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As stated in the text of this document, the Manifesto is a declaration of the Faculty's position regarding its frustrations and repeated failures to secure a collaborative working relationship with the Administration of the University. The Manifesto was adopted as a forceful and frontal response to the Faculty's festering frustrations, resulting from its recurring and persistent ineffectiveness, despite sustained and well-intentioned efforts, to develop a collaborative and productive partnership with the Administration, consistent with substantive and explicit language as set forth in two pivotal University documents, both of which were adopted by the Board of Trustees in 1993 (The Howard University Faculty Handbook, and the Constitution of the Faculty Senate). Specifically, the Manifesto brings into relief the unequivocal language of the Constitution, which frames the Board mandated character of the relationship between the Faculty and the Administration when it not only defines but, more importantly, constitutes the Faculty at Howard University "as a partner with shared responsibility" (Article XI, Section C.1).

The essence of the Manifesto is its detailed delineation of the disrespectful and disruptive presence of the Administration in areas of academic functioning that properly fall within the domain and primacy of the Faculty, together with the threats to academic quality that ensue from such disruption. The Manifesto makes patently manifest that these abuses to Faculty oversight of academic quality resulted directly from irresponsible and inappropriate activities/behaviors on the part of the President and Provost, and in light of such conduct, these administrators were deemed culprit of sustained interference with the Faculty's charge to be guardians and the ultimate safeguard of the quality and the integrity of the Academy at Howard University.

Since every identified problem begs for a solution, the Manifesto recognizes that the primary steps toward a solution to the problem as framed must be twofold:

1. the Faculty's acceptance of its partial responsibility for tolerating administrative incursion into its academic space; in effect, the Faculty must locate itself within the problem and, thereby, recognize that by virtue of their own activity or inactivity, they have wittingly and unwittingly contributed to the very violations that they condemn on the part of the Administration; and
2. emboldened by the cathartic affirmation of its presence within the problem, the Faculty commits to an attitude on non-collaboration with such internecine practices, and in so doing, re-affirms its responsibility and commitment to "Reclaim the Academy" at Howard University. This belligerent attitude of "Never Again!" and the associated acknowledgement of shame for such collaboration represent a defining moment in Faculty consciousness and Faculty conscientiousness. In adopting the sub-theme of Reclaiming the Academy, the Manifesto makes manifest that the Faculty begins with the affirmation of its role to re-claim its responsibility to be the primary guardians of the Academy in its local setting, and concomitantly, take direct action, where necessary, in all matters related to the academic life of the institution. In effect, that in so doing, the Faculty commits to being a pressing presence and a frontal force prerequisite to establishing and maintaining the academic health and long-term welfare of the University.

**HISTORY, HOWARD AND VISION**

Howard University's mission is to solve the unsolved problems of the communities that make Howard’s existence possible. The University does not separate its research and teaching missions. As researchers, the university's members endeavor to solve intractable problems. As teachers, we train our students as apprentices in the art of solving problems. At Howard we look beyond the methods and scope of traditional European and United States philosophies to include other cultures.

Howard’s Founders’ sense of the communities for which the University is responsible included all those who could not otherwise secure a university education—women, Native Americans, Chinese, and Africans among others. With the resources of the Freedmen’s Bureau behind him, General Howard focused the University’s attention on African American communities.

Over its history, the University has extended its attention to include African-descended peoples in Africa and throughout the diaspora. Howard connects its resources to universities and other institutions in Africa, the Caribbean and Brazil in particular. Coming from diverse cultures, the University's faculty and student body have unswervingly dedicated their research attention to global communities in urgent need of solutions to their problems. Solving the problem of a first-rate education for freed slaves gave Howard its distinctive mission. The University's greatest success in solving
problems was the Brown vs. the Board Supreme Court case. Its architects were Charles Hamilton Houston (Dean of the School of Law), James Nabrit (later President of the University), and Thurgood Marshall (later Supreme Court Justice). However, every campus building named after a Howard researcher points to a solved problem—Drew Hall, for example, with blood transfusion, and Just Hall with the structure of the cell.

Howard has taken responsibility for solving problems that are theoretical and practical. In solving problems, we look beyond Harvard's *veritas* to Howard's *veritas et utilitas*. In the words of Teresa A. Sullivan, President Designate, University of Virginia, and distinguished speaker at the GSAS Hooding Ceremony on May 6, 2010, Howard University's historic responsibility is to "push society toward justice and understanding." Howard stands for social justice under conditions of sustainability for those who shall inherit the earth from us.

