Introduction

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

Historically, Howard University has been a national repository of African American cultural experience and a recognized center of African American thought, critical analysis, and leadership. While remaining true to its historic mission, the Howard University of today also embraces its role as a unique and irreplaceable comprehensive research university. In this latter role, the University remains true to its core values: excellence in all its activities, especially teaching and research, and an enduring commitment to educating African Americans and other people of color for leadership and service to the nation and the global community.

The University is being guided into the 21st century by Strategic Framework for Action I and II, the first of which was set forth by President H. Patrick Swygert following his appointment as President in 1995. The second was adopted by the Howard University Board of Trustees on June 8, 2001 and builds upon the ambitious agenda outlined in Strategic Framework for Action I. This series of frameworks establish a blueprint for the
University’s transition into the 21st century and beyond and affirm the core values that have always undergirded the University’s efforts to provide Leadership for America and the Global Community.

Howard’s intellectual strengths are concentrated in its 12 colleges and schools, inclusive of several that merged in fulfillment of one of the goals of Strategic Framework for Action I, to strengthen academic programs and services. The current schools and colleges include Arts and Sciences, Business, Communication, Dentistry, Divinity, Education, Graduate School, Law, Medicine, Social Work and the two successfully merged units, the School of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science and the College of Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences.

Commitment to the Characteristics of Accredited Institutions

The University continues to uphold the Characteristics of Accredited Institutions, as defined by MSCHE. It conducts its activities in an open, honest, and humane manner, guided by its regularly updated policies that govern students, faculty, staff, and other constituents. Moody’s Investors Services recently upgraded the University’s debt rating from A3 to A2, with a stable outlook for the future. The mission of Howard University continues to be appropriate to its cliental domestically and internationally, and for its leadership position within America and the global community. Its goals reflect its irreplaceable position in American higher education, expressed through its vision and Strategic Framework for Action and within the context of its resources. While continuing to attract academically talented students and those with academic potential, the
University is committed to providing supportive services to students with special needs for remediation and nurturing in the full development of their capacities.

Howard offers a broad breadth of academic programs and related services at the baccalaureate, masters, and doctoral and professional school levels to address the interest and career aspirations of its diverse students and in addressing societal needs well into the 21st century. Howard offers 58 undergraduate degrees, 62 masters’ degrees, 27 Ph.D, 2 other doctoral degrees, and first professional degrees in Medicine, Law, Dentistry, Pharmacy and Divinity. Howard continues to attract and retain a highly intellectual and productive faculty capable of cultivating young minds into critically astute and competent graduates, who are sought to assume leadership positions and roles of responsibility. It transmits its fundamental values through its broad and rigorous academic core deeply grounded in the arts and sciences and augmented through major curricula offerings.

Howard, as this report will substantiate, is committed to state-of-the art library and technological resources that enhance and expand access to boundless information, which underpin academic programs and the research enterprise. Also evident in this document and earlier in the *Follow-Up Report on Progress in the Development and Implementation of a Comprehensive Assessment Plan* (March 30, 2001) submitted to MSCHE, the University is making sustained progress in implementing an institution-wide program for the assessment of institutional, program, and student outcomes. Increasing, such data informs indicators of effectiveness, and the basis of continuous planning and decision making. Despite economic challenges globally and domestically and within American
higher education, in particular, the University continues to manages prudently its resources; federal, private, and tuition generated, to support its multiple enterprises.

Howard University has a long history of distinguished, dedicated, resourceful, and strategically positioned trustees who exercise their stewardship, responsibility, and accountability in setting policy and setting direction for the University. The organizational structure and operational policies and procedures of the University support shared governance by administration, faculty, students, and staff, which foster academic excellence in teaching, research, and service within an open environment that respects and encourages academic freedom.

Howard University remains committed to a campus whose facilities are at the minimum sufficient to support it academic programs, research, and services, but is aggressive in upgrading, replacing, and erecting new facilities that reflect superior quality and capability second to none. This is evident and apparent through the ambitious Strategic Framework for Action I and II whose initiatives are methodically coming to fruition and enhancing the quality and appearance of the campus. The University has multiple media outlets and publications conveyed in print and electronic formats, inclusive of its television and radio resources. The Office of University Communications, in harmony with its administrative, academic, and service arms, holds all University communication to a standard of excellence, accuracy, and integrity. As a dynamic enterprise, Howard University engages in regular self analysis, facilitated increasingly through its emerging mechanisms of assessing institutional effectiveness. Such assessment includes analysis of
its mission within the context of environmental, societal, and global changes. Careful review of this Periodic Review Report will provide concrete evidence that substantiates Howard’s congruence with the characteristics of accredited institutions, but also reflects its leadership position in defining excellence.

**STUDENTS**

The diversity of the Howard University student population is still as prevalent today as it was several decades ago. Although many relegate diversity in terms of race and gender, Howard University’s diversity is expressed well beyond this two pronged approach. The composition of the University is diverse in gender, ethnicity, national origin, academic pursuits, intellectual capacity, as well as range of social interest and involvement. Although significant strides have been made to increase graduate and professional enrollment, the university still remains predominantly female and predominately undergraduate. The University’s total enrollment has steadily increased in recent years, rising from 10,690 in 2000-01 to its current level of 11,056. In fall, 2003, the University enrolled its largest freshmen class in nine years—1,460. Current female enrollment represents 64.5 percent of the total University enrollment, a slight increase from 62.2 percent in 2000-01. This gender imbalance is particularly evident among the University’s undergraduate population, although women also outnumber men in the graduate and professional schools. This trend is consistent with patterns reported for African American students nationally. The international student population at Howard continues to be more evenly balanced between males and females.
The University is experiencing a gradual increase in the ratio of undergraduate to graduate enrollment. In 2000-01, 66% of the enrollment was undergraduate with 35% as graduate. In fall, 2003, undergraduate enrollment accounted for 66% of Howard students and graduate students represented 34%. Enrollment in the University’s professional schools (Medicine, Dentistry, Law, & Divinity) totaled 1,274 and has remained at capacity over the past 10 years and represents about 13 percent of the total student population. Transfer students continue to represent a very small portion (less than four percent) of Howard’s student population.

Howard University continues to attract a diverse population of students from 47 states and 97 countries. International students account for 11 percent of the current enrollment, a slight decrease since 2000-01. These enrollment trends – the reduction in the number of undergraduates, the increase in the number of graduate students, and steady enrollments in the professional schools – is consistent with Howard University’s goal set forth in Strategic Framework for Action

**FACULTY**

The total faculty of Howard University is comprised of 1598 individuals of whom 1123 are full-time and 475 are part-time. The representation of female faculty has increased in the last five years rising from 37% female in 1999-2000 to its current level of 42%. Male faculty participation, though continuing to be dominant in numbers, fell from 63% in 1999-2000 to 58% in fall, 2003. However, the representation of women has not shifted significantly in the ranks of full-time faculty. Currently, 62% of the full-time faculty is men and 38% are women. The increase in faculty has occurred primarily in the part-time
ranks. The proportion of part-time faculty has increased significantly in the past five years, from 17% of the faculty in 1999-2000 to 30 percent of the faculty in 2003-04. In addition, of those currently in part-time positions, 51 percent are women. Faculty distribution by school and college are available in appendix A.

The majority or 63 percent of the full-time faculty are African American, compared with 15 percent who are white, 9 percent who are Asian, and 1 percent Hispanic. There is no Native American faculty. Non-resident aliens make up the third largest cohort of full-time faculty, accounting for 12 percent. In the part-time faculty ranks, African-Americans represent 68 percent of the faculty cohort.

The highest professorial ranks, Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor, are roughly dispersed as a third each and each ranks is dominated by males, as has been the case over-time. See Figure 1 below. Of the 348 Professors, 77 percent are male, 61 percent of the Associate Professors are male, and 54 percent of the Assistant Professors as male. Female faculty is over represented in the lowest rank constituting the larger proportion of lecturers at 57 percent. Faculty distribution by rank in the various schools and colleges is found in appendix B.
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The percentage of faculty who are tenured/tenured track has changed significantly in the last five years, from 72 percent of the faculty in 1999-2000 to 53 percent in 2003-04. This shift is also reflected in the percent of faculty with tenure, which is currently 41 percent compared to 53 percent five years ago. Figure 2 illustrates the relative distribution of tenure for 2003-04.

FIGURE 2

The highest professorial ranks, Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor, are roughly dispersed as a third each and each ranks is dominated by males, as has been the case over-time. Of the 348 Professors, 77 percent are male, 61 percent of Associate Professors are male, and 54 percent of the Assistant Professors as male. Female faculty is over represented in the lowest rank constituting the larger proportion of lecturers at 57%.
Faculty salaries continue to lag behind peer institutions. While Howard ranks first in comparison to other Historically Black Colleges and Universities, it falls short in comparisons to other institutions such as Emory, Georgetown, Vanderbilt, George Washington, University of Maryland, Temple, and Tulane, institutions Howard considers its peers. Faculty has been eligible for merit increase since 1999 through the Faculty Performance Award Program, administered by the Provost. Although awards are based on the availability of funding, recently, a 2.5% performance adjustment has been provided with merit for the top 15% of the faculty performers.

**OPERATING BUDGET AND FINANCIAL POSITION**

Similar to most universities and colleges, Howard University will continue to experience financial challenges during the next few years driven primarily by increasing healthcare and utility costs. The university continues to explore ways of reducing these costs including more equitable sharing of healthcare costs with employees and installation of more modern/efficient mechanical systems in University buildings.

The federal appropriation, the primary source of the University’s funding continues to be stable. The University has received small increases in the federal appropriation during the past few years to fund specific construction projects. The federal appropriation represents approximately 54% of the university’s unrestricted revenue. Given Howard’s mission, continuous record of accomplishment and the consistently strong support the federal government has provided over the decades, we are confident that the federal appropriation will continue into the foreseeable future.
The other significant source of funding for the University is tuition revenue. The number of full time equivalent (FTE) students has increased from 8,800 to 9,500, this combined with the increases in tuition has provided moderate increases in funding. With the projected FTE expected to reach slightly below 10,000 by FY2007, we expect continued stable funding from tuition which currently represents 32% of the university’s unrestricted revenue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted Revenues</th>
<th>Amount ($000's)</th>
<th>Percentage of Unrestricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees (Gross)</td>
<td>120,599</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Appropriation</td>
<td>204,390</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>46,152</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>5,862</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Unrestricted Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>377,003</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts &amp; Exchange Transactions</td>
<td>62,311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>493,314</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University’s financial statements show new assets of $728.7 million as of November 30, 2003. The first five months of FY2004 show an increase in total Net Assets of $26.6 million, comprised of a $15.8 million operating increase and a $10.7 million net increase from investments and other non-operating items. Unrestricted Net Assets increased by $22.9 million, Temporarily Restricted Net Assets increased by $1.0 million, and Permanently Restricted Net Assets increased by $2.6 million.
Results for the first five months of FY2004 represent a significant improvement over the same period of FY2003, due to an upturn in the financial markets and thus in the performance of the endowment and other investments. For the same period last year the University showed a decrease in total Net Assets of $9.8 million, as compared to this year’s $26.6 million increase.

