors in the administrative chain of command. Another authority is the *Constitution of the Faculty Senate*, which locates them in the governance system. The third authority is, ultimately, the *Constitution of the United States of America*, which applies to professors *qua* citizens and/or otherwise through the University’s article of incorporation in the District of Columbia. Called herein at-large professors comprising the at-large faculty, such individuals may seek to communicate with, say, the president without the approvals of deans and Senate committees, but are likely to produce the independent thoughts and creative works that the formal processes of administration and governance are not likely to produce.

The challenges put to Howard University in the twenty-first century by a flattened Congressional Appropriation, the global economy, competition for students, and new research funding mandates necessitate greater productivity of at-large faculty on administrative and governance issues. Chief among these issues is a clear if not altogether shared vision of the university. This is a pathway for the life of the University that acknowledges its past and keeps it on track out of harm’s way of vacillation and chaos. At risk is the Howard University brand. There is a need at Howard University for its Trustees and President to make a symbolic gesture of their common desire for greater and sustained scholarship at the highest degrees from the at-large faculty on issues of vision. Herein, that symbol is called the Howard Institute.

**The Howard Institute** is a think tank located at Howard University in the person, support staff and physical facilities of a tenured professor holding the rank of University Professor and designated by the Board of Trustees as The Keeper. The mission of the Institute is to bring The Keeper’s vision of Howard University to the Trustees and the President, and to provide them the learned opinions of The Keeper on the implications various existing university policies as well as proposed policies whether privileged or public might pose to his or her vision. The methods of the Institute include the following:

- Publications of the Institute’s vision and opinions on existing and openly proposed university policies;
- Seminars and workshops on vision issues for the Howard University community; and
- A library on visions of Howard University and opinions on them.

Annual funding for the Howard Institute derives from the salary, support staff and physical facilities ordinarily associated with the position of a University Professor together with honoraria ($5K/year) for commissioned research papers and other support ($5K/year) for the seminars and workshops.

The Howard Institute seeks to be consistently evaluated by the Howard community as having the most influential, the most quoted, and the most trusted independent opinions on Howard University Policy and foreseeable futures.
Survey of Changes in Faculty Retirement Policies 2007

By Valerie Martin Conley
© 2007 American Association of University Professors. All rights reserved. Reproduction of excerpts for nonprofit use is hereby granted to educators, scholars, students, nonprofit educational institutions, and government. Any reproduction for commercial use without written permission is strictly prohibited.

American Association of University Professors
1012 Fourteenth St., NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20005-3465
(202) 737-5900
www(aaup.org

The AAUP’s purpose is to advance academic freedom and shared governance, to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education, and to ensure higher education’s contribution to the common good.
CONTENTS

ii About the Author
iii Acknowledgments
iv List of Tables and Figures

1 Introduction
1 Data Collection
2 Regular Retirement Programs
   Defined Contribution Plans
   Defined Benefit Plans
8 Retirement Planning
8 Retirement-Incentive Programs
9 Phased-Retirement Programs
10 Other Benefits for Retired Faculty
13 Recruitment and Retention of New Faculty
14 Conclusion

15 Appendix: Survey Instrument
ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Valerie Martin Conley is associate professor of higher education and director of the Center for Higher Education at Ohio University. She formerly held positions in institutional research and with statistical research and consulting firms. She is co-editor of New Ways to Phase into Retirement: Options for Faculty and Institutions and author of Exploring Faculty Retirement Issues in Public Two-Year Institutions. She is a member of the AAUP’s Committee on Retirement.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Co-Sponsors
This survey was co-sponsored by the American Council on Education, the American Association of Community Colleges, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of University Professors, the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources, and the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Financial Support and Data Collection
The TIAA-CREF Institute, the research foundation sponsored by faculty retirement insurance provider TIAA-CREF, and the Cornell Higher Education Research Institute generously financed the survey. Data collection, which occurred in 2006, was conducted by the Survey Research Institute at Cornell University.

AAUP Committee on Faculty Retirement, 2005–06 to 2006–07
Janet M. West (Economics), University of Nebraska at Omaha, chair
Valerie Martin Conley (Higher Education), Ohio University
Joseph Felder (Economics), Bradley University
Karen C. Holden (Consumer Science), University of Wisconsin–Madison
David S. Linton (Communication Arts), Marymount Manhattan College
Judith Wishnia (History), State University of New York at Stony Brook
Ronald G. Ehrenberg (Labor Economics), Cornell University, consultant
Wendi A. Maloney, AAUP Staff and Editor

Special Thanks
Special thanks to John W. Curtis, the AAUP’s research director, for attending the meeting of the committee in which members developed survey questions and for drafting the survey questionnaire. Thanks also to Wisdom Mensah, a graduate research assistant at the Center for Higher Education at Ohio University for helping to produce an initial draft of this report.
List of Tables and Figures
Survey of Changes in Faculty Retirement Policies 2007

Table 1  Participation of Full-Time Faculty in Retirement Programs by Plan Type and Number and Percentage of Faculty
Table 2  Participation of Part-Time Faculty in Retirement Programs by Plan Type and Number and Percentage of Faculty
Table 3  Participation in Retirement-Income Programs at Public Institutions by Plan Type and Employment Status
Table 4  Participation in Retirement-Income Programs at Private Institutions by Plan Type and Employment Status
Figure 1  Percentage of Responding Institutions by Public-Private Affiliation
Figure 2  Percentage of Institutions Offering Different Types of Retirement Plans
Figure 3  Plan Type by Public-Private Affiliation
Figure 4  Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Faculty Eligible for Retirement Plan Participation by Plan Type
Figure 5  Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Faculty Participating in Retirement Plans by Plan Type
Figure 6  Percentage Distribution of Institutional Contributions to Defined- Contribution Plans of Full-Time Faculty
Figure 7  Percentage of Institutions by Origin of Incentive Plan
Figure 8  Percentage Distribution of Institutions Offering a One-Time Additional Cash Payment by Payment Amount
Figure 9  Percentage of Institutions Offering Years of Service Credit by Number of Years and Timing of Plan
Figure 10 Number of Institutions Offering Phased-Retirement Programs by Year of Implementation
Figure 11 Percentage of Institutions Offering Special Benefits in Phased Retirement by Benefit Type
Figure 12 Percentage Distribution of Health-Care Costs Borne by the Eligible Party and the Institution
Figure 13 Distribution of Other Benefits by Percentage of Recipients
Figure 14 Percentage of Institutions Rating Key Staffing Practices as “Very Important”
Introduction
As many tenured faculty members approach traditionally acceptable retirement ages, observers of higher education are speculating about whether they will leave voluntarily, expect incentives to do so, or refuse to give up their positions indefinitely, leaving institutions with an aged faculty in desperate need of renewal. Although the 2007 Survey of Changes in Faculty Retirement Policies will not definitively end such speculation, it does point to trends in the way that institutions and faculty members are approaching retirement. The survey data also suggest, however, that a more important subject for speculation may be whether or not institutions can recruit and retain enough faculty to meet their growth and replacement needs.

The Committee on Retirement of the American Association of University Professors initiated its first retirement policies survey in 2000 to address a lack of reliable and systematically collected information on retirement policies and practices across U.S. institutions of higher education. At the end of the 1990s, there was a sense that institutions had been modifying policies and practices to gain more control over the timing of individual retirement decisions since mandatory retirement for tenured faculty members had ended in 1994. To gauge whether or not—and if so how— institutions were actually changing retirement policies, the 2000 survey elicited information about regular retirement programs for tenured faculty members, the prevalence and characteristics of retirement-incentive and phased-retirement programs, polices applicable to retired faculty, and perceptions regarding the end of mandatory retirement. A detailed report of the findings was published on the AAUP’s Web site, and an article by report author Ronald G. Ehrenberg (Career’s End: A Survey of Faculty Retirement Policies) was published in the July–August 2001 issue of Academe, the AAUP’s bimonthly magazine. (Both items remain accessible through the AAUP’s Web site.)

In 2005–06, the Committee on Retirement updated the survey instrument and redistributed it with an eye toward exploring how institutions might have changed their policies to deal with escalating health-care costs and the aging of so many faculty members nationwide. Specifically, the survey asked institutions to report the number of faculty members enrolled in each type of institutional retirement plan, details about the plans and any retirement incentives offered, and information about the availability and cost of medical insurance and long-term health-care options for retiring faculty members and their spouses and dependents. The committee hopes the survey will help faculty members who are planning their own retirements, faculty groups who want to improve policies on their campuses, and institutions seeking to develop more effective retirement programs. This report summarizes the survey findings.

Data Collection
The sampling frame for the 2000 survey was constructed using the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics’ Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Members of the AAUP’s Committee on Retirement met in spring 2005 to review the 2000 survey instrument and revise it in light of emerging issues and trends. The resulting survey, which was disseminated in 2006, had a total of forty-three questions covering four main areas or topics: (a) regular retirement programs, (b) retirement-incentive programs, (c) phased-retirement programs, and (d) policies regarding retired faculty. In addition, the survey gathered information about health benefits for retirees, spouses, partners, and families.1 (See the appendix to this report for a copy of the survey instrument.)

Institutions that had participated in the 2000 survey for which the AAUP could identify accurate and complete contact information were invited to take part in the 2007 survey. Eligible institutions included public and private, not-for-profit colleges and universities with seventy-five or more full-time faculty members. A packet of information including a letter of invitation, a description of the project, and a copy of the survey was mailed to the president or chief executive officer of each of the 1,361 sampled institutions.

Respondents were given the option of completing a paper-and-pencil survey or an online version of the instrument. Multiple follow-up telephone calls were made to increase the number of institutions represented in the study. Completed surveys were received from
567 institutions, reflecting a response rate of 42 percent. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents returned completed surveys by mail, while 42 percent completed the survey online. Only one respondent completed the survey by telephone. Responses were received from 369 public and 198 private institutions (see figure 1).

**Regular Retirement Programs**

Institutions offer a variety of retirement-income programs, including both defined-contribution and defined-benefit (or pension) plans. In “Endgame: The Design and Implementation of Early Retirement Incentive Programs,” published in 2003 in *Retirement: Reasons, Processes, and Results*, Daniel C. Feldman describes these two major types of plans and explains how they differ in terms of the financial commitment of the employer to the employee. In defined-contribution plans, employers deposit a set dollar amount (usually based on a percentage of annual salary) into a tax-deferred fund. In defined-benefit plans, the employer provides a guaranteed annual pension, basing its amount on a formula that typically includes salary and years of service. Institutions sometimes offer a combination of these two types of plans, permit faculty members to choose between the types of plans, or allow them to participate in both types.

Figure 2 shows the percentage of responding institutions offering different types of retirement-income programs to faculty. Forty-two percent offered defined-contribution plans (such as TIAA-CREF). An additional 41 percent of institutions allowed faculty members to choose either a defined-contribution or a defined-benefit plan (such as a state plan that calculates benefits based on a formula that might include years of service, final average salary, and age). Where faculty members were given such a choice, most institutions (72 percent) required participation in the defined-benefit system as the default. Just 12 percent of responding institutions reported offering only a defined-benefit program, and only 5 percent offered a combined plan that includes features of both types of programs. Only one institution reported not providing any kind of retirement program at all. Most institutions required faculty to participate in some plan: 81 percent of respondents reported that they do not allow faculty to opt out of all institutional retirement plans.

Public and private institutions offered different types of retirement plans. As figure 3 shows, most of the institutions offering defined-contribution plans were private (76 percent),

---

**Figure 1. Percentage of Responding Institutions by Public-Private Affiliation**
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Figure 2. Percentage of Institutions Offering Different Types of Retirement Plans

Figure 3. Plan Type by Public-Private Institutional Affiliation
while a higher percentage of public institutions than private institutions offered defined-benefit plans, combined plans, or the option to choose either or both plan types.

Most full-time faculty members at the responding institutions who were eligible to participate in retirement-income programs were doing so. As table 1 shows, among those eligible to participate in defined-contribution plans, 93 percent were doing so, as were 94 percent of those eligible to participate in combined plans. A smaller percentage (57 percent) of those eligible to participate in defined-benefit plans were doing so.