**HOWARD UNIVERSITY: AN AFRICAN AMERICAN HERITAGE UNIVERSITY**

**A VISION - by Taft H. Broome, Jr., Professor - 7 May, 2010**

A vision of a replacement for the African American University is herein called the African American Heritage University.

This is a paradigm shift in Howard's worldview that looks less to that part of the African American experience worthy of escape, than to 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 helping them to find all that is unique in them. Accordingly, the Howard Institute is envisioned as a think tank on visions of Howard. The Institute would publish scholarly articles on the following topics.

The first topic is 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 meet its perhaps otherwise unmet legal obligations.

The second topic is on Howard University as a national model of academic values. What values, if any, can Howard University stand for that are in jeopardy elsewhere? Possibilities include resistance to anti-intellectualism in higher education, resistance to the notion that hard work deserves high grades, resistance to helicopter parenting, and a passion for theory. This model has implications for the university’s research agenda and curriculum, and America’s image abroad.
The third topic asks, “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 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 the Faculty Performance Evaluation System (FPES). A proposed new role for 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 a Howard University brand 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 built upon the shoulders of its Giants; a *mutual admiration society*, through recognition of collective faculty achievements having national and international dimensions; support for faculty who are *exemplars of all that one can be*; and a collaboration of faculty with administrative experts on public relations and recruiting that develops and implements a public relations program aimed at a brand made from *pride of place, a mutual admiration society, and exemplars of all that one can be*.

**PCAR**

The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal process is working to meet President Ribeau’s charge to produce recommendations that reflect the best experience and ideas of broad communities of faculty, administration and staff. In PCAR plenary sessions, a two-day January retreat and subcommittee deliberations, the initial evaluation categories, weights and evaluative measures have been realigned to reflect shared thinking across the University. We expect that, in his June 8 report to the Board of Trustees, the President will relate the fact that the data collected so far, through surveys and program visits conducted by each of the four subcommittees, have begun to reveal the unique contours and metrics that will focus these experiences and ideas into recommendations that best fit Howard University. The data has built broad consensus among faculty that there are central issues that must be addressed alongside, (and in many instances before) full academic renewal. These include deferred maintenance, refurbishing of support infrastructure, and the re-allocation of resources from non-academic areas to academic support. A thorough process of Administrative Renewal will also be urgently required if the highest ideals of academic renewal are to be realized.
Over the summer, PCAR will analyze collected data and hone the faculty’s participation into recommendations of a Howard University model that will both seek to address the broad challenges and program-specific issues which have unnecessarily obstructed program development and cross-program collaboration, as well as to pursue greater levels of excellence in teaching and research throughout the University. This work will rest primarily on leveraging the best practices currently extant among Howard faculty, with targeted incorporation of ideas from a broad range of other invaluable sources. It is critical to note that the integrity of this summer process is as important as the product.

There is consensus among the Faculty Senate Executive Council that PCAR has evolved along the following stages of cooperation and contestation:

1. The initial Presidential charge, which reflected a largely market-driven (as distinct from mission-oriented) process of program evaluation and recommendations for academic restructuring;

2. An ensuing debate and emerging clarity on the function of Howard University’s legacy and ongoing uniqueness, and the capacitation of Howard’s present leadership to edify and strengthen this legacy and uniqueness;

3. The injection of a focusing agent for a STEM thrust in the person of the new Provost, catalyzing the ongoing PCAR process of program review, engagement and evaluation, and inducing spheres of competition among faculty, and contestation between a newly-engageing faculty involved in critical self-evaluation and other presumed stakeholders with less-informed perspectives on Howard’s future direction;

4. The emergence (as a direct consequence of its real-time, detailed and inclusive review, visitation and analysis work) of a focused and energized PCAR which rejects any real or perceived attempt to negate or undermine its work through the introduction of either a parallel process of ideas or models not generated by the faculty and staff of Howard University (including the aforementioned STEM emphasis); and

5. The sharpening of focus between PCAR (and the faculty analysis, experience, expertise and opinion its work represents) and elements of the Board of Trustees over resolving what group(s) constitute the fundamental “engine” of the university.

These stages have brought us to a central question related specifically to the Office of the Provost and its role in supporting the PCAR process: Has our Chief Academic Officer...
come to the University through a process of transplantation or incorporation? The normal consequences and challenges of the former are usually different from those of the latter. It is to be hoped that principles of mutual respect and cooperation will guide a process of institutional incorporation and renewal, so that the best practices of academic and administrative improvement will redound to the noblest goals and enhanced vision of Howard University’s mission to the global community.