The Periodic Review Report

The Periodic Review Report is a retrospective, current, and prospective analysis of Howard University since its last affirmation of accreditation in 1999. The preparation of the Periodic Review Report in many ways reflects a continuation of the University’s on-going efforts at quality improvement. This mid-point review in the accreditation cycle is a snapshot in time, a reading, of where the University is five years between its last Middle States visit in 1999 and its next visit in five years. Dr. Dorothy L. Powell, Professor and Associate Dean for Nursing was appointed by the Provost as Chair of the Periodic Review Committee and a cross section of 35 members of the University community was appointed by the President in September, 2003 to engage in sustentative discussion regarding the University’s progress and its goals, plans and strategies regarding the future. The first meeting of the Committee was held on October 10, 2003. Prior analysis of the report of the 1999 MSCHE site visit was done and the findings presented as part of the orientation of the committee to its work and to frame a process by which the committee would work. The committee was divided into 8 sub-committees each with a chair. The sub-committees included the following: Mission and
Governance; Students; Faculty Expectations, Incentives and Resources; Academic Programs and Curriculum; Institutional Effectiveness and Comprehensive Outcomes Assessment; Technology, Library and Learning Resources; and Facilities and Equipment. The membership the Periodic Review Report Committee, listed by sub-committee members is founded in Appendix C. A PRR Office was set up with a full – time secretary to collect needed documentations and follow-up with committee members to ensure deliverables was forthcoming in a timely manner. A calendar of monthly standing committee meeting dates was established as well as clearly articulated list of monthly deliverable. Sub-committees were charged to meet between the scheduled monthly meetings to compile, analyze, and synthesize data pertaining to their charge and to prepare required monthly progress reports and draft sections of the PRR drafts. Early on, the structure of the final report was established following guideline produced by MSCHE for the PRR document.

One of the greatest assets of the process was the development of a PRR web site, managed by Mr. Mohamed Mekkawi, the director of the Moorland Spingarn Library and a member of the committee. The website was restricted to the members of the committee, it contained the organizational structure of the committee and contact information for members; PRR draft reports and monthly progress reports; minutes; a monthly to-do list; and resource materials inclusive of such materials as the 1999 self study. Strategic Framework for Action plans, MSCHE documents and other vital internal and external information. The web site provide desk top access to most materials needed to prepare sections of the report to receive constant updates on overall project progress.
and as a means of maintaining connectiveness among committee members. Monthly progress reports were due prior to meetings. The chair analyzed and summarized all reports and prepared a comprehensive power-point presentation for each meeting using a standard format to include who submitted reports and who did not; progress made by submitting subcommittees, areas not addressed or insufficiently addressed, and clarifying next steps. Three drafts of the report were produced prior to the final completed documents; in December, March, and late April. In February, an all day retreat was held for all committee members at the Law School Library. The objective was to divide into sub-committees and respond to the annotated second draft. The second draft included questions and concerns for all sections of the report prepared by the chair for consideration as the report was being reviewed and revised. Each sub-committee was provided with a meeting space at the Law School and a laptop computer to review and modify their areas of the report and to devise a plan for completing their sections. At the end of the day, sub-committees reported out their progress in a session attended by the Provost.

There was a high degree of compliance with expectations and the timetable by committee members and attendance at meetings was consistently high. An unedited third draft of the report was completed and submitted to the Provost on May 1 for reading and final editing. On retrospect, the process used for an effective and efficient one and one that engaged and kept engaged the cross section of the University community. Central to the work of the committee was to accurately and analytically assess the University’s accomplishments pertaining to the areas of concern raised as a result of the last
accreditation visit. Following the 1999 Middle States Commission on Higher Education visit, five concerns were summarized by the evaluation team, to include:

- The University must closely review its mission in light of changing times, specifically, the nature of the undergraduate student body sought and the mix between undergraduate and graduate/professional students.
- The requirement to formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness, including clear quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning.
- The perceived need to strike a balance between full deliberation on policy issues and timely adoption and implementation of policy.
- The need to expand and deepen its research program.
- Continue to take steps to assure future financial security.

**Organization of Report**

The remainder of this report is organized to respond to the criteria for the Periodic Review Report as defined by MSCHE. This includes discussion of the accomplishments and changes pertaining to the five areas of concern, noted above, identified by the Visiting Committee in 1999. Further evidence of progress and change is evident within the context of Strategic Framework for Action I and II, the well defined and aggressive strategic plan of the University. SFA I and II afford opportunities for retrospective analysis of progress as well as a framework for prospective planning. The University’s self recommendations (1-37) listed in its’ 1999 institutional self study are integrated throughout the discussions of institutional progress. Evidence of outcomes assessment is discussed to compete with the seven elements indicative of continuous institutional self-study and planning outlined in the PRR handbook (p.9).
SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND/OR CHANGES SINCE PREVIOUS EVALUATION REGARDING THE MSCHE SUMMARY CONCERNS

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

The strengthening of academic programs goes straight to the heart of the University’s mission, “as a comprehensive, research-oriented, predominately African-American University [established] to provide an educational experience of exceptional quality at reasonable cost to students of high academic potential.” Within the context of the demands and opportunities of the 21st century, this mission directs the University to clarify who its clientele shall be, the mix and scope of academic programs it must foster for national and global impact in line with its core values, the resource priorities it must provide and maintain, and the high level of quality and efficiency to enable its members to be successful and the high level of accountability and integrity it must certify in the execution of its activities. Integral to visioning, planning and decision making regarding the University’s future, the University had to modify existing emphases and priorities to the changes of society and higher education in particular.

It is to this that the 1999 Middle States Evaluation Team raised a fundamental issue as “the nature of the undergraduate student body sought and the mix between
undergraduate and graduate/professional students” or the student body composition. In responding to this matter, the Howard University Five Year Plan for Enrollment Management was developed by an Enrollment Management Task Force. The EM 5-year Plan is based on 22 assumptions that include variables such as optimum enrollment and student distribution and retention, admission criteria, the allocation of financial and personnel resources, program review and development outcomes, physical facilities use, faculty retirement projections and faculty workload. Further, these assumptions were extracted, primarily, from Board of Trustees’ performance indicators, SFA I and SFA II, and recommendations from the Middle States review and program reviews. Importantly, these assumptions had been presented by the former Provost to the President for review and the President explicitly approved the assumption of undergraduate to graduate/professional school ratio will be enrollment 60/40. The draft report was transmitted to the academic deans for comment and review and to obtain faculty reaction, and this feedback was considered in developing the report. Although the Task Force completed its work in December 2002 and transmitted its report to the former Provost, the report has not been transmitted to the President for endorsement. The report is currently under review by Interim Provost Richard A. English. Dr. English, previously Dean of the School of Social Work was named Interim Provost in July, 2003 following the departure of Dr. Toy A. Caldwell-Colbert who held the position from ______ to _________.

It has been determined that the enrollment plan is, in fact, guiding University enrollment. Changes in the enrollment trends were monitored beginning with 1998 data,
reported in the 1999 Self Study Report, and revealed to be 68% undergraduate to 32% graduate and professional. Actual ratios for 2000-01, 2002-03, and the first semester for 2003-04 were respectively 67%: 33%, 67%: 33%, and 68%: 32% for 2004-05, 2005-06, and 2006-07 are respectively, 64%:36%, 62%:38%, and 60%:40%. It should be noted that while the ratio is changing, the total enrollment level is projected to increase.

Enrollment is projected to grow from an actual headcount in 2001-01 of 10,690 to 12,000 in 2006-07, noting that in 2001-02 and 2002-03, actual enrollment exceeded projections.

As a comprehensive, research-oriented, historically Black private university, Howard University provides educational experiences of exceptional quality to students of high academic potential with particular emphasis upon the provision of educational opportunities to promising Black students. The University is committed to the continued development of a nationally competitive undergraduate student body, as indicated by traditional high school performance indicators (SAT/ACT, grade point average, recommendations, personal statements and extra-curricular), while continuing to be accessible to students with demonstrated potential.

The requirement to formulate a comprehensive program to evaluate institutional effectiveness, including clear quantitative and qualitative measures of student learning.

Howard University is committed to continuous self-examination to demonstrate its accountability, effectiveness and efficiency in achieving its stated mission.
In fact, the first six of the University’s 1999 self study recommendations pertain to the design and implementation of an assessment program for each academic and non-academic unit (#1) directed by a highly visible and expertly staffed University-wide Office of Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to work in cooperation with the Offices of the Provost and Institutional Research (#3). The recommendations promoted an inter phase between a centralized assessment system and assessment plans and committees in each academic and non-academic unit (#5 and #6). An advisory committee (#4) was to be established to help guide the development and implementation of the assessment system and the University was clear in affirming the need for continuous assessment as an integral part of all future University initiatives (#2).

Clearly, the University has made progress towards the accomplishment of these self recommendations. In the spring of 2001, a Task Force on the University Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness (OAIE) Committee was appointed. This task force was established as a “jump-start” enterprise to galvanize the development and institutionalize an OAIE focus on the campus. The Task Force, which still operates today as the OAIE Committee, is composed of representatives from the faculty, administration, staff, and students. The charge to the Task Force was as follows:

- Develop a campus wide organizational structure for the OAIE
- Develop guiding principles for the conduct of assessment activities at Howard University
• Outline functions, roles, and responsibilities of individuals and units involved in assessing institutional effectiveness and educational outcomes for students
• Document current levels of assessment activities underway on campus, and
• Develop a timeline for the implementation of a fully coordinated program of institutional effectiveness measures and student learning outcomes assessment.

On March 30, 2001, the University submitted to Middle States Commission on Higher Education, a *Follow-Up Report on Progress in the Development and Implementation of a Comprehensive Assessment Plan*. Without intending to repeat the essence of that report in this document, it was clear that planning was underway in a robust and inclusive manner. The report provided a (a) summary of the University’s strategic planning process, (b) the status of the University’s significant assessment-related activities, (c) efforts to conceptualize and formulate a comprehensive outcomes assessment plan for evaluating student outcomes and institutional effectiveness, and (d) assessment-related initiatives directed toward the goal of implementation of an outcomes assessment system, which will generate findings used as a basis for the on-going self-renewal and continuous improvement of the University. Referral to the March 30th report may be helpful, the body of which in enclosed in appendix D. The purpose of this current discussion is to further up-date progress and analyze where the University is to-date in accomplishing its intentions and where continuous work is needed.

The OAIE Committee has developed with faculty input, templates and a process for completing or updating an annual assessment plan and for filing an annual assessment
report based on the plan. The overall plan is discussed later in this report under the section Evidence of Outcomes Assessment. The accompanying templates are found in appendix __E__ and __F__. What is not sufficiently clear from the plan is how the systematic analyses of reported data will be carried out. This part of the comprehensive plan needs to be strengthened. Also, how can faulty provide input, ostensibly through the plans and reports, into major academic decisions of the University? This is a matter that perhaps warrants further consideration.