Fifty-seven percent of responding institutions indicated that part-time faculty members were eligible to participate in institutional retirement-income programs, and 43 percent reported that they were ineligible to participate. According to the data collected, an estimated 59,528 part-time faculty members were eligible to participate in some type of retirement-income program at responding institutions. Fifty-three percent of those eligible were currently participating in these retirement programs (see table 2).

Among part-time faculty members eligible to participate in defined-benefit plans, 57 percent were doing so, compared with 48 percent of those eligible to participate in defined-contribution plans. Forty-four percent of part-time faculty members eligible to participate in combined plans were taking advantage of them. (Combined plans were not, however, prevalent among the responding institutions.)

Figure 4 shows the distribution of eligible part-time faculty by plan type, and figure 5 shows the distribution of those actually participating. Fifty-seven percent of all eligible part-time faculty members were eligible for defined-benefit plans, while 38 percent were eligible for defined-contribution plans. Sixty-one percent of those participating were signed up for

Table 1. Participation of Full-Time Faculty in Retirement Programs by Plan Type and Number and Percentage of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Eligible</th>
<th>Number Participating</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>299,375</td>
<td>241,722</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Contribution</td>
<td>184,439</td>
<td>171,324</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Benefit</td>
<td>102,032</td>
<td>58,299</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Plan</td>
<td>12,904</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Participation of Part-Time Faculty in Retirement Programs by Plan Type and Number and Percentage of Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number Eligible</th>
<th>Number Participating</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59,528</td>
<td>31,441</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Contribution</td>
<td>22,704</td>
<td>10,997</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Benefit</td>
<td>33,713</td>
<td>19,060</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Plan</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4. Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Faculty Eligible for Retirement Plan Participation by Plan Type

Figure 5. Percentage Distribution of Part-Time Faculty Participating in Retirement Plans by Plan Type
defined-benefit plans. The survey did not elicit information about whether or not part-time faculty members could choose among plan types, nor did it gather specific details related to part-time faculty participation in these plans.

Tables 3 and 4 show the number of full- and part-time faculty members at public and private institutions eligible to participate and actually participating in each type of retirement plan. Part-time faculty members employed in public institutions have more access to retirement benefits. However, institutional size varies, and many of the public institutions in the sample are two-year colleges. Public two-year institutions employ large percentages of part-time faculty and may be more likely than other types of institutions to offer them retirement benefits.

**DEFINED-CONTRIBUTION PLANS**

Approximately 30 percent of responding institutions offering defined-contribution plans reported a typical contribution rate of 10 percent of a full-time faculty member’s annual salary. Yet fewer than 20 percent of responding institutions reported typical contribution rates greater that 10 percent, while 57 percent contributed less than 10 percent (see figure 6). In other words, it was more “typical” for institutions to contribute less than 10 percent of a faculty member’s salary to defined-contribution systems than it was for them to contribute 10 percent or more.

Twenty-eight percent of responding institutions offering defined-contribution plans did not require faculty to contribute to the plan at all (that is, the minimum required contribution rate was zero). Eleven percent of institutions required faculty members to contribute a minimum of 3 percent of their annual salaries. Twenty-three percent of institutions required a 5 percent minimum contribution, and 10 percent demanded a 6 percent minimum contribution. For most institutions, the contribution rate was not affected by years of service, age, faculty rank, or date of hire. The percentage of institutions reporting that one or more of these factors affected their contribution rate ranged from a low of 2 percent for faculty rank to a high of 18 percent for years of service. Of these factors, years of service and date of hire were more likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Contribution</td>
<td>136,650</td>
<td>125,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Benefit</td>
<td>99,911</td>
<td>56,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Plan</td>
<td>12,093</td>
<td>11,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Participation in Retirement-Income Programs at Public Institutions by Plan Type and Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-Time Faculty</th>
<th>Part-Time Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Contribution</td>
<td>47,789</td>
<td>45,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Benefit</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Plan</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Participation in Retirement-Income Programs at Private Institutions by Plan Type and Employment Status
to affect the contribution rate than faculty rank or age.

**Defined-Benefit Plans**

Most responding institutions offering defined-benefit plans reported using an annual benefit formula equal to two times the number of years of service. For example, if the percentage benefit rate for each year of service is two, and a faculty member has thirty years of service, then the annual benefit is 60 percent of the faculty member’s annual salary. Eighty-one percent of responding institutions reported a percentage rate of two for each year of service.

There are, however, several ways to define salary for the purpose of calculating the benefit under defined-benefit plans. Respondents were asked if salary was calculated based on career average, the final three years of salary, the highest salary, or some other method. Sixty-four percent of the responding institutions reported that the benefit was calculated using criteria other than the three options given. Of these three response options, highest salary was used to calculate the benefit most often. Twenty-one percent of the responding institutions reported using it to calculate the benefit, 1 percent reported using a career average, and 14 percent reported using the final three years of salary.

Academic rank affected the benefit formula at only five of the responding institutions reporting defined-benefit plans. Sixty-five percent of the institutions reported that the age of a faculty member affected the formula, and 63 percent reported considering date of hire.

Fifty-six percent of responding institutions with defined-benefit plans reported no maximum on the level of the benefit that an individual could receive upon retirement. Forty-one institutions that had a maximum reported basing it on years of service, fifty based it on salary, and 64 based it on some other criteria. The most common maximum credit for years of service is forty; 51 percent of the responding institutions offered such a maximum. Most institutions that capped the level of the benefit based on a faculty member’s salary reported a maximum greater than or equal to 75 percent of the individual’s salary. Fourteen institutions reported that the maximum level of the benefit an individual could receive upon retirement was 100 percent of his or her salary.

**Retirement Planning**

Eighty-eight percent of responding institutions reported making financial-planning services or retirement counseling available to their faculty members; 12 percent indicated that they did not do so. Seventy-two percent offered early planning for retirement (to faculty younger than fifty-five), while 28 percent of institutions did not. A substantial number (248) of institutions
provided “lifestyle planning” to help faculty determine what to do in retirement. Such services were more likely to be provided by organizations external to a college or university. Ninety-four percent of responding institutions indicated that they did not provide financial subsidies for the services offered by outside organizations.

Retirement-Incentive Programs
Retirement incentives (sometimes referred to as buy-outs) have become accepted practice among institutions of higher education since the end of mandatory retirement. Incentives are designed to encourage tenured faculty members to retire prior to age seventy. More than 38 percent of responding institutions reported that since 2000 they had offered one or more institution-wide financial-incentive programs for retirement. Only a small number of institutions indicated that their most recent plans were offered before 1994 (n=13), in 1994 (n=8), or between 1994 and 2000 (n=13). Fifty-two percent of the institutions that reported having a previous plan indicated that it was introduced after 2000. The 9 percent of institutions that reported having two previous plans indicated that their most recent plans had also been initiated after 2000. Figure 7 shows the percentage of institutions reporting that a legislature, a collective bargaining unit, or a governing board or administration originated the incentive plans. Clearly, governing boards or administrations originated the highest percentage of the most recent plans at surveyed institutions.

At most of the responding institutions, faculty were automatically eligible to participate in whatever retirement-incentive program was on offer once they met a plan’s age or years of service requirement. However, most plans were available only for a specified time. Among the most recent retirement-incentive plans institutions provided, ages fifty (25 percent), fifty-five (34 percent), and sixty (25 percent) were the most frequently reported minimum ages to participate. Ten (33 percent) and fifteen (25 percent) were the most frequently reported minimum years of service required to participate. Nine percent of institutions reported that faculty members could participate in the most recent plan if they had five years of service. Seven percent of institutions reported permitting

Figure 7. Percentage of Institutions by Origin of Incentive Plan
faculty members to participate only after they had accrued twenty years of service. Characteristics of previous plans were generally similar.

Most of the institutions that reported providing one-time additional cash payments indicated that the payment totaled less than nine months’ salary. Figure 8 suggests, however, that the amount of cash payments may be increasing. Any such increase would give faculty an incentive to wait to see if a more generous buy-out might be offered in the future. Institutions may be increasing the amount of the cash payments to make buy-outs more effective.

Among institutions offering credit for additional years of service as part of an incentive plan, three years of credit was the most commonly offered benefit. However, fewer institutions offered three years of service credit in their most recent plans compared with their previous plans, and the percentage of institutions providing less than three years additional service in their most recent plans increased. The data also suggest that at least a few institutions may be experimenting with offering more than three years additional service credit (see figure 9).

Phased-Retirement Programs
Phased-retirement programs can take many forms. (See, for example, “New Ways to Phase into Retirement: Options for Faculty and Institutions” in the winter 2005 issue of the journal New Directions for Higher Education.) For the purposes of this survey, phased retirement was defined as “a formal program that permits tenured faculty members to phase into retirement by working fractional-time (for pro-rated pay) on the condition that they waive tenure at a specified time” (question 19 of the survey instrument). The survey data suggest that the number of phased-retirement programs in higher education has increased (see figure 10). Fifty-eight institutions reported that they implemented phased-retirement plans since 2000 (twenty institutions reported doing so in 2005 and 2006 alone). More institutions reported implementing phased-retirement programs since 2000 (n=58) than between 1994 and 1999 (n=51).

Still, only 32 percent of responding institutions reported that they currently had a phased-retirement program. Unlike retirement-incentive programs, phased-retirement programs are not typically “window” plans—that is, there usually is not a time limit on a
plan’s availability. Ages fifty-five (42 percent) and sixty (27 percent) were the two most frequently cited minimum ages for eligibility. Forty-four percent of institutions reported ages sixty-three, sixty-four, or sixty-five as the maximum age at which faculty could continue to participate; 19 percent reported age seventy as the maximum.

Sixty-seven percent of responding institutions required faculty members to secure administrative approval to participate in a phased-retirement program. The institutions provided a range of benefits to faculty members who chose phased retirement, including full contributions to health-insurance premiums, extra retirement payments or credits, extra salary payments over and above a pro-rata amount, and the ability to draw on partial retirement benefits while earning salary during phased retirement. Figure 11 shows the percentage of institutions offering each benefit.

Forty-three percent of responding institutions required faculty members to relinquish tenure to participate in a phased-retirement program. Most of the institutions specified a maximum number of years that faculty members could participate. (Thirty-five percent of institutions reported a maximum of three years, and 38 percent reported a maximum of five years).

**Other Benefits for Retired Faculty**

The survey gathered information on the presence or absence of policies for retired faculty related to part-time teaching, committee service, health-insurance coverage, and other benefits. Although information was requested on the level of benefits, specific details of the policies were not collected because of the variation among institutional programs. Many institutions post information about their retirement programs and policies on an institutional Web site. (Upon request, the AAUP will provide a list of the Web sites of respondents that agreed to be identified.)

Most institutions permitted at least some retired faculty members to teach part time. Forty-eight percent of responding institutions reported that all their retired faculty members could teach; 51 percent reported that some could do so. Only about 33 percent of the respondents indicated that part-time teaching was negotiable as a condition for retiring from a tenured position. Retired part-time faculty members are typically paid similarly to other part-time faculty.

Sixty-six percent of responding institutions did not permit retired professors to advise or supervise students or to chair student honors theses or dissertation essays. Twenty-one percent of the respondents allowed retired professors to supervise or advise students but not to chair
Figure 10. Number of Institutions Offering Phased-Retirement Programs by Year of Implementation

Figure 11. Percentage of Institutions Offering Special Benefits in Phased Retirement by Benefit Type
theses or dissertations. Retired faculty could both advise or supervise and chair at 13 percent of the institutions.

Eighty-two percent of the respondents conferred the title emeritus professor, but only 47 percent of them awarded it routinely to all retired tenured professors. In most cases, the title was conferred at the discretion of a university administration.