**UNFEASIBILITY OF FACULTY TO ENGAGE THE PCAR PROCESS DURING THE SUMMER**

- Nine-month faculty should not be expected to engage in any Howard University business, including PCAR, during the summer months. This expectation goes against their official contract with Howard University.

- Final recommendations of PCAR (scheduled for September 2010) should be aimed toward a more reasonable and coordinate endpoint, such as Dec 2010. The December date allows time for vetting, refinement, and revision of final PCAR recommendations after the faculty has returned from the summer break. In addition, there is a need for Town Hall Meetings to discuss the work and activity of PCAR, obtain feedback/commentary, and critique from the collective faculty. This process is compromised under the current schedule.

- The expectation that PCAR can capture the “Vision” statements of each department/unit during the summer is unreasonable, given the aforementioned points.

**BAC: BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Fourteen months ago, March 2009, President Ribeau established the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) with the charge “to review and make recommendations to improve the University’s budget.” In addition, Dr. Ribeau committed to an inclusive and transparent budget process. This was an extraordinary event in administration-faculty relations at Howard. This has not only allowed the Faculty to participate in the budget process through the Faculty Senate but it also allowed access to important budget information. While the faculty applauds Dr. Ribeau for this initiative, it is incumbent upon the faculty to identify any weaknesses and suggest improvements so that the
process can live up to its high ideals rather than continue as a Budget ‘After-the-fact’ Committee—one that simply serves to receive administration reports after development of policy and prior to implementation and entirely absent meaningful faculty input.

We note that the BAC first met in late AY2008-09, just prior to the end of that academic year. At that time the committee reviewed the FY2010 budget, raised some questions, and made a few, mostly minor, suggestions. The Faculty Senate, in parallel, also concurred in many aspects, but did make several additional suggestions focused on 1) the need to ensure that a 6% raise be given to faculty and that that raise be used to address salary compression and 2) that strategic investments be made in a variety of areas, particularly Health Disparities and Wellness, Green Initiatives and Environmental Sustainability, Internationalism/Human Rights, Financial Literacy and Education, and Communication Arts/Technology—not the single, legacy focus identified in the administration’s version of the budget, Nanotechnology. Neither the BAC nor the Faculty Senate received a response by the administration regarding either of these two proposals until February 2010 when faculty members of the BAC specifically requested that these proposals be discussed.

Soon thereafter, the administration presented a voluntary separation plan for faculty and staff. These plans had been drawn up absent faculty and staff input, let alone input from BAC. This proposal was from its very conception absent meaningful faculty and staff involvement and input—and far too late for meaningful response by BAC. It was clear to BAC faculty and staff representatives that this plan was extraordinarily flawed. Indeed, the administration soon withdrew the faculty option and when the staff option was offered, implementation resulted in an extraordinary fiasco.

In March 2010, Mr. Troy Stovall, Chief Operations Officer, presented a set of profound changes to the BAC concerning the university health plans that were to be implemented in June 2010. This presentation was, again, absent prior faculty and staff involvement and input—and far too late for meaningful response by BAC.
More recently, in April 2010, Mr. Robert Torola, Chief Financial Officer, presented to BAC a total and profound change in the mechanisms for budgetary process that was to be implemented within the upcoming month. This presentation was, again, absent prior faculty and staff involvement and input—and far too late for meaningful response by BAC.

It is clear that the current, passive, reactive BAC processes result in flawed products. It is time for the BAC to live up to its name—to shift to a proactive, advocacy position—to in fact, advise. To that end, we suggest that BAC immediately develop mechanisms to address four critical issues.

1. The need to focus on the development of the new portfolio budgetary process that includes and requires full and meaningful faculty and staff participation from its very inception.

2. The need to address issues of administrative expenses—to wit the extraordinary excessive administrative costs (we are to address budgeting not administration quality!)

3. The absolutely critical need to address issues of maintenance.

4. The need to develop a reasonable and effective mechanisms to address salary compression and salary inequity.

These are all critical issues that the administration cannot and should not develop and implement without full and meaningful faculty and staff participation. Addressing these offers an extraordinary opportunity for administrators, faculty and staff to learn how to work cooperatively for the future of Howard. It is an opportunity that cannot and should not be squandered by legacy effects and business as usual.