It is clear that in devising and implementing the Comprehensive Assessment Plan that all units of the University were not in the same place regarding their experience with outcomes assessment and the implementation of measures of effectiveness. For instance, the School of Education and the Division of Nursing had well developed outcomes assessment plans that had been used over time. Academic programs with specialized accreditation, likewise, were comparatively mature in designing and using outcome measure in strengthening their programs. By contrast, many areas of the University were at an embryonic level of development and would require considerable in-service training, modeling, coaching and “internal cultural shifts” to make a full commitment to outcomes assessment and measures of effectiveness an integral part of their operations. Consequently, University-wide efforts to evolve into a highly functional and universally consistent comprehensive assessment program will take time and a diversity of strategies. Hence, it is not surprising that during the initial phase of implementing the plan in fall, 2002, there was substantial variance in the degree of compliance.
X of the X academic units had outcomes assessment committees versus X of the ____ non-academic units. X percent of the eligible academic plans units submitted outcomes assessment plans, while X percent of the non-academic units submitted outcomes assessment plans. Of those academic units submitting plans, roughly X % were considered consistent with the expected standards. Members of the OAIE committee were assigned to various deficient units to assist in generating plans, coaching through the process, or assisting in plan strengthening. Similar to the planning phase, the reporting phase also experienced less than ideal results. Acceptable reports of plan activities during the 2002-03 academic year were submitted by X percent of academic units and X percent of non-academic units. It was clear to the Committee that the first year of implementation had to be considered as a pilot year. Feedback from the process, suggest a need for on-going strategizing for how to (a) keep progressive units actively engaged in the comprehensive process, (b) increase the skill in plan development and use among emerging units, (c) increase participation in planning by reluctant units.

Clearly, it will take time, effort and resources to facilitate growth and the integration of OAIE strategies into the routine functions of every University academic and non-academic unit, as well as systematically contribute to continuous assessment and improvements for the collective university. The work to-date, which has been substantial and far-reaching, has been accomplished by a voluntary, yet extremely dedicated committee of faculty, administrators, staff, and students. The importance of a comprehensive assessment program and the seriousness, with which each unit of the University must address it, requires the full-time facilitation of an Office of Outcomes
Assessment and Institutional Effectives. Such an office must be sufficiently staffed to provide the necessary levels of training, coaching, management, analysis, and reporting to address effectively the needs of diverse units and their development. Also, this office must be aligned closely with the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of the Provost, a means of effectively linking all measures of institutional effectiveness.

Self-Study recommendation # 2 states that assessment plans should be developed and incorporated into all new University initiatives. Strategic Framework for Action I and II represent to a great extent, new University initiatives. Over the last five years, many of the SFA initiatives have incorporated an outcomes assessment plan. Among these are the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (SFA I-6), the design and construction of new health science and law libraries (SFAI- 9 and 10), the assessment and review of all graduate programs (SFA I-5), and the development of a University-wide workload policy (SAF I-13) all of whom discuss these processes throughout this report. However, there is currently no University-wide mechanism for systematically assessing the impact of the core curriculum on student learning. It is deemed critical that comprehensive assessment for these initiatives be undertaken immediately. While individual undergraduate academic units are assessing the impact of the core, this does not replace the need for effective measures of the core across the campus. In addition, whereas the merged academic units (SFA I-2-4) are engaged in outcomes assessment at the school or college level, there is not currently a University-side element of the comprehensive plan that documents objectively the institutional effectiveness across the merged units.
Other areas of expressed concerns regarding the comprehensive program of outcomes assessment, relates to evaluation of all constituents of the University, Student, faculty and staff all experience and are rewarded, in a general and specific sense, based on some form of evaluation; for students this takes the form of grading; for faculty and staff, the merit system and the Performance Evaluation Program, respectively, provide the data for decision making and recommendations. However, there is currently no system in place for on-going evaluation of administrators with input from multiple constituents. This missing component is worthy of consideration.

The perceived need to strike a balance between full deliberation on policy issues and timely adoption and implementation of policy.

Need to address progress, developments and changes in this area. Assigned to Sub-committee on Mission and Governance.

The need to expand and deepen its research program in order to remain a national leader in higher education

Howard University holds the Carnegie Foundation’s designation as a Doctoral/Research University-Extensive, one of only 144 such universities in the nation and the only Historically Black University so designated. In continuing to expand and deepen its research enterprise, the University is concentrating its efforts in increasing its research activities and strengthening graduate education. Deliberative processes are in place to address these complementary goals, both essential to maintaining a competitive position in higher education as a research-extensive university.
The University has made significant progress in organizational restructuring that gives research much greater visibility and focuses the institution’s efforts to support research. As of July 1, 2003, the Office of the Vice Provost for Research was created to provide oversight and coordination of all aspects of university research policy, priorities, and administration. To recognize the inextricable relationship between research and graduate education, responsibility for both research (including the Office of Research Administration-ORA) and graduate education was placed under the leadership of one individual, Dr. Orlando Taylor, who serves also as Dean of the Graduate School. The Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School has appointed an informal, 13-person Faculty Research Advisory Council, which comprises faculty members from a wide range of disciplines and professorial ranks, to provide regular advice and input on research issues, policies and practices, as well as input on new research initiatives.

The incumbent Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School has taken a two-pronged approach toward expanding and deepening the University’s research program. Broad strategic plans have been established to set a long-term, far-reaching vision for research across the campus. At the same time, concrete initiatives have been undertaken to boost the research productivity of the faculty and to minimize or eliminate administrative barriers in processing research applications and post-award funding. This section of the report will address both components of this approach, which intersect and overlap in many areas.
To establish a strategic framework for the university’s continuing increases in research productivity, the Vice Provost for Research has engaged in an extensive examination of the university’s historical data regarding research funding. The University has now established a goal of $100 million in extramural research funding by 2006. For 2004, extramural research funding is on pace to total approximately $75 million, compared to the little more than $50 million at the time of the 1998-99 University-Wide Self Study and Middle States Site Visit. The $100 million goal was established after review of the research activity levels of 10 peer research universities determined by the University President.

Other studies have been completed on more detailed five-year trends in extramural research productivity (i.e., numbers of proposals submitted, numbers of awards, and dollar amounts of awards) within schools, colleges, and departments and to benchmark these activities at the school and college level against the peer institutions. Each school, college and department has been compared to those peer institutions with comparable departments, and adjustments for departmental size have been made accordingly. This analysis demonstrated that the university’s research activity in a few departments is above the peer means, but that targets and intensified efforts needed to be established in most departments to bring extramural funding levels to a level comparable to those at peer institutions of similar size and scope. Based on these analyses, a preliminary set of extramural research targets have been established for each school/college and department for the next three years. Achievement of these targets will move the University’s annual
level of extramural support from its 2003 level of $65 million to the aforementioned $100 million level.

In planning for the achievement of these goals, the University is cognizant of the imbalance in research activities among its faculty, and by schools/colleges and departments. It is clear that the areas with the greatest research productivity and the potential for the largest contribution to extramural funding growth are the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science and the College of Medicine, and that it must intensify its extramural activity in these units. It is also clear that the university must strengthen its links to the major federal agencies that support research. Aggressive efforts are underway already to establish such communications and linkages. It is the intention of the University to not only increase external funding, but to increase the breadth and depth of participation of its faculty in the research enterprise.

Several other initiatives have occurred or are underway to strength the overall campus research productivity. During academic year 2002-2003, for example, a faculty driven Research Think Tank was established under the leadership of the former provost to address barriers to research at the university and to explore the feasibility of establishing certain “niche areas” in which to prioritize research activity.

One particularly important observation that must be noted is that the University faculty includes researchers with diverse levels of experience in the research enterprise, and that the University must support and strengthen faculty capacity across this wide range of
experience. To address this fact, the new Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer has taken the bold step to consolidate all previously, and rather fragmented, internal faculty research programs and funding streams to establish a new University-wide Faculty Research Program with an initial funding stream of approximately $4 million. This program will provide seed funding for research for junior and senior faculty in separate competitions, matching funds for selected extramural efforts and for undergraduate and graduate student research activities.

The aforementioned Faculty Research Advisory Council has worked directly with the Vice Provost for Research to seek solutions to thorny issues that have historically functioned as barriers to research at the University. To date, the Council has met with selected senior university officials to address such issues as contract administration, information technology services to support research, and the timeliness in administering post award activity. Considerable progress has been noted in each of these areas, thanks largely to enormous support and cooperation of senior university officials in advancing the research enterprise at Howard, most notably the President, Interim Provost, Interim Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, and the General Counsel.

Two particular concerns which faculty indicated discouraged extramural research engagement have been addressed, namely research space and research administration infrastructure. The designation of a newly acquired campus building as the Howard University Research Building I (HURB-I) housing funded researchers is expected to both catalyze and reward faculty research productivity by providing much-needed research
space, as well as to encourage more interdisciplinary and collaboration in research by locating complementary projects in physical proximity. HURB-I will be administered by a high-level administration/faculty committee, chaired by the Provost, and will have full authority to recommend incumbency and strategic uses of the building directly to the President. Incumbency in HURB-I is expected to prioritize extramurally funded projects and projects that are complementary to one another. No wet labs will be housed in this particular facility, but additional space for such activities is clearly on the university’s radar screen. The University expects to achieve additional space for research, especially in science and engineering through development of the proposed new Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Building, discussed at length later in this report. These new structures, along with other renovations in exiting research space, reflect that recommendation # 29 in the 1999 Institutional Self-Study progressively is being addressed.

In addition, several other initiatives are underway to support and reward faculty extramural research efforts. An ongoing communications strategy has been undertaken to showcase Howard University research and researchers, both in print and on-line. These efforts have already resulted in a completely new online presence for research, with a redesigned Office of Research Administration (ORA) web site. Faculty research has been showcased in print in the university’s campus-wide magazine, and a new university research magazine, *Quest*, will be launched this spring. As these activities continue, opportunities will be sought to further enhance faculty initiatives through communication. Further recognition of faculty research efforts will be provided through
a new model for supernumerary compensation for extramural grant recipients, as well as a planned faculty recognition program to showcase and honor faculty researchers.

Further efforts to support faculty research productivity have been made with the creation of an office to provide faculty with technical assistance in grantsmanship. This office offers technical assistance for faculty in formats ranging from individual meetings to workshops and seminars; tracks major opportunities for external funding; and coordinates interdisciplinary groups to prepare such proposals. The university has also instituted a subscription to the Illinois Researcher Information Service (IRIS) to allow researchers access to a database of research funding opportunities.

Support for research administration, which has been viewed as a disincentive for faculty research participation, has been markedly strengthened. For example, in response by the Office of the Internal Auditor that identified major deficiencies in the Office of Research Administration, an extensive overhaul of that Office and its procedures has been undertaken. Among the issues identified in the report were extensive time delays in post-award and contract administration and excessive signatory requirements for initiating post-award budgets. In August 2003, a new procedure was instituted to reduce the time for the establishment of an account following notification of an award from three weeks to 48 hours. This was achieved by reducing the number of signatures required to establish an account and by introducing electronic award administration. Moreover, the length of time to promulgate contracts has been reduced from an average of 13 weeks to three weeks, a period very consistent with peer institutions. A new Contract Specialist will
soon be hired by the Office of Research Administration to further enhance the quality and timeliness of contracts administration.