At 82 percent of responding institutions, faculty retirees continued to be eligible for group health insurance (other than as required by law through the COBRA program); at 80 percent of the institutions, spouses also continued to be eligible. The amount of cost borne by the individual and the institution varied, however. Fifty-one percent of institutions paid part of the cost for the faculty retiree, while 33 percent required the individual to pay 100 percent of the cost (see figure 12). Although 17 percent of institutions paid the entire cost of medical insurance for the individual retiree, few institutions reported paying the entire cost of medical insurance for spouses (3 percent), domestic partners (5 percent), family members (2 percent), or survivors (2 percent). The most common scenario was for individuals and institutions to share the cost of medical insurance for the retiree (51 percent), spouse (51 percent), partner (54 percent), or family member (51 percent). Individuals are more likely than not to bear responsibility for 100 percent of the cost of long-term care (96 percent), dental insurance (65 percent), vision coverage (62 percent), and survivors’ benefits (54 percent).

Only 45 percent of responding institutions reported that their health-insurance benefits had remained the same for both active and retired faculty members since 2000. Twenty-six percent of the respondents reported reducing benefits for both groups equally, while 8 percent indicated that benefits for retired faculty had been reduced more than those for active faculty. When asked about future plans for retiree health-insurance benefits, most institutions reported that they intended to maintain benefits at current levels. However, 20 percent of the institutions did not respond to this question, refused to answer it, or indicated that they did not know.

Many retired faculty members also received other benefits, such as library privileges and office space. Figure 13 depicts the variation in other benefits offered by how many faculty members received the benefit: none, some, or all.
For example, 78 percent of institutions offered library privileges, 72 percent let retirees use campus fitness facilities, and 64 percent extended faculty pricing for events to all retired faculty members. About half of all responding institutions provided retirees with an e-mail address (56 percent), access to institutional computer networks (48 percent), and parking (54 percent). Fifty-four percent of institutions provided office space to some retired faculty.

Less common benefits were tuition remission (47 percent of institutions did not offer it), campus telephone numbers (49 percent did not provide them), secretarial assistance (59 percent did not make it available), and travel funds (83 percent of institutions did not provide it).

Forty-two percent of institutions had a faculty retiree organization. Where retiree organizations existed, 69 percent had been organized by faculty retirees; 26 percent were initiated by administrators. Only 43 percent of the responding institutions provided space on campus for retired faculty to meet.

Recruitment and Retention of New Faculty
The survey asked institutions to rate the importance of three key areas related to staffing: recruitment, retention, and retirement. Figure 14 shows the percentage of institutions rating each of the three areas as “very important.” Ninety-six percent of responding institutions indicated that recruiting new faculty was very important to them; 89 percent reported that retaining current faculty was. Only 19 percent of institutions, however, reported that retiring older faculty was very important—a significant finding given the aging of the faculty population. The National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, a project of the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics, estimates that the average age of faculty increased from forty-seven to fifty between 1988 and 2004. In 2004, the average age of full-time tenured faculty members was fifty-four. This aging of the faculty population has many implications for policy and practice that go beyond the scope of this report.

Conclusion
The findings of this survey show that the context and environment in which decisions about faculty retirement are being made is marked by both consistency and variation. Consistency is evident in the attempts by institutions to manage the number of faculty members retiring by
offering retirement incentives and phased-retirement programs. But variation in institutional policies and practices regarding retirement suggests that where an individual faculty member retires from matters. Among the major findings of the study are:
1. Although the shift from defined-benefit to defined-contribution retirement programs continues, the default plan, if there is one, is defined benefit.
2. The number of institutions that reported having implemented phased-retirement programs was larger between 2000 and 2006 than between 1994 and 1999.
3. High percentages of responding institutions reported that recruitment and retention of faculty were important (over 90 and 80 percent, respectively), but only 20 percent reported being concerned about retiring older faculty.

It is important to continue to monitor and systematically collect information on retirement policies and practices across higher education to help individuals and institutions navigate the maze we now know as retirement.

Notes
1. A question was also included to aid in the calculation of retirement rates for the 2004–05 academic year.
2. This requirement may change now that the Pension Protection Act of 2006 has removed barriers that prevented companies from automatically enrolling their employees in defined contribution plans.

Figure 14. Percentage of Institutions Rating Key Staffing Practices as “Very Important”
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Contact information for individual completing the survey:

Name:__________________________________________________________
Contact Title or Office:__________________________________________
University:____________________________________________________
Street Address:_______________________________________________
City/State/Zip:_______________________________________________

Phone:______________
E-Mail:______________
Unit ID:______________
Please answer the following questions. If your plan features do not fit the options provided in a specific question, please insert a brief description or, if the feature is too complex, say so and skip to the next question. If you would like to provide a fuller narrative with your answer to any question, please do so on separate sheets that include your name, institution and institution Unit ID at the top of each sheet.

Part I. Regular Retirement Programs

1. Does the retirement income program covering your faculty include a defined contribution system (such as TIAA-CREF), a defined benefit system (such as a state system in which benefits are based on a formula that might include years of service, final average salary and age), or both? (Please circle one response.)
   1. Defined Contribution
   2. Defined Benefit
   3. A combined plan that includes features of both
   4. Faculty can choose either (1) or (2) or both
   5. Do not provide a retirement program → Skip to Question 9, page 4

If “faculty can choose” in Question 1:

1a. Which type of plan is the default (or is required)? (Please circle one response.)
   1. Defined Contribution
   2. Defined Benefit
   3. Neither

Everyone please answer:

2. Are part-time faculty eligible to participate in your retirement program? (Note: This item does not include full-time faculty who take a temporary load reduction or leave.) (Please circle one response.)
   1. Yes
   0. No
3. For each type of plan available, please give the approximate number of faculty currently participating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN TYPE</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Eligible</td>
<td>Number Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined plan that includes features of both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Can faculty choose to opt out of all retirement plans offered by your institution? *(Please circle one response.)*

1. Yes
0. No

*Please Note: The remainder of this questionnaire applies to full-time faculty only.*

5. If you have a retirement program based on a defined contribution system, what is the typical contribution rate by the institution and the minimum required contribution rate for the full-time faculty? *(Please write in response for both (a) and (b) below.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution Rate</th>
<th>Institution Typical Contribution Rate:</th>
<th>Faculty Minimum Required Contribution Rate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Institution Typical Contribution Rate:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Faculty Minimum Required Contribution Rate:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Variable Rate:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>□ Years of service</th>
<th>Institutional Contribution Rate</th>
<th>Faculty Contribution Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Age of faculty member</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Faculty rank</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Date of hire</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have a retirement program based on a defined benefit system (as specified in Question 1), please continue with Question 6a below. Otherwise, skip to Question 8 on the next page.

6a. What is your annual benefit formula (percentage rate per year of service)?

6b. How is salary defined for purposes of calculating the benefit? (Please circle one response.)

1. Career average
2. Final three years
3. Highest salary
4. Other (please specify):

6c. Which of the following factors affect the benefit formula? (Check all that apply and provide a brief explanation for each response that you checked.)

- [ ] Age of faculty member
- [ ] Faculty Rank
- [ ] Date of Hire

Explanations:

7. If you have a retirement program based on a defined benefit system, is there a maximum on the level of benefit that an individual can receive upon retirement? (Please circle one response.)

1. Yes
0. No —> Skip to Question 8, next page

If “yes” in Question 7:

7a. Is the maximum based on: (Please check all that apply and specify number and/or percent for each response you checked.)

- [ ] Maximum Years of Service Credit: 
- [ ] Percent of Final Year(s) of Salary: # of Years % Salary 
- [ ] Other Limit (Please specify criteria): 
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**Everyone please answer:**

8. Which of the following does your institution offer to encourage and/or assist faculty in retirement planning? *(Please check all types of planning offered and then check all ways that each is offered.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF RETIREMENT PLANNING OFFERED</th>
<th>Seminars offered by outside organizations</th>
<th>Seminars offered by internal staff</th>
<th>Individual assistance by outside organizations</th>
<th>Individual assistance by internal staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Early planning for retirement (prior to age 55)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Financial planning or counseling for retirement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Lifestyle planning for retirement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If any retirement planning offered from outside organizations:*

8a. Does your institution provide any financial subsidy for retirement planning services offered by outside organizations? *(Please circle one response.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Yes</th>
<th>0 No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Part II. Retirement Incentive Programs (Not Phased Retirement)**

*(Note: Phased Retirement Programs are covered in Part III)*

9. Has your institution had one or more institution-wide financial incentive programs at any time since 2000 that encouraged tenured faculty members to retire prior to age 70? *(Please circle one response.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Yes</th>
<th>0 No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Skip to Part III, page 7" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If “yes” in Question 9:*

9a. In what year was each of these incentive plans implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9b. What was the origin of each of these incentive plans? *(Please check all that apply.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Legislature</th>
<th>Collective Bargaining</th>
<th>Governing Board or Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Questions 10 through 18 request information concerning your current retirement incentive plans and up to two possible previous plans since 2000, as identified in Question 9a.

10. For each of the incentive plans please indicate whether the program is (was) one in which all faculty meeting the plan’s age or years of service requirement automatically benefit from the program, or is (was) eligibility subject to administrative approval?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Automatic</th>
<th>Approval Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Is (was) the program open for an indefinite time to those faculty who reach a specified age or number of years of service on an ongoing basis or was it a “window” plan limited to a specified calendar time period? *Note: “window” refers to a time limit on the availability of the plan, not age or years of service for participation.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ongoing Basis</th>
<th>Window Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td>1 (or) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If a plan has (had) a *minimum* years of service or age requirement, please specify the years and/or age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age (specify)</th>
<th>Years of Service (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td>______ (and/or)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td>______ (and/or)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td>______ (and/or)</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. If a plan has (had) a maximum years of service or age requirement, please specify the years and/or age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (specify)</th>
<th>Years of Service (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recent plan:</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (1):</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (2):</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If a plan diminishes (diminished) benefits over an age range and/or years of service, please specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range (specify)</th>
<th>Years of Service (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recent plan:</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (1):</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (2):</strong></td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If an incentive plan provides (provided) a one-time additional cash payment, how many months of salary was the payment typically equivalent to? (Note: 9 months = academic year base salary.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>&lt;9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10-18</th>
<th>&gt;18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recent plan:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (1):</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (2):</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. If an incentive plan provides (provided) increased retirement benefits please indicate how that is (was) provided:

16a. Number of additional service year credits, if any:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recent plan:</strong></td>
<td>_______ year credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (1):</strong></td>
<td>_______ year credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (2):</strong></td>
<td>_______ year credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

16b. Approximate value as a percent of annual salary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most recent plan:</strong></td>
<td>_______ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (1):</strong></td>
<td>_______ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous plan (2):</strong></td>
<td>_______ %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. If any plan provided a paid terminal leave please indicate the number of months of leave (Note: 9 months = standard academic year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>&lt;9 Months</th>
<th>9 Months</th>
<th>10-18 Months</th>
<th>&gt;18 Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most recent plan:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (1):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous plan (2):</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If you reported any discontinued plan(s), please indicate briefly the reason(s) for discontinuing it (them):

________________________
________________________
________________________
________________________

Part III. Phased Retirement Programs

19. Does your institution currently have a formal program that permits tenured faculty members to phase into retirement by working fractional-time (for pro-rated pay) on the condition that they waive tenure at a specified time? (Note: Part-time teaching subsequent to retirement is covered in Part IV below.)

1 Yes

0 No → Skip to Question 26, page 9

If “yes” in Question 19:

20. If the phased retirement plan has a minimum and/or maximum years of service or age eligibility requirement, please specify the years and/or age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (specify)</th>
<th>Years of Service (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum:</td>
<td>(and/or)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum:</td>
<td>(and/or)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Are all faculty members who meet the age and years of service requirements specified in the plan automatically eligible to take advantage of the program, or is administrative approval required? (Please circle one response.)

1. All eligible
2. Administrative approval required

22. Which of the following special financial benefits are provided to faculty members who choose phased retirement? (Please check all that apply and then circle response to indicate how many receive the benefit for each benefit provided.)