Howard University also has a vast number of research centers that afford opportunities for cultivating research capacity among faculty as the important science of the center is being achieved. For example, several schools/colleges and departments were awarded P-20 health disparities center grants over the past two years, which among other things seek to increase the number and proficiency of minority investigators and investigators studying health disparities. These mechanisms provide mentoring and funding for pilot projects. It is the intent that these projects will be nurtured over time into larger extramural funding. Other major research centers have been established over the past two years, some involving partnerships with other universities with Howard serving as the lead institution. Among these new, reasonably well-funded centers are: the NOAA Center for Atmospheric Studies (NCAS) and the Center of Research Excellence in Science and Technology (CREST) Center for Nanomaterials Characterization Science and Processing Technology.

In addition to these significant partnerships, Howard researchers in both medical and non-medical fields are involved in a variety of other major research efforts. For example, researchers in the university’s Sickle Cell Center recently published ground-breaking work in conjunction with the National Institutes of Health in the New England Journal of Medicine. Researchers from Howard’s Center for Atmospheric Science funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) are currently
leading a research voyage on the NOAA vessel Ronald H. Brown to study Saharan dust and its impact on climactic change. Cutting-edge research is also being conducted by externally funded researchers in the university’s National Human Genome Center.

Research and graduate education are fundamentally interconnected activities, and the university’s placement of both endeavors in one administrative area underscores their connection on campus. In graduate education, two important achievements were realized during the past five years, including program reviews and the subsequent submission of strategic plans to advance the quality and reputation of each of the Graduate School’s master’s and doctoral programs. A detailed report, *The Future of Graduate Education at Howard University*, was subsequently released which contained among other things a comprehensive set of recommendations designed to significantly advance graduate education and research at Howard University. A more detailed explication of the findings and recommendations of the systematic review of the graduate program is discussed under **Major Accomplishments and Changes**, later in this report.

**Continue to take steps to assure future financial security.**

The University has two major sources from which it receives sixty-eight percent of its unrestricted operating revenue; the federal appropriation and tuition/fees. The keys to ensuring future financial security of the University are; moderate increases to the federal appropriation, generation of higher levels of tuition revenue, successful fundraising and stringently controlling operating expenses.
The University has a long history of significant financial support from the federal government. Senior University officials have maintained outstanding channels of communications with federal officials and continuously strive to ensure that the University’s strategic objectives and operating performance justifies continued support from the federal government. The financial support provided by the federal government during the past few years were stable with moderate increases in the appropriation. However, given the stagnant economy and the increasing federal deficits, moderate increases are very positive indications of the strong federal government’s financial commitment to Howard. We anticipate that the federal appropriation will increase by an average of two and one half percent per year during the next five years.

The University’s enrollment continues to grow with projected enrollment of approximately 10,000 by FY’ 2007. This coupled with increases three to four percent per year in tuition rates will generate moderate tuition revenue increases while not negatively affecting future enrollment given Howard’s low tuition increases relative to other higher education institutions and its national ranking in U.S. News & World Reports as one of the fifty “best values” in the category of National Universities – Doctorial.

In addition to generating consistent increases in its two main sources of funding for the University’s unrestricted budget. Howard has made significant progress in its Capital Campaign which was started during FY’ 2002. To date over fifty percent of the $250
A $34 million Campaign goal has been achieved. (Further detail about the Capital Campaign is found later in the report).

These initiatives to grow University revenue, while stringently controlling expenses, and a planned major evaluation of programs and resource allocation for implementation in FY ‘2006 are essential to securing the University’s financial future.

**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION: ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHANGES SINCE LAST EVALUATION**

At the time of the March 14-17, 1999 Middle States site visit, the University had recently embarked upon Strategic Framework for Action I, a visionary document and action plan to lead the University into the 21st Century. The visitors perceived of the plan as a very positive and a clearly articulated road map to an enhanced presence of Howard into the next century. Strategic Framework for Action I was declared sufficiently successful giving way in July, 2001 for the introduction of SFA II. Certain of the strategic initiatives, though considered completed at the conclusion of SFA I, are subject to continued measures of effectiveness and outcomes assessment. Others initiatives begun under SFA I continue to mature along with initiatives introduced through SFA II.

Although SFA I and SFA II were framed around four strategic goals; namely, *strengthening academic programs, promoting excellence in teaching and research, increasing private support, and enhancing national and community service*, each has its own distinctive thematic character. SFA I highlighted strengthening academic programs
through consolidation, a core curriculum, enhanced teaching/learning, and bridging hardware, software, and infrastructure gaps by making technology accessible to all faculty and students. Augmenting these was the completion of two state-of-the-art libraries to provide major enhancements to the academic and research productivity of the campus.

SFA II is characterized by major capital expansion to strengthen significantly the University’s capacity and resources for excellence in academic programs, research, student life, and community services. Enriched technological and telecommunications capabilities and external linkages are also highlighted among the SFA II initiatives.

The discussion that follows specifies and amplifies the accomplishments and changes occurring through SFA I and II, organized according to the four strategic goals. Strategic initiatives that continue at the planning and enactment phase are captured under Future Plans, itemized later in this report. This section also integrates progress in meeting the University’s self-recommendations detailed in the 1999 institutional self study.

**Strengthening Academic Programs and Services**

The University-wide Core Curriculum (SFA I-1) is implemented throughout the undergraduate programs.

A new undergraduate core curriculum, encompassing five themes, was mandated by the University, to correspond with the core values, which are: search for truth; provide educational opportunity for African Americans and other minorities; respect for cultural diversity and the Howard University family; and promote leadership spirit in the students.
In December 1999, a panel was formed in the College of Arts and Sciences, and was charged with studying and recommending a university-wide core curriculum. At the completion of its extensive work, the panel recommended that the core curriculum should be based on five objectives as follows:

1. Understanding varying social structures and diverse concepts of social equity, social justice and community development.
2. Understanding the African American cultural heritage and its continuing significance.
3. Learning to use and control technology to advance social and individual goals.
4. Developing the communicative and expressive skills needed to address social relations and values through analysis, creative expression and/or constructive intervention.
5. Building multicultural national and international perspectives on the roles of the individual, the African American community and other ethnic groups in domestic and international social/cultural relations.

Based on the proposed objectives, a total of 23 to 27 credit hours of formal courses were recommended by the panel to be considered as the University's core curriculum. Given the diverse nature of education programs, some flexibility was foreseen and allowed in course selections and decision-making by the faculty across the Howard University's undergraduate programs. The following core themes were recommended to fulfill the proposed objectives:
1. Intellectual Openness and Cultural Diversity (3 credits)

2. Historical Awareness (6 credits)

3. Empirical Analysis (6 credits)

4. Quantitative Literacy and Statistical reasoning (3 credits)

5. Social and Human Relations (3 credits)

6. Health and physical education (2 credits)

A decision was made that each school and college was required to implement the core curriculum by either adding new courses and/or incorporating the core requirements within existing courses. To date, the core curriculum has been largely incorporated into the current undergraduate programs at Howard University. To evaluate the impact and effectiveness of the core curriculum, data have been collected by individual undergraduate programs through exit surveys, licensure examination pass rates and departmental self-studies. However, steps toward analysis and feedback of the data across all schools and colleges are underway. In addition, a comprehensive outcome assessment of the core curriculum and its impact on the undergraduate programs will be developed.

The merger of selected academic units (SFA I 2-4) to include the incorporation of the College of Fine Arts into the College of Arts and Sciences, the School of Architecture and Planning with the School of Engineering, and the combining of the Colleges of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences has been structurally and functionally achieved.

The creation of three new schools and colleges through merger was one of the first strategic actions of the new President of Howard University, Mr. H. Patrick Swygert.
The common goal, as advocated by the President's Strategic Framework for Action I (SFA-I), was to combine the strengths of the several existing colleges and schools in order to materialize the University's vision and mission. The mergers, which were implemented between 1997 and 1998, involved the following three groups of colleges and schools:

- The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Fine Arts
- The School of Architecture and the School of Engineering and Computer Sciences
- The College of Pharmacy, the College of Nursing, and the College of Allied Health Sciences.

It must be emphasized that the individual colleges and school did not set their specific goals for merger. They implemented the mergers, based on the goal of SFA-I.

Based on the reports from the three merged colleges, it appears that the mergers have been largely successful and effective, although details of the outcomes assessment await future in-depth analyses of data from each college. Since the implementation processes, the accomplishments and the outcomes vary among the above merged colleges and schools, the details have been presented separately as follows:

College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Fine Arts merged in 1998. The new College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) is comprised of four divisions: Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences.
To implement the merger, the faculty of the COAS elected a task force and charged it with resolving curriculum, admissions, governance, and personnel issues. The task force had three subcommittees: 1) Curriculum and Admissions; 2) Mission Statement and By-laws; and 3) Appointments, Promotions and Tenure. The key actions of these subcommittees include a study of the conceptual structure of the core curriculum and general education requirements at other institutions with programs comparable to those offered by COAS (e.g., Temple University, University of Virginia, University of Maryland, Emory University, Vanderbilt University, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology). Taking an innovative approach as well as lessons learned from other institutions on the integration of the fine and traditional liberal arts, a general education curriculum was developed, recommended, and approved.

Further, the faculty of the COAS unanimously approved the Articles of Organization and By-laws, which ensure that the four divisions are operation under one set of guidelines. The Articles of Organization also mandated that the faculty as a whole engage in a number of joint activities throughout each academic year. Today, the COAS is thriving and moving forward. Evidence of the effectiveness of the merger include:

**Development and Growth of Interdisciplinary Activities:** The Department of Theater Arts and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology have worked together on projects on HIV and AIDS. The Department of Art, the Department of Physics, and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology have developed an interdisciplinary course.
The "Service Learning" minor and the American Humanics programs are attracting students from numerous disciplines. The "Environmental Science" course is another example of new interdisciplinary activity in the COAS.

Support: The COAS governance structure encourages and supports the full participation of students and faculty members in interdisciplinary efforts.

Recognition: The COAS continues to attract some of the best students and faculty, as demonstrated by prestigious recognitions received from regional and national organizations.

Professional Opportunities: Since the merger, more students and faculty are availing themselves of professional opportunities (e.g., interdisciplinary research; travel, study and research abroad). Faculty and students alike are winning more honors and awards.

Outcomes Assessment: To ensure growth and academic excellence, the COAS must emphasize systematic reviews (internal and external), evaluations, and outcomes assessment of its programs; general education, core, and major disciplines of study. To date, there has been no comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the merger in the COAS. To a limited extent, some reviews have been conducted of the existing programs, which have touched upon the effectiveness of the merger. Also, additional resources are needed to provide financial assistance to students, to strengthen faculty
development programs, to upgrade laboratories for science, language, and art programs, and to enhance existing initiatives and to begin new ones.

**College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science**

The College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science, likewise merged in 1998 and strategically planned and executed a mechanism for effectively blending the three former separate units. Much of the new Colleges plans, accomplishments and challenges were chronicled in the 1999 Self Study to MSCHE. Below is a brief overview of the Colleges Continuing progress in the areas of integration, governance and outcomes assessment.

**Integration:** There was a previous concern about the merger of the School of Architecture with the School of Engineering and Computer Sciences into the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences. An excerpt of the review of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB; 2002) demonstrates that although the two schools have very diverse disciplines and cultures, the merger has been very successful and the current integration of the schools is of no major concern.