How many faculty members who choose phased retirement receive benefit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFITS PROVIDED</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full contribution to health insurance premium:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra retirement payments or credits:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra (more than pro-rata) salary payments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to receive partial retirement benefits in addition to salary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify): ________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Are faculty members who take advantage of the phased retirement program and move to part-time status required to relinquish their tenured status prior to participation in the plan? (Please circle one response.)

1. Yes
0. No  

If “yes” in Question 23:

23a. What, if any, is the maximum number of years that the faculty member may remain in part-time status (phased retirement) before relinquishing tenure? (Please circle one response.)

1. No limit
2. Maximum years permitted__________

24. In what year was the current phased retirement plan implemented?_______

25. Is the current phased retirement program a “window” plan limited to a specified calendar time period? Note: "window" refers to a time limit on the availability of the plan, not age or years of service for participation. (Please circle one response.)

1. Yes
0. No
Everyone please answer:

26. Was there a previous phased retirement program (within the last five years) that has ended? (Please circle one response.)

1 Yes
0 No

27. Does your institution permit retired faculty to teach on a part-time basis? (Please circle one response.)

3 All
2 Some
1 None

Part IV. Policies Regarding Retired Faculty

28. Does your institution provide that faculty may negotiate continued part-time teaching opportunities as a condition of retirement from their tenured positions? (Please circle one response.)

1 Yes
0 No

29. Are retired part-time faculty generally paid more than, less than, or similarly to other part-time teaching faculty? (Please circle one response.)

1 More than
2 Less than
3 Similarly to
8 Do not know

30. Is the title emeritus professor conferred on retired faculty? (Please circle one response.)

1 Yes
0 No

Skip to Question 31, next page

If “yes” in Question 30:

30a. Is emeritus status fairly routine for all retired tenured professors or is the award of the title subject to the discretion of the university administration?

1 Fairly routine
2 Administrative discretion
**Everyone please answer:**

31. Are retired professors eligible to advise or supervise student honors thesis or dissertation essays and to chair pertinent committees? *(Please check one response.)*

   1. Eligible to supervise/advise
   2. Eligible to chair
   3. Both
   4. Neither

32. Does your institution provide continued eligibility (other than as required by COBRA) for group health insurance to retired faculty? *(Please check the types of coverage available, and then circle one response for how each benefit is paid.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT AVAILABLE</th>
<th>Eligible individual pays 100%</th>
<th>Institution pays part of cost</th>
<th>Institution pays entire cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance for retiree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance for spouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance for domestic partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance for family members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical insurance for survivors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental coverage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term care insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Since 2000, how have health insurance benefits for retired faculty changed in comparison to those for active faculty? *(Please read all options carefully and choose the one that best reflects your institution.)*

   1. Retired faculty benefits have been reduced more than those for active faculty
   2. Retired faculty benefits have been improved more than those for active faculty
   3. Benefits for both groups have been reduced equally
   4. Benefits for both groups have been improved equally
   5. Benefits for both groups have remained the same as they were in 2000
34. What are your institution’s future plans for retiree health insurance benefits? (Please circle one response.)

1. Plan to increase retiree health insurance benefits available
2. Plan to maintain retiree health insurance benefits at their current level
3. Plan to decrease retiree health insurance benefits available
   (If this is the case, please specify what measures are under consideration):

35. Which of the following other benefits are provided to retired faculty? (Please circle one response for each benefit (a) through (k) below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>All Retired Faculty</th>
<th>Some Retired Faculty</th>
<th>No Retired Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Office space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Secretarial assistance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Access to institutional computer network</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Institutional e-mail address</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Campus telephone number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Travel funds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Library privileges</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Tuition remission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Faculty price for events</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Use of fitness/recreational facilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Are retired faculty members who are scientists assigned lab space using the same criteria that are used for tenured faculty members (e.g. volume of sponsored research activity over a predefined period)? (Please circle one response.)

1. Yes
0. No
7. Not applicable

37. Are retired faculty eligible to continue to apply for research grants through the university? (Please circle one response.)

1. Yes
0. No
7. Not applicable
38. Does your institution provide a space on campus for retired faculty to meet? (Please circle one response.)

1 Yes
0 No
8 Do not know

39. Does your institution have a faculty retiree organization? (Please circle one response.)

1 Yes
0 No → Skip to Question 40
8 Do not know → Skip to Question 40

If “yes” in Question 39:

39a. Who initially organized the group? (Please check all that apply.)

☐ Faculty retirees
☐ Faculty senate
☐ Collective bargaining representative
☐ Faculty organization
☐ Administration

*Everyone please answer:*

40. We would like to calculate the retirement rate for the 2004-05 academic year. Please give us a count of active full-time faculty in each age category at the beginning of the academic year, and the number who retired by the beginning of the 2005-06 academic year: (Please enter a number for each age range; enter 0 if no faculty in a particular category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in 2005</th>
<th>Number of active full-time faculty at the beginning of 2004-05</th>
<th>Number of those faculty retired by the beginning of 2005-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. Does your institution have information regarding your retirement program on an institutional web site? *(Please circle one response.)*  
1 Yes → Specify web site address: ____________________________  
0 No  

42. Please indicate whether your institution may or may not be identified when data is shared with other institutions. *(Please circle one response.)*  
1 May be identified  
2 May not be identified  

43. Finally, how important is each of the following to your institution? *(Please circle one response for each item.)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not So Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Recruiting new faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Retaining current faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Retiring older faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If there are one or more other institutional officers whom we or others might contact for further information on faculty retirement issues please include their information below.

Name: ___________________________  
Phone: ________________________  
Contact Title or Office: ___________________________  
E-Mail: ______________________  
University: ___________________________  
Unit ID: ______________________  
Street Address: ___________________________  
City/State/Zip: ___________________________  

Name: ___________________________  
Phone: ________________________  
Contact Title or Office: ___________________________  
E-Mail: ______________________  
University: ___________________________  
Unit ID: ______________________  
Street Address: ___________________________  
City/State/Zip: ___________________________
A recurring and persistent challenge of the Faculty at Howard University is its inability, despite sustained efforts, to develop a collaborative and productive relationship with the Administration. In their persistence to secure such collaboration, the Faculty is complying with the substance of language that was crafted in major institutional documents that were jointly produced by both Faculty and Administration, and subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees. As guardians of the Academy in its local setting, and as the ultimate safeguard of the integrity and quality of academic life, the Faculty of Howard University take seriously its appropriate characterization in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (January, 1993) “as a partner with shared responsibility” (Article XI, Section C.1). The principle of shared governance, which mandates the collaborative efforts of Faculty and Administration, represents the fundamental condition, indeed, the sine qua non for ensuring that the best that we collectively have to offer will guide our discussions and, ultimately, our decisions for the benefit of our beloved institution and especially, those who live, learn and labor in association with Howard University.

This Faculty Manifesto is a declaration of the Faculty’s position regarding its frustrations and repeated failures to secure a collaborative working relationship with the Administration. The format of the document is four-tiered, and organized as follows:

**Section A.** presents specific language in both the Howard University Faculty Handbook (1993) and the Constitution of the Faculty Senate (January, 1993) that outlines the institutionally adopted commitment to a collaborative relationship between the Faculty and the Administration;
Section B. presents a representative set of inappropriate behaviors on the part of the Administration that constitute misdeeds or violations of both the spirit and intent of the specifications in Section A;

Section C. presents the range of possible responses or strategies that the Faculty are prepared to embrace in order to ensure compliance on the part of all parties identified as partners in the shared governance of Howard University;

Section D. presents a challenge that grounds responsibility for the character of the Academy with the faculty.

Section A. Institutional Documents that Frame the Collaborative Character of Faculty and Administration Relationship

Article 1. Section C. of the Constitution of the Faculty Senate, entitled University Faculty Partnership with the Administration and Board of Trustees, clearly specifies the character of the relationship that must exist between the Faculty and the Administration as a “partnership,” which is to be based on mutual respect and shared responsibility for the welfare of the University. This framing concept of a partnership is further reinforced in Section E. of the same article entitled University Faculty Issues Agenda, which stipulates that on an annual basis the Faculty Senate shall prepare a University Faculty Issues Agenda which shall serve to ensure collaborative dialogue and resolution with the Administration and Trustees. To this end, in keeping with the concept of partnership, Section E of Article 1 explicitly recognizes that the Faculty Issues Agenda is not restricted to the Faculty alone, but rather serves to link the Faculty with the Administration and Trustees as jointly responsible for the issues that constitute the University Faculty Issues Agenda. With respect to educational policy at the institution, Article 1 further specifies in Section F. entitled University Faculty Role in General Educational Policy that “the University Trustees and Administration act in collaboration with the collective University Faculty, through the Senate, with regard to the development, review and revision of general educational policy; that is, policy that is applicable to more than one school or college.”

The Constitution in Article XI. Section C. 8 and 9 is also clear on the collaborative character of all policies and procedures affecting more than one school or college that either the President or the Board of Trustees might initiate. That is, the Administration must seek Faculty Senate input before deciding policies and procedures that affect more than one school or college. Additionally, it is stipulated that the Faculty Senate shall be consulted whenever the Administration develops recommendations or proposals so that the Faculty Senate may assist and collaborate in their development. The language in this section specifies
that the reason for seeking Faculty input on such matters is to ensure that the “individual and collective expertise” of the Faculty is sought “before final recommendations of the President are cast.”

Finally, in Section 1.5.1 General Institutional Governance, the Howard University Faculty Handbook, which addresses the role of Faculty (1.5.1.2), states that “the faculty shares responsibility with the administration of the university in matters related to academic programs including faculty recruitment and development; faculty evaluation; program development and review; student advising; class schedule planning; and general supervision of the research, teaching, and outreach activities of the school, or college.”

In essence, both the Constitution of the Faculty Senate and the Howard University Faculty Handbook frame the relationship between the Faculty and the Administration within a discourse that converges around the concepts of partnership and collaboration in (1) University governance, and (2) the development of university-wide programs, policies and procedures.

**SECTION B. INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIORS ON THE PART OF THE ADMINISTRATION THAT VIOLATE THE SPIRIT AND INTENT OF THE COLLABORATIVE CHARACTER OF FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIP AS OUTLINED ABOVE.**

Although the final authority for the conduct of university affairs is vested in the Board of Trustees, the academic judgments, recommendations, and policies of the faculty are central to the university’s general educational policy and in determining the shape and character of the university as an educational institution (Howard University Faculty Handbook, 2.3., Faculty Responsibility).

Since the adoption of both the Faculty Handbook and the Constitution of the Faculty Senate in 1993, the Administration of Howard University has maintained a tradition of sustained violation of both the spirit and intent of a collaboratively working relationship with the Faculty, as specified in the cited University documents. In many ways and on many occasions, the Administration has frustrated efforts on the part of Faculty (1) to meet with the Administration, (2) to have reasonable access to documents and information; and (3) to have early and meaningful input into policies and procedures in advance of their adoption. In effect, the Administration has made it clear that they do not consider the Faculty as a valued and significant partner in matters related to the academic health and long-term welfare of Howard University. Among the many violations that can be cited as evidence of the Administration’s negative and dismissive attitude toward Faculty, the following can be referenced:

1. Violations of Shared Governance
a. Strategic Framework for Action I and II were drafted and adopted without soliciting input from Faculty. When unsolicited input was advanced by the Faculty for consideration, the Administration did not use that input in the final form of either SFA I nor SFA II;

b. The President’s “merit program,” established and implemented without input from the Faculty, is an egregious affront to the Faculty of Howard University. Despite repeated efforts on the part of Faculty to seek needed review and revision of the program, the Administration has staunchly refused to allow such review and revision leading toward the overhaul of such a poorly designed, highly divisive, and organizationally dysfunctional program;

c. Although the Faculty Handbook provides for shared governance between Faculty and the Administration for academic programs, Faculty recruitment, Faculty evaluation, and program development, the Administration (especially involving the Deans and Provost) has continued to hire Faculty without departmental review and approval;

d. The Administration routinely implement procedures that violate the Faculty Handbook with respect to the appointment of department chairs;

e. The President and Provost routinely form committees to address matters related to the interests of the Faculty, and do not seek input from the membership recommended by the Faculty Senate, nor do they include membership from the duly elected representatives of the Faculty;

f. The Administration has refused to work with the faculty to clarify or amend the nefarious “not withstanding” clause in the Faculty Handbook that grants to the Administration the right to remove any professor when “the interests of the university require it” (2.7.4.2 Basic Principles of the Tenure System).