**Governance:** The relationship of the School of Architecture with the Department of Engineering that caused a concern in the last report is now moot. Based upon current conditions, the autonomous structure of the School of Architecture gives it a direct relationship and connection to the Provost, which puts it on an equal footing with the School of Engineering and Computer Sciences.
Outcomes Assessment: To date, there has been no documented analysis or compiled data on the effectiveness of the merger in the College of Engineering, Architecture and Computer Sciences. This initiative needs to be given a high priority and implemented to ensure that future growth of the College is based upon factual evidence.

College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences

Like other merged units, the CPNAHS has made considerable progress since 1999. The discussion below speaks to governance, integration and outcomes assessment, providing relevant examples of activities supportive of interdisciplinary enhancements.

Governance: The new College of Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences (CPNAHS) merged in 1997. For one academic year (1997-1998), an interim dean led the College until a permanent dean was appointed in 1998. Currently, the College is governed by the Dean and three Associate Deans; one to oversee the administrative affairs of each of the three units comprising the College.

Integration Process: The College consists of three units: 1) School of Pharmacy; 2) Division of Nursing; and 3) Division of Allied Health Sciences. These units administer a total of 10 departments, offering seven B.S., two Master's, two doctoral and two certificate programs. The College enrolls approximately 1,118 students, who are served by 90 full-time and 20 part-time faculty members. Since 1999, the College has accomplished considerable progress in the integration process of the College, as described below:
• Annual Awards Program: The three units to celebrate the achievement of its graduates at the Annual Honors and Awards Program held the day before graduation. This event includes a keynote speaker who addresses all graduating seniors, their family, faculty, administrators and staff.

• Committee on Interdisciplinary Education, Research, and Service: This committee was established in 2000, and has had a number of accomplishments, including:
  - Development of a strategic plan to address long-term, intermediate and short-term goals of education, research and service within the College.
  - Holding an Interdisciplinary Research Faculty Forum in December 2002.
  - Holding a Faculty Retreat in March 2004 to address the accomplishments and concerns of the faculty regarding education, research and service.

• Annual Report: Since 2000, the College has prepared and submitted one comprehensive annual report yearly. The reports reflect the combined effort of the three units in meeting and supporting the goals and objectives of University's Strategic Framework for Action I and II, and the Provost's Targets of Opportunity, “Moving to Tier I”.

• Articles of Organization and Bylaws: The faculty unanimously approved the Articles of Organization and Bylaws for the College on April 24, 2003. The document has been forwarded to the Provost for review and transmittal to the President and the Board of Trustees for approval. The Articles of Organization and Bylaws will ensure that all three units are moving forward with one set of guidelines.
Faculty Appointment, Promotion and Tenure: Faculty appointment, promotion and tenure guidelines for the College were adopted by the faculty on April 27, 2004.

Outcomes Assessment: In collaboration with the three units, the college has developed a comprehensive outcomes assessment plan, which is based on the goals and objectives of the college and supported by the individual units. The review and analysis of the data are underway.

Consolidation of Faculty Travel and Faculty Development Activities: Since 2000, the College consolidated the budget for faculty development and travel activities in the Office of the Dean. This has resulted in a more efficient utilization of resources devoted to faculty development in the College.

Appointment of a Board of Visitors: To assist the College in its support of SFA II Goal 3 (increasing private support); a Board of Visitors was created to support the cultivation and solicitation of gifts. Dr. Harold Freeman, member of the Board of Trustees, chairs the Board of Visitors. The College hosted its first Board of Visitors meeting on March 24-26, 2003.

Significant progress has been made in the restructuring the administration of the graduate program (SFA 1-5).

In response to the concerns expressed by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education and consistent with the directives of the University's Strategic Framework for
Action II, the Graduate School has undertaken deliberative activities in restructuring and in strengthening its programs. Much of the restructuring was discussed earlier under “expanding and deepening research”, as was reference to the study on the *Future of Graduate Education at Howard University*. This study is a landmark document because it establishes the baseline and framework for progress in the growth and impact of graduate education at Howard University. A litany of recommendations emerged from this study. Some of the most important recommendations aimed at improving the University’s graduate programs and research productivity are presented below, several of which have already been implemented.

**Recommendations from “The Future of Graduate Education at Howard University”**

- A process should be developed to identify those graduate programs which could be candidates to join the top ranks of national programs, and a strategy developed and resources provided for such programs to rise to that level.

- Graduate programs and the Graduate School will develop strategic goals and objectives for each program, to include targets on enrollment, research productivity, assessment of graduates, and other such measures.

- Closure or probation should be considered for graduate programs that are characterized by such factors as low enrollment, low faculty productivity, minimal membership on the Graduate Faculty, and other such characteristics, with
alternatives possibly provided for participation in existing or planned interdisciplinary degree programs.

- All graduate programs with a corresponding professional accreditation capability and that are not accredited currently must immediately seek such accreditation. Should accredited status not be achieved, program suspensions should be considered.

- The Graduate School should adopt a new and aggressive strategy for recruiting graduate students from diverse racial groups and from Howard’s own undergraduate programs, including such approaches as “seamless admission.”

- It is recommended that a new position be created (at the time of the appointment of the next Dean of the Graduate School) titled “Associate Provost for Graduate Study and Dean of the Graduate School.” With the creation of this position, all graduate study at the university should be coordinated through this office.

- A significant investment should be made in increasing the stipends for graduate assistants, at both the master’s degree and the doctoral degree levels. The recommended increase is from $8,000 to $12,000 for master’s stipends, and from $9,500 to $13,500 for doctoral stipends.
• Interdisciplinary doctoral programs should be considered in a number of areas, including, but not limited to, environmental studies, cultural studies, and neuroscience/cognitive science. New, single-discipline doctoral degree programs should be considered at this time only if they are in an area of demonstrated high demand and emerging trends in graduate education.

• All graduate programs with a corresponding professional accreditation capability and that are not accredited currently must immediately seek such accreditation. Should accredited status not be achieved, program suspensions should be considered.

• The program review process for graduate programs, which has been policy at Howard University for many years, should be extended so that a review of the Graduate School itself is also a component of the assessment process.

Review of Graduate Programs: Based on student enrollment, graduate faculty membership and productivity, external funding, and program reputation, a categorization system was developed by the Graduate School in 2001 (see Graduate School Annual Report 2001-2002). The review process utilized both self-studies and external evaluations of the departments, in light of national trends and the missions of the University. The Graduate School strongly believes that program improvement should be actively driven by the faculty of individual programs, while effectively utilizing resources available to them from the Graduate School and the University. Further, the Graduate School has initiated routine onsite visits to all graduate programs with the expectation to
formulate effective strategies for each graduate program to attain viability and prominence. To date, the review process of all the 33 graduate programs has been completed, the results of which are outlined below:

- Nine programs have been placed in **Category I** (Strong Programs). These programs received the continued strong support of the Graduate School, and will be used as role models for bringing about improvement in the graduate programs under other categories.

- Nine programs have been identified under **Category II** (Programs at the threshold of achieving national prominence). These programs will enjoy the continued support of the Graduate School, and will be assisted with their individual strategic plans to enhance scholarly productivity and research funding. Also, the limitations facing these programs, such as laboratory space, new building and infrastructure have been addressed.

- Fifteen programs are placed in **Category III** (Programs of acceptable quality, but unlikely to achieve higher standing in the foreseeable future without greater research productivity, funding, and student enrollment). Similar strategies as in Category II will be utilized to significantly improve the research productivity programs under this category. Depending on the merits and difficulties on each program, alternative strategies, such as merger, have been proposed and implemented. To date, impressive success has been made by some programs in
this category by developing interdisciplinary programs and initiating collaborative research projects among the departments. Four programs are assigned to Category IV (Weak programs) and six others are placed under Category V (Candidates for possible termination due to low student enrollment, low faculty productivity, external reputation, and/or lack of accreditation). Based on the self-studies and strategic plans provided by these programs, and input from onsite visits and external reviews, plans are being drawn to address the issues facing these programs and recommend specific actions. For some of these programs, a provisional recommendation is merger into interdisciplinary programs. For others, termination may be the only viable solution. To date, however, no termination plan has been proposed for any of the existing graduate programs.

There are several graduate programs within the University that are not affiliated with the Graduate School. Consequently, they were not embraced within the comprehensive assessment of graduate programs. It would perhaps be beneficial if these programs be evaluated by the same criteria and standards as those with formal affiliations, be similarly categorized and required to complete strategic plans for strengthening and moving up in categorical designation. It is also worthwhile to facilitate all qualifying graduate programs not affiliated with the Graduate School to become affiliated.

The establishment of the Fund for Academic Excellence (SFA 1–6) has proven to be one of the most successful initiatives for enhancing academic programs and services. It has continued to promote excellence in teaching and learning. Established in the fall of
1997 by Strategic Framework for Action I, the Fund enables full-time faculty “to apply for financial support to strengthen and enhance instruction, curricula, scholarly expertise, performance and creative expression, and academic management” (Swygert & Coleman 2001, p. 1). So far there have been nine cycles, granting awards of $2,000 to $6,000. Through these awards, the Fund has promoted not only innovative teaching strategies but outcomes assessment and grantsmanship, as all recipients are required to assess the impact of their initiative on teaching and learning, and all are encouraged to seek external funding. True to its mission, the Fund is strengthening academic programs and services, as indicated by the project summaries in Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Learning: A Report on the Howard University Fund for Academic Excellence Grants (March 2001). Many summaries document increases in the level of student motivation, satisfaction, or academic performance. For example, nursing faculty reported that students who completed a self-paced study module during the summer “passed the medication/dosage examination at a higher rate than students who did not take the self-paced instruction” (Promoting, p. 8). Meanwhile, Allied Health faculty noted increased student interest in working at underserved community-based sites as a result of a Fund initiative to develop HU affiliations with such sites (Promoting, p. 3).

Participation in the Fund’s program has increased over the years. According to the Office of the Provost, during AY 98-99, the University received only 152 proposals, but in AY 02-03, it received 222. As for funding, since FY 98-99, dollars designated for the Fund increased from $519, 963 to $634, and 690 in FY 02-03. Table 1 reveals that over the last five academic years, 736 (81%) of the 910 proposals have been funded, averaging
147 per year. Most awards have been designated for travel to workshops or conferences, equipment, course/curriculum development, and on-campus seminars or symposia. During the latest cycle, AY 02-03, 169 (76%) of the 222 proposals were funded, with the greatest percentage of funds awarded for travel (50%) and for equipment (26%). Only 11% of the Fund’s awards were directed to course/curriculum development, less than 5% to interdisciplinary projects, less than 3% to student outcomes/performance, and a mere 1% to faculty development. Since these statistics reflect the distribution of applications [CK with Barksdale], at first blush, these figures indicate that too few of the Fund’s projects focus directly on teaching, learning, or assessment. This shift in project foci may suggest that relatively few faculty are proposing such projects because departments tend to discount the scholarship of teaching during deliberations about appointments, promotion, and tenure. On the other hand, the shift could indicate that faculty is increasingly seeking external training as reflected in the rise in travel grants. The Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost are already addressing issues such as the role of the scholarship of teaching. However, the University also needs to conduct an outcomes assessment to identify the reasons for the shifts in foci and to analyze the impact of the Funds on student achievement.

A Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (SFA I-8) was established in

2003:

The new Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLA) was established as another vehicle for strengthening academic programs. Originally proposed in Strategic Framework I in 1996, CETLA became fully staffed and operational on October 6, 2003.
(Although the facility opened its doors in 2000, until October 6, 2003, it had been utilized for Outcomes Assessment Committee meetings and contract workshops.) Housed in the iLab, Howard’s central computing lab, the Center now offers faculty weekly workshops, hands-on help in “Open Labs,” and consultations, among other services related to teaching, student learning, and classroom assessment. (See www.cetla.howard.edu).

For example, within the first four months of operation, CETLA offered 57 hands-on workshops and 43 Open Labs to teach faculty how to use the Blackboard online course system, operate equipment in campus Smart Rooms, create websites, design PowerPoint slide shows, and improve writing across the curriculum. Through these activities, CETLA seeks “to stimulate and increase faculty support for student-oriented, problem-based teaching and learning techniques such as technology-based instruction, team teaching, and other innovative approaches” (Self-Study Recommendation #9).

Already, Howard’s faculty has responded to CETLA’s call. As of February 6, 2004, over 200 faculties had participated in CETLA’s activities. Over the next two years, CETLA will collect data from surveys, databases, syllabi, portfolios, and research studies to determine whether it is strengthening academic programs and services. Specifically, it will conduct formative and summative assessments of the following: (1) faculty participation in and satisfaction with CETLA’s program activities, (2) classroom implementation of those teaching strategies, and (3) the impact of those strategies on students’ learning and the faculty’s productivity.

Progress has been made with objective SFA II-10 that calls for digitizing essential information and building requisite infrastructure to facilitate asynchronous education. In
2001, the University implemented the Blackboard System which enables faculty
courseware developers to mediate, supplement, extend and offer any course throughout
the various curricula in an asynchronous manner. The leadership and staff of the center
for Excellence in Teaching, Learning and Assessment provide inspired technical support
to faculty and other courseware developers who elect to employ the Blackboard System.
One of CETLA’s primary objectives is to teach faculty to leverage the power of the
Blackboard course management system to enhance teaching and learning. Blackboard
allows faculty to post syllabi, assignments, slide shows, and other course material online;
conduct class discussions in chatrooms and on discussion boards; and administer tests
that give students instant feedback. As of fall 2003, 572 Blackboard course sites had
been activated. Now that CETLA has been established, it plans to increase the use of
Blackboard and monitor the impact of Blackboard-assisted pedagogy on teaching and
learning.

With the growth in the use of Blackboard and other instructional technology, security and
technical support for the University’s network and Smart Rooms have become mission-
critical. Too often the lack of weekend and evening technical support for the Blackboard
server or the network as a whole has disrupted instruction and discouraged some faculty
from teaching with technology and some students from learning with technology. ISAS
should monitor ‘downtime’ of the Blackboard server and the network as a whole when it
conducts its outcomes assessment. Meanwhile, repeated thefts have disabled many Smart
Rooms, leaving teachers with nothing but “chalk and talk.” To address these problems,
the Office of the Provost is working with the Smart Room managers, campus police,
ISAS, and CETLA. Moreover, the Provost recently appointed a Teaching, Learning, and
Technology Committee that will bring together representatives of the faculty, student body, library, bookstore, and ISAS to develop a strategic plan for the use and maintenance of instructional technology.

Construction of new health sciences (SFA I-) and law libraries (SFA I-) was completed in 1999 and both facilities are fully operational.

The Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library is indeed a state-of-the-art facility with computer access throughout and study and problem-based learning rooms equipped with the latest digital technology. The new law library supports the School of Law faculty and students with cutting edge technology and a variety of appropriate space for learning and practice. Both of these facilities exceed the intent of self study recommendation # 19 which called for an investigation into the need for technological capability in the libraries. Elsewhere within the Howard University Library System, building conditions are improved in the Undergraduate Library and the Architecture Library. Founders’ Library, the chief graduate library, experienced repairs of water leaks, re-carpeting, painting, and complete renovation of windows.

Faculty and student access to electronic databases (SFA I & II) has substantially improved since 1999. The Library system subscribes to major electronic bibliographic and full-text databases and has expanded the coverage provided of other previously held databases. For instance, the number of full text journals accessible on-line has increased dramatically since 1999, to include an increase in EbscoHost titles from 997
in 1999 to 4,605 in 2004 and an increase in Science Direct titles from 261 in 1999 to 1,548 in 2004. Access to all propriety resources previously restricted by vendors to on-campus use is now available to HU-affiliated users 24/7 from off-campus locations using the user’s preferred Internet Service Providers. Furthermore, the Library implemented a client/server web-based online catalog, Sterling, using the Innovative Interfaces system.

Access to library and information services is further enhanced through a number of coordinate, collaborative resource sharing arrangements among the major library units. The various library units are engaged in more cooperative purchases, engage in collaborative deselection, promote complementary holdings, and broad electronic access. **Sterling** is shared by the Main Library Group and the Health Sciences Library. Sterling employs the same online system previously installed in the Law Library, thus moving the entire campus toward greater standardization in accessing information services. In-house enhancement to Sterling enables the searcher in a discipline to list all e-journals in the chosen discipline and proceed to display, download, or print the full-text articles in each journal and database. In addition, sharing of resources and services across institutions is expanded: Graduate students and faculty have direct borrowing privileges at each CIRLA library (Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance), including the following universities and institutions; Georgetown, George Washington, Maryland, Johns Hopkins, Delaware, the Smithsonian, National Agricultural Library, and Library of Congress. In fall, 2003, a full-time Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and digitalization specialist was hired to increase usage of priority ILL borrowing from CIRLA institutions.
Digitalization projects have also expanded capacity and accessibility of library resources (SFA II). The expansion and evolution the University’s digital infrastructure, inclusive of wireless networks and fully networked residence halls, were wedded with new initiative in the Library. Since fall, 2002, the library has offered an electronic reserves service that supplements the traditional paper course reserve system. Access to e-reserves is restricted to Howard University faculty, staff, and current students, both campus-based and distance learning. In addition, through digitalization, the Moorland Spingarn Research Center scanned more than 20,000 original images from the Center’s collection, including manuscripts, photographs, and rare books, substantially increasing access to formerly restricted resources.

Major progress has been made in enhancing student/faculty information management skills (SFA I&II). To enhance student information management skills, the library created a detailed user-friendly help guide to the online catalog, as well as tutorials to address other databases and research needs. The library’s Web-based OPAC and proprietary databases are available remotely with patron authentication. Public service librarians schedule classes on searching the online catalog, the library Web site and bibliographic databases. While reaching just over 50% of the student body and faculty today, the number of participants in group presentations increased substantially, from 3,572 in 1999 to 5,779 in 2003. The ratio of presentations to total FTE students at Howard (about 62% in 2003) is midrange among the Association of Research Libraries members, and compares favorably with such institutions as Case Western (63%); Vanderbilt (65%); Johns’ Hopkins (69%). The Library has partnered with Department of English faculty in
developing information management skills tutorial, scheduled for implementation in fall, 2004, targeting every freshman student.

Enhancement of academic programs and the research enterprise is partially assessed by the extent to which the resources of the library are used (SFA I&II) The Library system regularly receives usage statistics from most database vendors. A locally-developed monitoring system also provides ongoing usage statistics for each monitored resource. While our utilization statistics may be modest compared to some research universities, it is gratifying to know that for the 48 databases for which multiple-year data is available, usage increased each year since 2001 for all but five databases. In four of the five cases, decline occurred because of subscription changes or cancellations. Since the usage differential between 2001 and 2003 is significantly greater than the difference between 2001 and 2002, or between 2002 and 2003, it is reasonable to expect usage to continue increase. For example, utilization of Academic Universe from Lexis-Nexis has skyrocketed, in part, because of increased publicity, campus-based initiatives (lectures and projects), and national attention on affirmative action and related issues.

Contributing to library utilization, security and safety precautions have been strengthened in recent years. Implementation of security coverage in Founders UGL during all library hours and access control for all have had a positive impact on the quality of the study environment

Other plans for measuring the impact of the library resources and services on the academic and research programs of the University are defined through developing outcomes assessment plans facilitated through campus-wide outcomes assessment plans
and activities. The library system has established a very robust assessment plan driven by SFA I and recommendation # 20 of the 1999 institutional self-study and is engaged in ongoing assessment activities. The library plan focuses on four main goals:

1. **Access to Information**: Provide prompt, seamless, reliable and flexible access to high quality information to meet the patron's educational, research and service needs.

2. **Information Empowerment**: Provide information consultation services and educational opportunities to further the student's information skills as foundations for life-long learning.

3. **Appropriate Environment**: Provide physical spaces appropriate for the presentation and exchange of knowledge and ideas.

4. **Effective Organization**: Enhance organizational effectiveness and efficiency, and promote sustained financial growth.

Each goal is expressed through specified objectives with related performance criteria; methodological practices and assessment methods were identified. In addition, the staff has begun conducting assessments defined feedback channels and established a timetable for evaluation of results. During the last two weeks in April 2004, the Library will administer a service quality questionnaire to faculty and students. It will use the results of the survey in decision making about enhancing and/or modifying services to better serve the library constituents. The Library assessment plan may be viewed at

http://www.howard.edu/assessment/restricted/Community/resources/library/Index.htm
Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Research

A University-wide workload policy (SFA I-13) has been implemented across the University.

The Faculty Workload Policy (FWLP), adopted in 2000, was the result of joint effort on the part of the Faculty Senate and the Administration. The FWLP provides for accountability of faculty work in the domains of instruction, research/scholarship, and service with institutional minimums in each category. The FWLP is predicated on the assumption that full-time career-status, probationary and tenured faculty will devoted a minimum 40% of their effort to instructional duties, 30% to research, scholarship and creative activities, and 10% to service. Four patterns are offered to describe the distribution of faculty work depending on level of instruction ranging from undergraduate, to graduate and professional and the proportion of effort accorded to research, service and professional development. Expected academic year teaching loads are as follows based on teaching assignments:

- Undergraduate programs (5 to 6 courses or 15 to 18 credits)
- Undergraduate units with degree programs at the master’s level (4 to 6 courses or 12 to 18 credits)
- Programs that confer doctoral degrees (3 to 5 courses or 9 to 15 credits)
Programs that confer professional degrees (3 to 5 courses or 9 to 15 credit hours)

The implementation of the FWLP has varied among and within the school/colleges, although the proportion of departments requiring formal workload agreements is increasing.

Consistent with recommendation 15 of the University’s 199 Self-Study Report, substantial process has been made in the development and use of a University-wide faculty activity reporting instrument. During the 2003-04 academic year, the Office of the Provost initiated an assessment of the workload of eligible faculty in accordance with the expectations of the policy. Data were collected during the fall, 2003 semester from 765 or 59% of the fully eligible faculty, using a Workload Certification Form. Data for the fall, 2003 semester revealed that faculty members covered by the faculty workload policy generally met the expected teaching requirements. Individual faculty taught an average of 2.7 courses, with roughly 50% of associate and professor ranks teaching 2 to 3 courses during the term. However, 30% of the covered faculty taught four or more courses during the semester. Forty-nine percent (49%) of the faculty provided graduate level instruction. Further analysis of workload certification data indicated that 35% of the responding faculty indicated that they participated in funded research activity during the fall semester, with 50% of those in the Colleges of Medicine and Engineering, Architecture and Computer Science and 40% in the College of Pharmacy, Nursing, and Allied Health Sciences reporting their engagement in funded research. Fort-six percent (46%) of the faculty claimed a publication or a creative production during the fall, 2003 semester. The vast majority of faculty (81%) reported that they spent time in service
activities at the school or college level, followed by 30% contributing to the university and 55% to the community at-large.