2. Non-Reponsiveness to Faculty Concerns

a. The President has failed repeatedly to respond to requests from the Faculty Senate leadership for dates regarding significant University events, which has often resulted in needless delays in the conduct of Faculty Senate affairs;

b. The Faculty Senate leadership generally and the Faculty individually have often sought to communicate with and to confer with either the President or the Provost on matters of significance. On many occasions, both University officials have assumed an attitude of social distance and non-responsiveness to such requests, despite follow-up requests in many instances;

c. The President has never complied with the procedures related to the Grievance Hearing Commission which requires, in the event that the President declines to implement the recommendations of the Hearing Commission, that he communicate detailed reasons for his decision in writing to the chair of the Faculty Senate;

d. The Faculty has made numerous recommendations to address the cumbersome and confusing research infrastructure of the University; however, to no avail.

3. Threat to the Quality of Academic Programs
a. Departments have suffered losses of Faculty lines and major budget cuts without Faculty consultation, and in many instances, without Faculty knowledge;

b. Academic programs across the University are in disarray, with many of them obligated to suffer under conditions characterized by substandard equipment and facilities;

c. The Administration has persistently refused to implement Faculty evaluation of Deans, the Provost, and the President despite repeated requests from the Faculty.

d. The Administration has adopted a policy of performance evaluation of the Faculty to occur at least every two years, which includes a requirement that the Administration share the evaluation with the Faculty member in a personal interview. In many instances across the schools and colleges, this is not done despite requests from the Faculty for the past four years;

4. Inadequate Management of Fiscal Resources

a. The President has failed to identify alternative financial sources to support and sustain strong academic programs, given that the federal appropriation has remained flat;

b. The President has failed in some instances to implement funded programs when such funds have been awarded;

c. The President has failed to effectively and properly manage the fiscal resources of the University, and, as a result, has jeopardized the long-term fiscal health of the institution.

SECTION C. RANGE OF POSSIBLE STRATEGIES THAT THE FACULTY ARE PREPARED TO EMBRACE TO RECLAIM THE ACADEMY AT HOWARD UNIVERSITY. THE AREAS OF FOCUS WILL BE THE FOLLOWING:

(I) The Howard University Community and Its Affiliates

a. Bring the issues as outlined above directly to the Faculty Senate membership at a Faculty retreat;

b. Continue to educate the Faculty community across the campus in order to ensure their knowledge and support;

c. Take our concerns and our demands in writing directly to the Board of Trustees for action;

d. Forward the Manifesto to the Board of Trustees, the President, and the Provost;

e. Disseminate the Manifesto through the Senate Communicator, the Faculty Senate website, and the Hilltop;
f. Align with the Howard University Alumni Association.

(II) The External Community

a. Inform the Middle States Accrediting Association;

b. Inform AAUP;

c. Inform all accrediting boards affiliated with the respective schools and colleges;

d. Inform the various media outlets associated with the Academy (e.g., *Faculty Voice*, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*).

**SECTION D. RECLAIMING THE ACADEMY**

In the opening paragraph of this Faculty Manifesto, it was stated that Faculty are the guardians of the Academy in its local setting as well as the ultimate safeguard of the integrity and quality of academic life. The itemized details of the experiences that Howard Faculty have endured from the Administration, as presented in Sections A and B above, represent in many instances the incursion of administrative personnel into the academic space that properly belongs with the Faculty. Given the fundamental principle that primacy for academic programs together with the integrity and quality of those programs fall within the purview of Faculty, it is the duty of Faculty to accept partial responsibility for its tolerance of this incursion, and to recognize that if the Academy at Howard University is to be what it must be, then Faculty are challenged to recognize that by virtue of its activity or inactivity, it has wittingly or unwittingly contributed to the very violations that it condemns on the part of the Administration.

Reclaiming the Academy begins with the affirmation of the Faculty role in re-claiming its primary responsibility (1) to be the guardians of the Academy in its local setting, and (2) to recognize that direct Faculty action in all matters related to the academic life of the Institution is prerequisite to the academic health and long-term welfare of the University. By virtue of what the Faculty does or fails to do in all academic matters, the character and quality of the Academy at Howard University depend. By acknowledging primacy in the Faculty for the integrity and strength of academic programs, the Faculty re-affirms its commitment to work to “Reclaim the Academy” as properly falling within its domain and expertise, and to collaborate with the Administration “as a partner with shared responsibility” as mandated by the *Constitution of the Faculty Senate*. 
The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal: Selected Points

A vision for any established institution of higher education is compelling only when it solidly grounded in the institution’s achievements and recognized strengths while drawing on their natural evolution in order to enhance expectations and inform the range of possibilities.

 Unlike virtually all other comprehensive universities in this country, Howard University’s mission is grounded in the singular struggle of the nation to transform, if not reconstruct fundamental elements of racial and social inequality rooted in American social history.

A real renewal, like a realistic vision, places the physical plant and the administrative procedures at the service of its academic vision and planning such that academic renewal does not imply planning for or planning around unknown or unchanging working conditions.

Research

The institution has remained largely in the background of the major research achievements of its faculty… It brings incentive but little substance to the individual and insular initiative of researchers and their colleagues. As research scripts have changed overtime, the newer scripts call for preparatory institutional financial commitments in terms of office space, laboratories, fellowships and personnel as well as matching funds at levels that fade into the accounting background only after a long run of research successes. The current and proposed efforts to reward research initiative assume institutional inertia, if not indifference, while the individual researchers put the research in motion.

The Emphasis on Graduate Education

For graduate education, as proposed, funding would be significantly dependent on the financial marketplace for ideas. For many of the big RFP providers the absence of common interests with the university has been disrupted by Howard’s propensity toward egalitarian and human rights campaigns. In the competitive funding arena the legacy of Howard’s historic figures like Sterling Brown, Ralph Bunche and E. Franklin Frazier would be obscured by the bias of the proposed reward system in graduate education.

Program Evaluation (or Who and What Goes Down for the Greater Good)

The six criteria for program evaluation are reasonable but not quite empirical nor measurable, much less quantifiable. To the extent that terms like “academic quality” can be operationalized some of the concepts logically contained in the term must be excluded while its operationalization includes utilitarian but artificial distinctions. Accordingly, terms like “research” too easily degenerate into a kind of grantsmanship.
Program Elimination

If we at Howard need to respond to new social forces or to a changing marketplace in higher education, we should simply say so; we should confront the new challenges. We should start program change with a clear purpose rather than seeming to renew programs that serve their purposes as well as they always have.

The preferences for any programs including “STEM and Health Sciences” ones should be consistent with institutional capabilities and potential. However competitive Howard may be in STEM fields, it is probably more competitive in other areas. The higher the level of competition for funding, the less the well-intentioned researcher faces an open field.

Faculty Voluntary Separation and Retirement Incentives

As for the recruitment and retention of faculty in chosen fields (STEM fields), institutional reputation weighs as heavily on their choices as that of departments. No department can be appealing in an unappealing institutional environment. And no program is an island.

What Should Be Done

A real renewal, like a realistic vision, places the physical plant and the administrative procedures at the service of its academic planning such that academic renewal does not imply planning for or planning around unknown or unchanging working conditions.

RESEARCH: In virtually every field of research where major grants are necessary, major research is collaborative and institutionally based. In order for researchers to win large external grants, a sustained institutional commitment is required

GRADUATE/UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION: Selective increases in the graduate programs should accompany the recognition that the university does not adequately finance the ones it has. Reinforce the undergraduate program emphasizing quality rather than quantity.

FIELD PREFERENCE: We should be realistic about the comparative competitive advantages and disadvantages of Howard’s programs. Support the fields in which Howard excels.

PROGRAM ELIMINATION AND ENHANCEMENT: Program elimination is more reasonable as part of a thoughtful change in institutional direction than as a component of cost saving. There are numerous avenues for program enhancement that draw on Howard’s special background and are highly attractive to students, research grant donors or both.

FACULTY SEPARATION: Howard professors should have a clear chance to exercise their best judgment about their potential contributions to the educational process and share with the administration their responsibility for its conclusion.
CONCERNS ABOUT THE PCAR PROCESS II

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(To Be Presented at the PCAR Retreat, July 6-7, 2010, Palomar Hotel, Washington, DC.)

1) The Howard University Board of Trustees has a legal and moral obligation to solicit faculty recommendations on major academic program changes. The University charter, faculty handbook, faculty senate constitution and by-laws, as well as AAUP and Middle States principles mandate this solicitation.

2) PCAR is a Presidential, not a faculty commission. Its members are appointed by the President. Only six members were appointed on recommendation of the faculty senate chair. The PCAR chair was university Provost for half of PCAR's duration. PCAR faculty commissioners have not had formal opportunities to set PCAR agenda.

3) The PCAR timelines have afforded no time or mechanism for full faculty response to preliminary or final PCAR recommendations. The President's June 22, 2010 letter to the PCAR chair requires a PCAR final report during the week of August 16, with his recommendations to the Board to be delivered on September 24—this during the busiest and most important time of the academic year.

4) The PCAR timeline affords no opportunity for full PCAR deliberation on revisions to preliminary program evaluations as all PCAR commissioners are not available during the summer months. The President's recent letter states that PCAR deliberations considered academic and research themes recommended by the Faculty Senate. Neither the executive officers, steering committee, council nor body has approved any documents for consideration by PCAR or other university entities.

5) There has been no opportunity for full PCAR deliberation on the relations of academic programs to the university's mission. The plenary meeting dedicated to this topic produced no standards for evaluation based on mission.

6) Most importantly, the President's recent letter states: "I reiterate that I am not asking the commission to recommend the retention or elimination of academic degree and student support programs. I will make program recommendations after carefully reviewing the PCAR report and other information available to me" [my emphasis]. This statement implies either that PCAR is not a body representing the faculty or that the President is not required to seek the full faculty's advice before recommending substantive changes to academic programs—as required by university and professional
body governing documents. Those documents require full faculty input on program changes—including "retention or elimination." The President's proposed Town Hall meetings cannot represent the full deliberation of the faculty as a body. The proposed PCAR timeline is as precipitous as the proposed and withdrawn faculty VSIRP plan.

7) Given allegations (which ought to be investigated) that the Board of Trustees has demonstrated financial mismanagement (nearly $200M in deferred maintenance, perhaps $300M in necessary new construction costs, non-competitive faculty salaries, historically inadequate student and faculty services and support, library resources, and threatened termination of the Moorland Spingarn Research Center), the Board of Trustees' competence to mandate changes in academic programs without fully informed and deliberate faculty advice may be questioned.

(8) On being presented with these six arguments, fellow PCAR commissioners have responded that the Board is determined to cut or merge academic programs. Recommendations based on even limited faculty deliberation are better than no PCAR input to the Board. Against this view, I argue that PCAR commissioners, faculty senate executives and council members, student and faculty Board of Trustee elected members, should urge the Board members to postpone final PCAR recommendations until the above concerns have been addressed.

I note that the PCAR chairman stated continuously that the PCAR deadline of May 15 was inflexible. That deadline is now postponed until the week of August 16.

PCAR commissioners have won one postponement. Let us now make the case for another. A university contemplating the purchase of Walter Reed Hospital and its grounds cannot be in extreme financial straits. Recouping ~$85M in excess administrative costs, terminating the practice of hiring external consults in sums exceeding $100M, and cost savings from a rational and equitable VSIRP should give the university ample time for an academic renewal process whose hallmark is excellence in accord with Howard's mission rather than haste in the face of undocumented fiscal catastrophe.

CONCERNS ABOUT THE PCAR PROCESS II
(FULL TEXT)

The seven following reflections constitute the rationale for this report on concerns about the PCAR process.

1) The Howard University Board of Trustees has a legal and moral obligation to solicit faculty recommendations on major academic program changes. The University charter, faculty handbook, faculty senate constitution and by-laws, as well as AAUP and Middle States principles mandate this solicitation.

2) PCAR is a Presidential, not a faculty commission. Its members are appointed by the President. Only six members were appointed on recommendation of the faculty senate
chair. The PCAR chair was university Provost for half of PCAR's duration. PCAR faculty commissioners have not had formal opportunities to set PCAR agenda.

3) The PCAR timelines have afforded no time or mechanism for faculty response to preliminary or final PCAR recommendations. The President's June 22, 2010 letter to the PCAR chair requires a PCAR final report during the week of August 16, with his recommendations to the Board to be delivered on September 24—this during the busiest and most important time of the academic year.

4) The PCAR timeline affords no opportunity for full PCAR deliberation on revisions to preliminary program evaluations as all PCAR commissioners are not available during the summer months. The President's recent letter states that PCAR deliberations considered academic and research themes recommended by the Faculty Senate. Neither the executive officers, steering committee, council nor body has approved any documents for consideration by PCAR or other university entities.

5) There has been no opportunity for full PCAR deliberation on the relations of academic programs to the university's mission. The plenary meeting dedicated to this topic produced no standards for evaluation based on mission.

6) Most importantly, the President's recent letter states: "I reiterate that I am not asking the commission to recommend the retention or elimination of academic degree and student support programs. I will make program recommendations after carefully reviewing the PCAR report and other information available to me" [my emphasis]. This statement implies either that PCAR is not a body representing the faculty or that the President is not required to seek the full faculty's advice before recommending substantive changes to academic programs—as required by university and professional body governing documents. Those documents require full faculty input on program changes—including "retention or elimination." The President's proposed Town Hall meetings cannot represent the full deliberation of the faculty as a body. The proposed PCAR timeline is as precipitous as the proposed and withdrawn faculty VSIRP plan.

7) Given allegations (which ought to be investigated) that the Board of Trustees has demonstrated financial mismanagement (nearly $200M in deferred maintenance, perhaps $300M in necessary new construction costs, non-competitive faculty salaries, historically inadequate student and faculty services and support, library resources, and threatened termination of the Moorland Spingarn Research Center), the Board of Trustees' competence to mandate changes in academic programs without fully informed and deliberate faculty advice may be questioned. The initial principle that generates this report is that the Howard University Board of Trustees must solicit faculty recommendations for substantive changes in academic programs.

As a presidentially appointed commission, PCAR is not yet able to represent the faculty's wisdom as is evident from the following considerations.
1) The preliminary PCAR report submitted to the President on June 1 and presented by him to the Board of Trustees' executive committee was incomplete and not vetted by all subcommittee members.

2) Preliminary report conclusions were not submitted to academic program chairs, directors, and faculty for collective reflection, criticism, correction of factual errors, and response requesting formal revision on part of the PCAR subcommittees.

3) PCAR execution is based on a narrow assumption. The President has stated that Howard's ~180 academic programs are excessive for a university of Howard's size. PCAR is directed to recommend academic programs for termination, merger, continuance or enhancement based—to the degree possible—on external objective assessment procedures (e.g., Academic Analytics et al.).

4) PCAR has devoted only a single plenary session to Howard's mission as proper grounds for reflection on revisions to academic programs. That session was judged by the Provost as evidence that PCAR commissioners did not have the will to make the program cuts necessary for Howard's economic viability—jeopardized in ways that the Provost could not reveal to the President, presumably because of confidentiality requirements. No formal principles guiding the evaluation of academic programs by reason of Howard's mission issued from PCAR first retreat—held during the winter break when some commissioners could not attend.

5) The only ethical way to assess academic programs at Howard is through the principles of the university's mission—both historic and changing in the light of changes in higher education since Brown vs the Board. The Board of Trustees, the President and Provost have expressed their intention to move Howard to a concentration in the STEM disciplines. Is the rationale for this re-focus purely fiscal? Or does it adjust the university's academic programs to the university's mission?

6) The Howard mission. Its expression is clearest in the university's founders' intentions: to provide a first rate education for those who would not otherwise have the opportunity. Its original students included the daughters of Congregationalist ministers, Native Americans, Chinese, Africans, and with General Howard and the Freedmen's Bureau, freed and free African Americans. The architectural work on Brown vs the Board by Houston, Nabrit, and Marshall amplified the Founder's original intentions. Howard has a history of solving unsolved problems for the communities that justify Howard's existence.

7) Howard is a comprehensive research HBCU. The term research is appropriate because Howard's mission is not simply a search for a solution to a problem. Re-search implies that the problem is so difficult that many have searched unsuccessfully for a solution. Howard research problems may be theoretical or practical—or both.
A problem is literally a throwing in front of in the original Greek. Howard addresses two kinds of problems—negative and positive. Thrown in our path, negative problems prevent us from reaching our goals. We must solve those problems in order to get on with life. Positive problems we find so inherently fascinating that we do not care to draw our attention away from them.

As a comprehensive research university, Howard's mission is solving problems. All its other roles are subservient to that task. We are not here to teach students—if you will forgive my hyperbole. We are here to solve our supporting communities' unsolved problems. We teach students, yes, but not to give them degrees so they can get well-paid jobs. Any institution of higher learning can do that.

We teach students so they can learn to do what we do. And what we do is research. Howard is a comprehensive research university. Not a teaching university—except in fulfillment of our mission as a comprehensive research university. Our mission is not to give degrees. Our mission is to solve the unsolved problems of the communities that justify our existence. We grant degrees in recognition of our students' capacities to assume our tasks.

Students are not our customers. They are our apprentices. Our awarding a degree guarantees (or should guarantee) that students have mastered our trade, our profession.

Can undergraduate students perform research? The undergraduate research initiative in the College of Arts and Sciences inaugurated by Vice President Barbara Griffin is evidence of this claim. As apprentices, undergraduates need not solve unsolved research problems. Even learning to solve already solved problems on their own initiative, they are well launched on the path to becoming true researchers.

8) Cutting academic programs means the university will no longer assume responsibility for solving certain kinds of community problems. Enhancing STEM disciplines at Howard means that the communities that justify Howard's existence have as their most critical problems those that can be solved by STEM research.

9) Perhaps this is a false opposition. Perhaps the real reason for STEM focus at Howard is fiscal. No other measures will guarantee the massive infusion of funding required for Howard's continued existence.

10) But surely that claim is false. The university has hardly begun to implement administrative cost-cutting measures.

11) Hence the real question for PCAR remains: What are the unsolved problems of the university's supporting communities that the university presently wishes to assume responsibility for?

12) My proposed method of assessment: what are the most grievous problems that Howard's supporting communities face? A "survival ethics checklist" is in order.

The urgency of these problems does not dictate an overemphasis on applied versus theoretical research at Howard. In the long run of intellectual history, pure research has had powerful effects on practical applications.

13) A true PCAR assessment of Howard's academic programs: What responsibility will Howard take for solving the unsolved problems of the communities that justify Howard's existence?

A) Let academic programs state the problems they have assumed responsibility for, and let them assess their successes, their failures, their needs, their vision for the future.

B) Let everyone in the Howard community remember that Howard should be unique in solving problems that other comprehensive research institutions do not care to address, or in addressing that task in more effective ways.

14) Every comprehensive research subject grounds itself in seven basic intellectual subjects. These subjects constitute a core that grounds academic programs. This core must form the general education requirement for all Howard undergraduates. Three of these subjects cover the relations of symbols to other symbols—math, logic or critical thinking, and grammar or effective writing and speaking. Students cannot become professionals in any fields without basic competence in reading, writing, critical thinking, and calculation.

Four other subjects cover the uses of symbols sets to describe the wider ranges of human experience: art, history, science and philosophy. Art includes both fine and practical arts like health and exercise courses. History is the record of human experiments in living across thousands of cultures over thousands of years. Science's laws or generalizations over experience allow us to predict and thereby control the future. Philosophy presents us with hyper-generalizations, rules for the direction of life culled from diverse cultural sources and screened through techniques of formal analysis and argumentation. Philosophy's rules set the standards for ethics in all professions. A professional without a working professional ethics is a recipe for disaster, as the current global crises shows so well.

15) These seven basic intellectual disciplines set the foundation for all professional training in Howard's practical arts schools like law, medicine, and engineering. The subject matter of Howard's College of Arts and Sciences, they furnish the theoretical
research that gives applied research its greatest power. The atomic bomb came from Einstein's purely theoretical conviction that \( E=mc^2 \). Even he did not believe that such a theory could lead to the Manhattan project—until the advent of World War II. An even more practical example of the power of theory is the conviction expressed some thousands of years ago in Africa and Eurasia that all humanity forms a single community. This theory, like all the most powerful theories in our intellectual history, still needs work....

16) If an academic program is critical to Howard's execution of its mission, then its past performance can have no bearing on its assessment. It should be a matter for scandal, for example, that Afro-American studies does not have MA and PhD programs. That the department may not have sufficient numbers of faculty or faculty publications to warrant graduate programs reflects on the performance of university administrators rather than that of department members with extensive teaching responsibilities for general education courses.

Given the importance of understanding Africa's role in global cultural diffusion, it should be a matter for scandal that there is no PhD program in ancient civilizations including ancient Egypt, Nubia, Axum in Africa and Greece, Rome, Babylon, Persia, and India in Eurasia. The most ambitious recent work in this field, *The Shape of Ancient Thought* by Thomas McEvilley, came out of Rice University rather than Howard University.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Allegations about the Board of Trustees' financial mismanagement call into question its moral authority or competence to make changes to academic programs without the fully informed advice and consent of the faculty. "Fully informed" means faculty access to all budget data down to department, program and staff levels, physical plant, capital holdings—in short a complete inventory of the university's liabilities and assets, revenue and shortfall projections, accurate endowment figures, status of pension funds, and any other financial information relevant to assessing Howard University's capacity for solving the comprehensive ranges of its justifying communities' problems.

We cannot know how to execute the university's mission through its academic programs without a complete inventory of the university's resources and liabilities.

I have no wish to take an adversarial position against the Board of Trustees. If the Board can demonstrate that it is performing its duties in accord with Best Professional Practice as mandated by its Association of Governing Boards, AAUP principles, as well as the Howard governing documents (Charter, Faculty Handbook, Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Laws), then the Board has every right to implement changes to Howard's academic programs.

University governing documents clearly state that faculty consent is not required for Board of Trustees mandated program changes. However, Middle States reviews of the University consistently state that faculty consent to Board ordered academic program
changes is a first order desideratum. The spirit of the University Charter enforces the same sense of the Board's dependence on faculty advice. The faculty has the moral and legal obligation to advise the Board on broad changes to academic programs. The Board has no legal obligation to solicit the faculty's consent to program changes. However, a house divided against itself cannot stand.

From its inception in 1867, the Howard has suffered from a perception of a vast gulf between its administrative arms and the rest of the university community. Part of that perception stemmed from an initial division between white university administrators and black faculty and students. Alain Locke was removed from the university for protesting salary disparities for black and white faculty, and for intending to inaugurate courses on black culture. Mordecai Wyatt Johnson's arrival as the first black President (although there was a black pro tempore President in the founding years) could not bridge the sixty year gulf between the university community and its administrators. (Institutional inertia is a force that could challenge Archimedes' lever of infinite length.) The metaphor for the divide between community and administrators is well known and does not bear repetition here.

President Ribeau has signaled his determination to close this gulf with a number of historic measures including fiscal transparency and faculty engagement in budget processes. His inauguration of the PCAR process is another remarkable stride toward closing the gap.

President Ribeau has called for independent faculty senate recommendations for academic program changes. The senate has not complied with his request to date.