The process of implementing the FWLP and the resultant data gathered for the fall, 2003 semester re-affirm the integral role of the overall FWLP in furthering the excellence of Howard’s academic programs. The benchmark data gathered to-date is illustrative of the substantial efforts of the Howard University faculty in the key areas of teaching, research and scholarship, and service. Since the fall, 2003 is the first time the FWLP was implemented, it is expected that on-going input regarding the process from the faculty, the department, and the academic unit will ensure a more perfect fit between the intended goals of the FWLP and its actual implementation.

The FWLP makes provisions for supernumerary compensation as a means of fostering greater faculty research productivity. Facilitated by SFA I and Self Study recommendations # 17, the 2000 FWLP “will permit full-time faculty to obtain approval from the Provost upon the recommendation of the department head and dean for the equivalent of one day per week additional compensation from externally-funded grants, contracts, and cooperative agreement awards accepted by the University.”

A formal performance evaluation process for staff has been established (SFA I-14)

In the five years since its introduction to the University, significant strides forward were made in the implementation of a performance management system for uniformly setting
performance objectives and measuring employee performance against those objectives. As the university strives for excellence and continuous improvement it must insure that its major programs and systems are reviewed and enhances on a continuous basis. In this regard, during FY2003 a project was undertaken to recommend and implement improvements in the performance evaluation program and the key documents associated with it.

As a result of the review, changes to the performance evaluation programs were implemented to:

Provide a measurement tool that more accurately measures performance individually and across the institution.

- Emphasize that individual performance goals should be more closely aligned with departmental, unit, and institutional goals.
- Place greater emphasis on discussions between managers and employees about what work it is expected that the employee will do and how that work and contributing characteristics will be measured.
- Encourage interim assessments of performance so that employees know how their performance is viewed by management throughout the year.
- Ensure that supervisors are better equipped to plan performance goals, counsel employees on developmental activities, and appraise employee performance. Over the past 5 years the university has funded over $20 million in performance incentives that were related to the performance evaluation program.
The development and performance of the Information Technology infrastructure at Howard University continues to be a major priority as indicated in the Strategic Framework for Action I and II and the content of recommendations 7-12 in the University’s Self Study to Middle States in 1999. These recommendations essentially parallel the essence of the myriad of SFA I and II technologically-oriented initiatives ranging from infrastructure, use of technology in teaching and learning, student advisement and registration, and access to information. In fact, since 1999, University has made important progress in realizing or exceeded most of the strategic objectives outlined in SFA I and II pertaining to technology.

The University’s fiber optic network has been extended to the office of every faculty member (FacNet) (SFA I-15) with regular upgrades in FacNet equipment (SFA II-21)

The Faculty Network Program or FacNet, was one of the original objectives of SFA I. This fiber optic wiring effort was completed and then followed by the acquisition and distribution of computers and printers to the offices of every tenure and tenure-track faculty member and some faculty with the rank of Lecturer. The University continues to honor objective SFA II-21 which directs the FacNet equipment be updated. In fact, the University is completing the third of three phases of its latest distribution of some 400 new computers and printers to faculty. This latest distribution, called FacNet III, will ensure that the last shipment of some 1,200 computer systems will provide all of the new and full-time faculty with the very latest technology available. Faculty request and will receive robust Macintosh iBooks, iMacs, Windows-based laptops or Windows-based desktops to replace older computer systems in their offices. The FacNet project also migrates all of the faculty data and applications from the older machines to the new ones.
Beyond the objectives in SFA I and II, other initiatives have been required to support the information technology infrastructure. In the area of standards-based implementation of network wiring technology, early in 1999, Information Systems and Services, the central IT organization, published a set of specifications to guide installation of fiber optic and wiring materials associated with the Howard University Network (HUNet). In particular, these standards have been incorporated in all engineering and installation aspects of fiber and wiring projects associated with the creation, maintenance and modifications of the HUNet. These standards have been diligently employed in a host of major projects initiated since their publication.

**Significant progress has been made in the recalibration of administrative and student support operations to the Internet (SFA II-11)**

The University has implemented self-service functionality for many student and faculty services related to administrative support. The Banner Information System has been updated to provide web-based services enabling students to schedule classes, complete registration, inquire about their financial aid and student financial records, and pay tuition and fees. Faculty can review student records, advise students and enter grades online. Users can query the online campus directory from a link on the Howard home page.

**Progress has been made in establishing membership with the Internet 2 Consortium (SFA II-4)**

A group of research projects has been identified that require access to Internet2 level resources. A grant providing seed funding has been received to initiate the admissions process to the Internet 2 Consortium, the Abilene Network and to the MAX gigapop access provider. Additional funding has been sought to establish the OC12 data link
which is required to support the identified research projects. It is anticipated that admission to the Internet2 Consortium will be achieved this calendar year.

**Extension of the University’s fiber–optic network to student residential facilities (SFA I-16). Provide access to appropriate computing resources for every Howard University student (SFA II-6). Complete wiring of all residence halls for voice, data and video (SFA II-7).**

Residential students enjoy both wireless and wired access to University resources from every dormitory room and common area in the each residence hall. Progress has been made in enhancing campus-wide wireless capacity as proposed in objective SFA II – 9. In the summer of 2000, each residence hall was outfitted with wireless data access to the University’s network. Residential students were provided with wireless network adapter cards and free installation services giving them 24 hour access to University information and communication.

The Residential Network Program or ResNet2 project began in the summer of 2001, and was completed in early January 2002. An additional major layer of enabling technology was provided giving in-room access and capability for each dormitory resident to new audio, video and wired data access. Residents on a “per pillow” basis were provided connectivity to new telephone service, 50 channel cable TV service, and wired access extending the wireless data access that these students enjoyed. Beyond the residence halls, the University continues its expansion of wireless access by making both the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library and the Law School Library wireless as well as wired.

The Technology center, the Commuter Computer Laboratory and portions of the Administration Building and the Medical Towers are now also wireless.
A 200-station Information Laboratory within the Technology Center for 24-hour student and faculty use (SFA-I-17) was opened in April, 2000, providing access to appropriate computing resources for every Howard University student (SFA II-6).

The Information Laboratory or iLab is a 24 hour, 7 days per week state-of-the-art student and faculty computer laboratory that houses Macintoshes, PCs, and UNIX-based machines in an attractive, interactive information-rich setting. Each of the 200 workstations is equipped with a suite of productivity and anti-virus software. The iLab features over 20 network printers and several clusters of monitors that can display feeds from the Howard University Television Network, cable channels or video images from any of the 200 workstations. The iLab contains three smart classrooms, each with full network capability, and a high-end printing facility to accommodate the needs of students and researchers.

In addition, in the fall of 2002, the Commuter Computer Laboratory was opened in the lower level of the Blackburn Student Center. This is a special facility to accommodate all commuting students. The thirty-eight computers were equipped with a suite of productivity and anti-virus software, and SPSS/PC, SAS/PC and graphics software is available for use. Six emails kiosks, called eStops, are located throughout the main campus to enable convenient access to this important student resource. Of course, students can access email from any networked computer on campus or elsewhere.

Significant progress was made with several additional programs and activities to strengthen access to Information Technology that was also addressed in the MSCHE Visitors’ Report in 1999. These include the following:
• Publication of improved technical standards with regard to wiring, networks, servers, telecommunications systems and protocols by Information Systems and Services.

• Increased collaborative planning among all segments of the university community engaged in IT efforts.

• The bulk of the backlog of infrastructure replacement projects have been addresses by the implementation of a number of major IT projects which either directly address the backlog issue, or by virtue of the intrinsic benefits, obviated the need to pursue particular projects. In nearly all such cases, the issues involved network shortcomings which major new projects corrected.

• Significant progress has been made in filling staffing shortfalls in Information Systems and Services. By June 2004, all remaining vacancies will have been filled.

• Successful implementation of the Y2K Roll-over and Systems Greenlighting effort.

• IT training for faculty, staff and students has dramatically increased since 1999, provided through CETLA, referenced earlier, the Academic Leadership Academy, and Information Systems and Services that has been responsible for training faculty, staff, and students in the Banner Student Information System.

**Development of Howard University Television Network to connect Rankin Chapel, Burr Gymnasium, Cramton Auditorium, Greene Stadium, major academic buildings and other relevant campus sites to the University’s television station to allow special events to be videotaped routinely for subsequent closed-circuit campus distribution and, where appropriate, broadcast (SFAI-18).**

Howard University Television remains committed to making available to the Howard University community the vast array of local, national and international scholars and
speakers who visit our campus. As a result, WHUT has taken two significant steps—one programmatic and one technical. First, most recently within the past year, WHUT has developed an on-air program featuring visiting and resident scholars called @Howard that is broadcast on Howard University Television multiple times a week. Secondly, over the past few years the Howard University Network has been constructed with a fiber backbone (fiber line system) that connects several of the buildings on campus with the television station that serves as the system’s hub. The following facilities have been linked into the HU Network: The Administration Building, Blackburn Center, Cramton Auditorium, Bunche International Center, Childress Hall, C. B. Powell Building, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. Via the HU Network, the following are available: HU campus calendar (alpha numeric listing of information, HU NET (includes content from PBS-YOU and selected WHUT programs), C-SPAN, C-SPAN 2, CNN, and Bloomberg News. This expansion in WHUT capacity is consistent with self study recommendation # 26.

WHUT also serves as the head-end for RESNET—the campus distribution of cable, making various cable and network channels available to every on-campus dormitory bed and providing full access to students in their on-campus residence locations. In addition to the cable television channels and the on-air Howard University television station WHUT, students can now access WHBC (the student-run carrier current radio station) through RESNET.

As of spring 2004, fifty percent of the system remains unconnected with many campus locations needing both connectivity and monitoring equipment. While a video
teleconferencing system was initially proposed, budget constraints have prevented the activation of such. Plans for continued development of the HU Network are dependent upon the acquisition of resources to support such expansion and development.

**Increasing Private Support**

Increasing private support, as one of the four strategic areas of focus within SFA I and Self-Study recommendation #36, outlined the effort to develop greater capacity for raising significant funds from alumni, corporations, foundations, organizations and other friends of the university to complement support from the federal government. To this end, it was determined that the effectiveness of the development program required enhancement and that alumni participation should be increased.