The College of Arts and Sciences has initiated discussion among chairs and executive committee members about COAS recommendations for academic program changes. The College has issued no formal recommendations to date. If other schools and colleges have made their independent recommendations for their own program revisions, they have not made them available for community examination.

If the PCAR commissioners, faculty senate executive officers and council members, and elected student and faculty Board of Trustee members can convince the Board to extend the PCAR timeline, then the President can have access to full and independent faculty recommendations for program changes before he makes his final recommendations to the Board.

Cap'n PCAR has presented us with a vivid image of Howard on the brink of a potentially catastrophic waterfall. Rushing to decisions on terminating, merging, or enhancing academic programs without appropriate reflection has traumatized Howard in the past. The university has still not recovered from the consequences of terminating the College of Fine Arts—after all these many years!

The Cap'n contrasts Howard with George Mason, peacefully afloat in the calm pool below the waterfall of hasty academic program revision. Its tranquility springs from
academic program assessment built into the fabric of the university. Changes to academic programs should be made only after ample community reflection and consensus. Changes should be introduced in incremental ways to lessen shock to students and faculty in terminated or merged programs.

APPENDIX I TO VERHAREN PCAR REPORT

HBCUs' MISSIONS AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM ASSESSMENT
VERITAS, UTILITAS—ET JUSTITIA

INTRODUCTION

Is there some sense in which all historically Black colleges and universities should have identical missions? Should the mission of an HBCU dictate the nature and extent of its academic programs? Howard University notes its distinctive mission by adding Utilitas to Harvard's motto, Veritas.

The Latin utilitas means usefulness. The question raised in this essay is "usefulness to whom?" Certainly the university is useful to its administrators, faculty, and staff since it provides their livelihood. But the university should also be useful to its students.

Students attend the university to become professionals, whether with graduate, undergraduate, or professional degrees. They pay some small part of the cost of their training.

The university's constituent populations, those that justify the university's existence, pay the rest of the costs through taxes, profits on consumer products or other means. Therefore the students have an obligation to repay those costs. They cannot do that in a monetary way.

In the spirit of Du Bois' vision of HBCUs' responsibility to their constituent populations, the students best repay those populations by solving their unsolved problems. HBCUs should add Justitia to Howard's Veritas et Utilitas.

Many people died to make HBCUs possible. It's hard to repay those who have given their lives for you. But those acts of sacrifice made a university education for Blacks possible. That was the great problem that the inauguration of all HBCUs solved.

Students should have a sense of moral obligation to repay the sacrifice of life by solving the most urgent problems in the communities for which HBCUs are responsible. To give one brief example of my point, it should be a great embarrassment that Wendy Kopp's Teach for America program came out of her senior thesis at Princeton, rather than an
HBCU. It's too late for a Howard senior thesis to generate Teach for America. But thousands of comparable projects could come out of a Howard decision to require a senior thesis or project from all its undergraduate students.

Can undergraduate students perform research? The undergraduate research initiative in the College of Arts and Sciences inaugurated by Vice President Barbara Griffin is evidence of this claim. As apprentices, undergraduates need not solve unsolved research problems. Even learning to solve already solved problems on their own initiative, they are well launched on the path to becoming true researchers.

I propose the inauguration of a universal senior thesis or project requirement for Howard undergraduates in all my courses at Howard. I use the moral argument. I say that a senior thesis on a research problem they may be working on for the rest of their lives will be their best way of repaying all those who have sacrificed their lives—often literally—to make their Howard education possible.

At the beginning of the semester, most students scorn the idea. At the end of the course, with their 10-20 page research papers for the course in hand, I ask them whether they would be pleased to have their senior theses in hand when they graduate. Few say no.

Students are not customers. They are apprentices. We train them to do what we do—solve unsolved problems. The best of our students will replace us at the university. As research faculty, we engage in the highest form of teaching. We teach our students to solve problems that no one has ever solved.

Education has three levels: lower, higher, and highest. Lower education teaches students to solve their own problems—how to drive cars, how to balance a checkbook, how to read, write and compute, how to interact with others, how to find a common cultural history, how to do elementary science and art. On graduating, students with a lower education should be able to solve—on their own—the basic problems they'll face for the rest of their lives.

Higher education teaches students to solve problems of two kinds—first the problems they will be paid to solve as professionals. These are problems community members can't solve because they lack professional training. The second kind of problem is created by professionals who are incompetent or malevolent. A university education teaches students to defend themselves against those professionals using their skills in critical thinking, reading, calculating, and ethical assessment. HBCU graduates have a moral obligation to pass those self-defense skills to the community members that justify the existence of HBCUs.

Higher education in the professions teaches problem-solving skills that comprise the standards of the profession. This is easiest to see in the professions that require board certification. Professional education trains students to solve problems whose solutions are well known.
And the highest education? That is education at the PhD level—teaching students to solve problems with no known solutions.

WHY MUST UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION TAKE SO LONG?

Why must college take so long? Should HBCUs adopt the Oxford or Addis Ababa University model—students enter directly into professional training after completing high school?

The universal four-year requirement of most US colleges and universities springs from the ethical responsibilities of universities to their constituent populations. The communities that in the end pay for the student "leisure" (the original meaning of the Greek word, *schole*) do so because they require the students to solve their most urgent problems.

Generalized problem-solving capacities requires competence in all seven intellectual disciplines—those that study the relations of symbols to other symbols (math, logic, and grammar) and those that study the relations of symbol sets to the entire range of human experience (art, history, science and philosophy). Is competence in these seven skill-sets achieved by the end of US high school education? For the most part, no. So part of the mission of a US university is playing catch-up in math, logic or critical thinking and grammar or effective writing and speaking. And few high school graduates have any practical competence in history and science. And virtually no high school students have exposure to philosophy except in private high schools.

The inchoate state of lower, middle, and high school education in the US mandates the need for catch-up schooling. The burden of a dysfunctional educational system falls most heavily on minority populations. Howard has addressed this problem in the past by requiring students to spend one year in a preparatory academy to bring their skills in reading, writing, and calculation to a university level. (Past President of Howard Franklyn Jenifer was accustomed to boast that Howard would not admit him when he applied as an undergraduate—he was remanded to the academy.) Howard addresses this problem currently through the Center for Academic Reinforcement. The Center is understaffed, and students taking basic skill courses may also be permitted to take university-level courses requiring advanced skills. Remediation is a problem that Howard might wish to devote significant resources to, given its initial mission of providing a first rate education for those who would not otherwise have the opportunity.

But what of graduates from the wealthiest high schools in the US, students who have done hands-on science and who have been exposed to rudimentary philosophy?

What justification can there be to require four years of college from these more privileged students? Intellectual disciplines—even if taught autonomously in high school rather than in the haze of "social studies"—are not taught as problem-solving exercises. In university studies, psychology must be taught as the discipline that addresses the
psychological problems students and their constituent communities will face throughout life. So too with economics, political science, sociology, and anthropology.

Philosophy must be taught as the discipline that confronts the most challenging problem all humans face: how should we live ethically, both in a general sense, and in the unique details of cultural life. Ethics must be the ground of all professional activities.

As disciplines that tell us "what happens when..." the physical sciences solve the problems we face in rearranging our physical environments, even our biological bodies, ourselves, to ensure our survival and flourishing. The social sciences exercise a comparable function for our social environments. History is the record of humanity's collective experiments in living.

And art, whether fine or practical, shows us how to use our imagination, our emotions, our rationality in applied sciences, to create the varieties of human experience that imitate life itself—that continuity in change that changes itself. Art creates variety in life. And variety is not simply the spice of life. Rather it is the stuff, the engine, the mainspring of life.

Math, logic, and grammar—all disciplines that examine and dictate the relations of symbols to other symbols, make the four disciplines that relate thought to experience possible—art, history, science and philosophy.

Students take one to two years to acquire university level competence in these basic intellectual disciplines. They need this competence to achieve full measure of skill in their professional training, as well as in learning to defend themselves against incompetent professionals.

Universities acting in ethically responsible ways are responsible to their students only insofar as those students are their communities' problem-solvers. Students are not, I repeat, are not customers. They are our apprentices in the arts of problem-solving.

Students attending for-profit universities like the University of Phoenix in the US do not have the moral responsibility to their communities that students do at publicly funded universities, whether public or private.

Communities pay for the leisure required for a university education in order to have their problems solved. Students learn professions precisely to solve their communities problems, if students subscribe to Du Bois' philosophy. The point of a university education at HBCUs is not to get a well-compensated job, but to solve a community's problems. Du Bois goes so far as to say that HBCU-trained professionals should work toward the elimination of the need for their skills. To the degree possible, HBCU-trained professionals should pass their problem-solving skills on to their constituting communities.

HALLMARKS OF COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH HBCU EDUCATION
Should Howard and other comprehensive research HBCUs aspire to a unique mission that requires exceptional skills of their students?

Yes! With all other universities, HBCUs and African universities are working to solve problems of supporting communities. But HBCU students, if they subscribe to Du Bois's idealistic philosophy, do this for the sake of their communities rather than primarily for the sake of gainful employment.

And because of the grievous nature of the problems of HBCU constituting communities, HBCU students must bring unique problem-solving skills to their professional practice:

1) Imagination embedded in the constituting communities' cultures (why Afro-American and Africa Studies, history, and philosophy taught with an orientation to Africana populations are so important to HBCUs)

2) Primary aim to pass problem-solving skills to constituting communities where possible

3) Bonded to and trained in the arts of problem-solving from the first moments of matriculation

4) Compulsory senior papers, theses, or projects, to ensure that students are well-launched to securing their PhDs, whether virtual or actual. The true PhD degree guarantees that a student has solved a problem never before solved. Students can award virtual PhDs to themselves when they solve important unsolved problems. HBCUs should mandate that all their students pursue this virtual or actual objective with passion in the context of their compassion for their constituting, supporting communities.

5) All HBCU professional training should be embedded in service learning courses designed to help students pass their problem-solving skills on to the university's constituents.

6) All university activities should be embedded in assessment grounded in an ethics of survival. (See below, number 8.) The assessment must stipulate the problems the university has assumed responsibility for, proposed methodologies for their solution, status of progress, periodic scheduled reviews of programs for termination, merger, or enhancement.

7) All student training should be assessed by comprehensive research portfolios, reviewed on a semester basis by an academic program's collective faculty, with annual research projects to set students on the path to their senior capstone research project and to guarantee their competence to execute that project as a requirement for graduation.

Do these suggestions make undergraduate comprehensive research HBCU education seem too much like a PhD program? If you ask students to solve problems before they
come to their formal professional or graduate training, they will try. I know this from over four decades of experience at an HBCU. Some do not succeed but many do. If problem-solving were to become the collective ethos of the comprehensive research HBCU experience, the results could be breathtaking. As I said above, one of our greatest regrets at Howard should be that Wendy Kopp's Teach for America Program came out of Princeton rather than a Howard senior thesis.

8) The comprehensive research HBCU must develop a communal survival checklist for assessing the problems and academic programs that HBCUs will assume responsibility for. Basic survival goods are air, temperature control, water, food, healthcare, and education. The lack or poor quality of those basic goods dictates the urgency of a community's problems. Survival is best assured under conditions of flourishing. Five values dictate the universal conditions for flourishing: rationality defined as the pursuit of an objective with appropriate means; pleasure as a prime motive for action; community bonding; freedom or creativity; and finally meditation, or the rational control of the attention.

The survival good of meditation requires amplification. In a real sense, the only true function of education is the control of the attention. To the degree students assume rational command of their own attention, to that same degree they begin to control their chances of survival. Students with an HBCU community responsibility ethics will direct their attention to the solution of their communities' problems.

9) A generalized survival ethics checklist will help to assess the problems confronting any culture. Biological, environmental and historical details of a culture's evolution will determine the checklist's application in unique cultural contexts. Nonetheless, regardless of their unique histories and aspirations, cultures lacking full access to any of the seven basic survival values will not be capable of performing at peak levels.

10) Cultures may reject or promote any of the values on the survival checklist to the exclusion of or imbalance with others. The rise and fall of civilizations and the global extermination of marginalized cultures and their languages display humanity's capacity to pursue death rather than life lived to the fullest.

However, cultures now have a motive unprecedented in the history of the species to pursue a global survival ethics. Global climate change, technologies of mass destruction easily mastered by state and insurgent terrorism, international economic and political interdependence, all mandate a global commitment to a unified ethics. United Nations declarations of universal human, indigenous, and children's rights set the stage for this ethics.

The collapse of the Soviet Union, the moral and economic bankruptcy of the US with its wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the recent global economic collapse triggered by US credit policies, demonstrate the need to implement a global ethics. 9/11 shows that any nation can be destabilized, no matter how secure its apparent defenses.
Ethics, in the words of Rodney King, is just the plea for us all to get along. If we can't all get along, it's clear now there will be no going on for human life as we've known it.

Ethics, in the words of Alain Locke, founder of Howard's philosophy department, is based on the study of value. Locke argued that every university subject is an exercise in the study of value. A comprehensive research HBCU above all other universities in the US must be grounded in the ethical principles that issue from the study of value, a study that philosophy can accomplish only with the aid of the social sciences such as psychology and anthropology.

Locke hoped that an interdisciplinary research program would unearth a common set of values that all the world's cultures could sign on for. The deepest value driving every HBCU academic program should be the universality of human community, whether expressed in the maat (harmony) of ancient Egypt, the nagaa (peace) of ancient Ethiopia, or the universal love of Crates, Mo-Ti, Christ, or Nagarjuna.

APPENDIX II TO VERHAREN PCAR REPORT

SAMPLE QUESTIONS TO GUIDE STUDENT RESEARCH IN INTRODUCTORY PHILOSOPHY COURSES

1) What are the greatest problems facing you in your life—whether positive or negative? The former attract your attention because they are inherently compelling; the latter are hurdles you must get through in order to get on with your life.

2) What are the greatest problems facing your city, state, nation? And the world itself?

3) How did your interest in your chosen set of problems lead you to choose a major and minor concentration? If you have not yet chosen a major, will focusing on your problem set help you to choose your major?

4) How will your interest in your problem-set lead you to professional or graduate school after your undergraduate career?

5) If you are not planning on continuing your education, will your undergraduate career give you a sufficient foundation for solving the problems you'll be interested in working on for the rest of your life?

6) What are the problems you're interested in working on right now?

7) Do you see you choice of a problem as a research choice that may have a major impact on the rest of your life? That is your first philosophical or foundational research choice.
8) What are the radically different kinds of solutions that have been proposed for your problem?

9) Which of those solutions do you think are most promising? For what reasons or arguments? Do you see this choice as the second philosophical or foundational choice of your research program?

10) In what discipline or disciplines will you find the research skills necessary to start working on a solution to your problem?

11) What prominent figures in your discipline have set up oppositional approaches to the solution of your problem?

12) Do you see how the radically different choices about how to solve a problem in your discipline make up the philosophy or foundation of your discipline?

13) Do you now have enough information to structure your research paper?
   a) State the problem.
   b) In this course (Introduction to Philosophy), show how your approach to your problem will be philosophical or foundational. In other words, define philosophy from several different perspectives and show what approach or method you'll take in your research paper.
   c) Show how philosophy and your major discipline work together toward a solution of your problem. If your major has nothing to do with your problem, rethink your choice of major, and substitute the appropriate discipline for your research paper.
   d) Show how your philosophical choice of a particular research method in your discipline advances your work toward a solution of your particular problem.
   e) Conclude your paper with an assessment of progress. What have you accomplished toward a solution of your problem? What additional research skills or research proper will you need to advance your work on a solution? Should you look for other researchers whose collective efforts might help yours?
   f) Have you set up a sufficient foundation or philosophy to start your senior thesis? Will you need to go to graduate or professional school to do more apprentice work to solve your problem?
   g) Will you be able to transfer any of the problem-solving skills you've gained in writing this research paper to the communities that most need your problem solved? Can you join or help inaugurate a student/community organization to transfer those skills?
To conclude this Appendix II, I wish to suggest that the Writing Across the Curriculum initiative at Howard and other campuses can serve as an inspiration for requiring research skills in all Howard courses, even those that are algorithmic, like math, logic and grammar courses.

A final question. Is my proposal for undergraduate research practical, or merely another immodest proposal? Can undergraduate students really be expected to do research? As I said above, the undergraduate research initiative in the College of Arts and Sciences inaugurated by Vice President Barbara Griffin is evidence that they can. As apprentices, undergraduates need not solve unsolved research problems. Even learning to solve already solved problems on their own initiative, students are well launched on the path to becoming true researchers.

On a final note, W.E.B. Du Bois proposed the idea that it's the responsibility of HBCUs to start the process of transmitting college education to every community member. It is only a question of time, he said, until we reach that ideal. Student service learning can be a powerful instrument for this transfer: Each one teach one!

Fidel Castro has already committed Cuba to the realization of this ideal, as I spelled out in my "An African and American Survival Ethics: The Case of Cuba." Castro said it is his dream that the Cuban nation will become a university for its citizens. In large part because of a revolutionary literacy campaign conducted by Cuban students in the 60s, the Cuban literacy rate now exceeds that of the US. If HBCUs will not help carry out Du Bois's dream for those communities most in need in the US, who else will?
Refining and Applying the Vision for Howard University within the Academic Renewal Process:

What Can Haiti Teach PCAR about Mission and Vision?

Eric Walters

Howard boasts of a multiethnic and multicultural faculty and student population. While other universities also may make this claim, Howard transcends its peers by providing an historic and multidisciplinary context (Medicine, Law, Divinity, Humanities, Social Sciences, Technology) for an academic mission that embraces justice and equality. As such, the vitality of our academy is deeply rooted in the African-American struggle for liberation and freedom. Today, our challenge is to train future leaders who solve complex problems for the liberation of all peoples, with the understanding that liberation does not evolve from a sense of entitlement, but finds significance in service. Howard’s mission should be enacted through the affirmation that, “everyone can be great, because everyone can serve.” (Martin L. King, Jr.) While the essence of service may lie within a heart full of grace, the enactment of service is strengthened and undergirded by the development of intellectual, relational, and ethical practices that are transmitted through the faculty to our students.

The mission of Howard University articulates a commitment “to the development of distinguished, historically aware, and compassionate graduates and to the discovery of solutions to human problems.” One of the most pervasive problems existing today is poverty. According to UNICEF, 25,000 children die each day due to poverty. And they “die quietly in some of the poorest villages on earth, far removed from the scrutiny and the conscience of the world.” Being meek and weak in life makes these dying multitudes even more invisible in death. (http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats)

The devastating earthquake in Haiti serves as significant bellwether to reorganize our academic landscape with a renewed emphasis upon the plight of disadvantaged persons, nationally and internationally. As we continue to fulfill the University’s mission, our commitment to Haitian relief should remind us that the Agricultural (farming communities, 1840-1900), Industrial (factory workers, 1900-1960), and Informational (skilled workers 1960-2010) Ages are not distant relics of the past. Each epoch matured with unparalleled intellectual advancements, thereby flattening the social, linguistic, and geographic barriers between groups. Contrary to common belief, these epochs remain timeless, because they are manifested cyclically throughout the world. Within what may be referred to as the present Conceptual Age—where the integration of ideas and strategies will be necessary to incorporate all aspects of the “preceding” ages—Howard must train creative future leaders who recognize the limitations of orthodoxy and develop alternatives to solve persistent problems of the world with compassion and empathy. In this regard, the legacy of Howard University’s historic past must serve as its prologue for the future.

The Faculty Senate asserts that our process of Academic Renewal must be defined on the basis of shared goals and priorities that originate from the Faculty. I have taken the initiative to promote the concept of the five pillars in an effort to define a vision for the academic renewal process, and its recommendations for change. Such a vision can help to define a context of mission, where in we train our most valuable resource at Howard, our students. The Faculty Senate encourages vigorous debate about these initiatives in an effort to reshape the academic landscape at Howard in fulfillment of its mission.
The rich academic landscape of Howard University obligates us to be intentional in addressing the plight of the human condition as relating to suffering and inequality. Langston Hughes wrote what would be considered the manifesto amongst his contemporaries, published in The Nation in 1926, *The Negro Artist and the Racial Mountain*:

> The younger Negro artists who create now intend to express our individual dark-skinned selves without fear or shame. If white people are pleased we are glad. If they are not, it doesn’t matter. We know we are beautiful. And ugly, too. The tom-tom cries, and the tom-tom laughs. If colored people are pleased we are glad. If they are not, their displeasure doesn’t matter either. We build our temples for tomorrow, strong as we know how, and we stand on top of the mountain free within ourselves.

The faculty, staff, and students of Howard’s Afro-Intellectual Diaspora are uniquely and unapologetically positioned to stand as the conscience of this nation.

If Howard chooses to identify itself, in the words of the late President Cheek, as “a national treasure,” then it must conduct its internal operations in such a way that fully embraces the principles of shared governance, equality, transparency, and openness. In short, Howard must “operationalize its mission” to demonstrate its ideals to other universities, and the nation. As the PCAR commission continues its work, it must consider a number of variables that will be necessary to fulfill its charge to the fullest extent. Operationalizing the mission would therefore include the following:

- **Deliberate and intentional emphasis and practice of shared governance at Board of Trustees and Administrative levels.** Recent actions that identify failures of the Administration and BoT to seek faculty input and recommendations include: 1) the concept of PCAR and its design, strategy, timeline, membership, and use of external (compensated) consultants; 2) the appointment of the Senoir Vice President, Health Sciences (Higgenbotham) and Provost (Wyche) without appropriate faculty vetting; 3) the choice of CIGNA as the sole health care provider for the university.

- **Faculty salary compensation that is respectable, professional, and fair.** Howard should not and cannot boast of uniqueness and its legacy when faculty are continually oppressed by inadequate and unfair salaries, and disproportionate compensation exists between males and females of equal rank and experience. Howard should exemplify and promote fairness in compensation within the workplace, serving as a model for upholding the rights of the individual.

- **Reasonable expectations of Faculty Performance that are consonant with improvements in physical and operational infrastructure.** As we move to establish a
university-wide Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES) tool, we should be reminded that the failure of infrastructure supports, particularly physical facilities that are essential to the success of scientific research (i.e. animal housing facilities, controlled heating and cooling systems) impact the ability of many researchers to perform optimally. The use of the FPES tool to reward faculty must carefully consider the entropy of infrastructure demands on the productivity of individual faculty; all buildings and facilities are not created and maintained equally.

If Howard is to “Stand with Haiti”, then it must garner an intentional effort to practice the equality, justice, and service in mission at home. My fear is that the term “Legacy” is too often employed in the service of “Brand HU” than ensuring that fairness and justness are found in the seemingly mundane aspects of daily operations, practices and policies of the university. People deserve fair salaries, despite their skin color, gender, or job description. People deserve working conditions that are safe and respectable. People deserve the opportunity to advance and receive training as they contribute to the good of the whole university. People deserve a voice that is respected in the decision-making processes that determine their fate. Haiti did not crumble under the weight of an earthquake because of deficient civil and mechanical engineering; Haiti crumbled because of the factors that I have just listed, where the masses were taken advantage of, abused, and disrespected by the few who wielded power.

Similar analogies can be made when examining deferred maintenance, salary inequity, and a depressed atmosphere amongst the faculty. Did those entrusted with the care of Howard reward themselves while impoverishing the Faculty—far removed from the scrutiny and the conscience of the world? If so, then their mission to Howard failed.

That’s the heart of mission, and we can do better.

Eric Walters, M.Div., Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Howard University College of Medicine

Faculty Senate Recommendations to all CIGNA Health Care Enrollees:

1. Stay Healthy.
2. Don’t Get Sick.

This information is provided as a public service announcement.