To enhance the effectiveness of the development program, the University solidified its annual financial commitment to the Division of University Advancement and focused on hiring and retaining experienced professionals in the field. As a result, operations in several related departments including Alumni Relations, Annual Giving, Advancement Services and University Development have been strengthened. Notable achievements include formal adoption of new alumni association by-laws, the creation of an electronic alumni community, the revitalization of the *Howard Magazine*, the establishment of a coordinated campus-wide donor solicitation approach, a strengthened alumni database and revamped efforts related to donor relations and stewardship.
The alumni participation rate has also benefited from the solidified financial commitment to the Division. Upon the adoption of SFA I, the alumni participation rate was listed at 5%. The same rate, as of the end of fiscal year 2003, has increased to 20%. Despite of this increase, significant work remains to achieve the goal of 30% set in SFA I-19 for alumni participation. The Treasurer and Vice President for University Advancement report alumni contributions and the related participation rate annually to the Board of Trustees respectively.

Enhancements in alumni and donor relations, as well as in the annual giving program have combined to positively affect the alumni participation rate -- a factor of the number of alumni who give divided by the number that can be reached or solicited for a contribution.

Figure 3
Alumni Participation Rate: FY 1999-2003

As reflected in Figure XX, the rate of alumni giving has increased from 9.4% in 1999 to 20% in 2003. This percentage change was achieved despite the mathematical impact of a
dramatic increase in the number of alumni who could be reached/solicited, as a result of the strengthening of the advancement database. A more efficient, professionally-staffed and state-of-the-art telecenter is to credit as well. The telecenter, which falls under the annual giving program, has afforded direct communication with alumni through targeted, school and college-based appeals for support. The current alumni participation rate falls below the rate projected in the University’s Strategic Framework for Action I, which lists an aggressive goal of greater than 30% participation by this time. Continuous efforts on behalf of the Capital Campaign and in support of strengthened University Advancement programs will result in steady and ongoing increases in the alumni participation rate.

**A $250 million dollar Capital Campaign was initiated in Fiscal Years 2002 (SFA II-25)**

The Campaign for Howard: Leadership for America and the Global Community was officially launched on March 9, 2002, at the University’s annual Charter Day celebration with a goal of $250 million dollars. The Campaign seeks to reach out in an unprecedented manner to alumni and friends, as well as to corporate and foundation partners. It endeavors to reconnect Howard alumni to Alma Mater in meaningful ways that inspires them to invest in the University's academic and intellectual pursuits. It affords the entire Howard community significant opportunities to collaborate and focus on ideas that will strengthen the institution. Above all, it celebrates the rich Howard legacy, contributing to its future and further heightening its stature among the nation's premiere institutions of higher learning. To date, over 50% of the Campaign’s goal has been achieved.
Rooted in the goals outlined in the University's *Strategic Framework for Action II*, The Campaign will result in $100 million to strengthen academic programs and services, including endowed chairs, endowed scholarships and graduate and professional fellowships. An additional $150 million dollars will fund the completion of new facilities for learning and research, including a new Interdisciplinary Sciences and Engineering Center and a new School of Communications building, as well as a Teaching and Learning Center for the College of Arts and Sciences, a new School of Education building; a comprehensive health, recreation and student life facility; and the National Center for African-American Heritage and Culture. These priorities will support the scholarly preeminence of Howard University, offer educational opportunities and attractive incentives to all students, and bring the latest technological tools to its classrooms, libraries and dormitories. In support of The Campaign, Mr. Virgil E. Ecton was hired as Vice President for University Advancement after serving 31 years at the United Negro College Fund (UNCF).

Several of the largest dollar commitments to The Campaign have come from alumni, including $5 million from Howard’s Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Mr. Frank Savage, over $2 million from Mr. James Silcott, $2 million from Dr. Madison F. Richardson and at least three more at or above $1 million dollars. Commitments from friends of the University have been historic as well, including a gift-in-kind with a potential of $19.5 million from Microsoft Corporation, a gift of $4 million from Mr. John H. Johnson, $3.1 million from the Kauffman Foundation, $1.4 million from Mr. Richard
D. Parsons, $1 million from Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, $1 million from the PepsiCo Foundation and $1 million from United Technologies Corporation.

Enhancing National and Community Service

The University has strengthen its relationship with its neighbors through establishment of a Community Outreach Center (SFA I-22) and increased security and safety through establishment of a Joint Metropolitan Police Department/HU Security Station (SFA I-23).

The Howard University Community Association, a principal liaison between the University programs and activities and the community at large, provides information about University events, programs and activities on a daily basis. It also provides faculty, staff and students with information about important community projects, initiatives, and events.

The Howard University Community Association, Advisory Committee is comprised of community members, University staff, faculty and students. The group’s mission includes:

- Strengthening the University’s relationship with its surrounding neighbors through regular open dialogue designed to: share information about University and community projects and events; explore University-community partnership opportunities; and acquire information about community sentiments that may be useful in informing decision making.

- Augmenting the University’s value as a community resource through its community development and human resource initiatives; the
dissemination of information on University sponsored programs, activities and services; and its service corps programs.

In implementing its mission, the Howard University Community Association delivers community services to local public schools and human service agencies through the operation of two service corps programs. The services include providing academic support/mentorship to community youth; educational and social services to senior citizens and adult correctional clients; assistance in the delivery of health services to community families; and assistance in the development of a strategic plan for local community development corporations (CDC). The Association also serves as an information clearinghouse for community members interested in taking advantage of the more than 100 University-sponsored programs, activities, services and special events that are available to the public.

The Community Association's first project was in response to a request from area residents to enhance the police presence on the corridor. In the first (and only) partnership of its kind in the city, Howard University’s Campus Police and the Metropolitan Police Department opened a Joint Security Station in what was formerly a liquor store. What has been the impact? Question posed to Mr. Sutton.

Currently, the Community Association is the focus for ongoing University planning efforts regarding The LeDroit Park Initiative and development of the Georgia Avenue Corridor. LeDroit Park Initiative is the University's award-winning community
revitalization effort, and involves a variety of community activities, from planning and conceptualization to support before regulatory and legislative bodies to implementation. These activities have taken place in the LeDroit Park, Pleasant Plains, Shaw and Bloomingdale neighborhoods.

Other achievements of the Community Association include the following:

- Rehabilitation of 40 houses and community infrastructure.

- Initiation of a project to developer a town center complex, which includes 275 housing units at Pleasant Plains neighborhood in the District of Columbia.

- Acquisition of property from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to develop 35 units of mixed-income housing.

- Initiation of a project to establish a Public Charter Middle School of Mathematics and Science. The establishment of a public charter middle school of mathematics and has been approved by the public charter school authority, and negotiations are about to begin that will determine the parameters for its development.

- Development of a project to restore the Mary Church Terrell home as a museum and cultural center. Funding for this project has been secured from HUD and private sources.

In addition to the accomplishments spearheaded through the Community Association, strong community outreach programs occur at all schools and colleges at Howard University, providing over 100 programs and services to the public. These include: career counseling; development and exploration programs; consumer services; cultural, recreational and athletic programs; health education and clinical services; and activities
with District of Columbia Public Schools. The School of Education is an exemplar of academic outreach engagements of the University. The School of Education, through its nine separate units, offers 45 community outreach programs through its nine separate units. The foci of these programs are: curriculum; educational psychology; research on drug abuse and at-risk students; writing skills; early learning; family life; development of teachers and urban education leaders; and low-income and disabled students.

**Strategies have been devised and put in place to enable Howard University Hospital to continue to serve as the sites for medical, dental and health-related research, training and services (SFA I-24)**

Howard University Hospital (HUH) has experienced significant enhancements and upgrades over the past five years and continued to distinguish itself as a highly developed site for research, the education and training of health professional students and practicing professionals in the fields of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, nursing and allied health sciences. HUH have developed strategies in six focal areas to best enable it to support the education, research and training while maintaining a robust and diverse clinical base. These six focal areas are: facilities, programs/services, residency training, clinical initiatives, homeland security, and operations.

The facilities of HUH have undergone major improvements and upgrades to ensure state-of-the-science care, a research supportive environment, and a diverse and appropriate patient population. In achieving this goal, the VIP Pavilion was transformed to reflect state-of-the-art equipment and resources and upscale services and ambience. The Medical Intensive Care Unit (MICU) was upgraded to a 14-bed unit of all private rooms, designed
to provide continuous first class technologically enhanced intensive care services for critically ill patients. In addition, the 18 bed Inpatient Psychiatric Unit was improved to provide the highest level of care for emotional and psychiatric disorders through the application of an innovative patient monitoring system, a wireless emergency response system and a dedicated psychiatric treatment staff. The Novius Lab, consisting of a core lab and a new laboratory system, is improving the turn around time for high volume laboratory services, including remote accessibility to all nursing units. Higher levels of effectiveness and efficiency are realized also in the Homcare and blood banking system. These enhancements to the facilities of HUH will correlate with improved patient outcomes and a stronger learning environment for students and researchers. The hi-tech equipment and monitoring devices provide added dimensions of safety and efficiency for patients and learners who are being well prepared for 21st century health care. The cafeteria is also gaining a new face and expanded services to the delight of staff, students, and the general public.

To better serve the diverse clientele and their multiplicity of needs, improvements were made in such services as resources for the hearing impaired, ambulance service, and programs for women and children (WIC). HUH WIC Center is the only site in the District of Columbia offering inpatient and outpatient health care services to all. New and or enhanced programming to promote health are offered and sponsored by HUH, to include such priorities as breast feeding and a host of screening opportunities, such as the highly visible and well-subscribed association with the NBC4 Health and Fitness Expo.
These health promotion opportunities afford students beneficial preventive health care experiences and add to the comprehensiveness of HUH as an inclusive training site.

Reorganization of the graduate medical education program occurred to ensure that individual residency training programs meet accreditation standards and are correctly sized to support adequate experiences. The number of available slots for each program is now more realistically based on patient census. The net effect of a decrease in some slots is increasing the competitiveness for the programs and the sufficiency of the experiences. The resident’s quarters have been refurbished and include resources for study, computer access, and conference space in addition to comfortable on-call facilities. In addition, selected clinical initiatives further enhance the robustness of the patient mix and support excellent learning opportunities. Some of these include designation of the Hospital as a Level I Trauma Center by the American College of Surgeons; ownership of Capital View Home Health, a quality home health service; and preparation for acts of bio-terrorism through staff training and renovations of facilities, to include provisions for decontamination.

The operations of the hospital are strengthened through an improved faculty practice plan, new personnel in the finance division, and the achievement of a positive bottom line for nearly eight years. The Finance Division has added a new Chief Financial Officer, Controller, and Director of Patient Accounts.
Support of school and college based initiatives designed to strengthen the public schools of the District of Columbia (SFA I -25)??

We do not have definitive information to respond to this.

EVIDENCE OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT, CONTINUOUS INSTITUTIONAL SELF STUDY AND PLANNING

Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan

Howard University has embraced the challenge of developing a comprehensive system to assess learning and teaching outcomes and to evaluate institutional effectiveness. Since 1999 the University has initiated several institutional practices that are fundamental to and will support the development and implementation of objective and valid systems of assessment. The Office of the Provost holds overall accountability for the University’s assessment and effectiveness program with responsibility for the planning and initial implementation delegated the Task Force on University Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, a cross-section of faculty, staff, students and administrators.

Guided by the mission, goals, and objectives of the University, the purpose of the plan produced by the task force is to ultimately (1) analyze the University’s accountability to its mission, (2) measure academic achievement and learning outcomes, and (3) facilitate continuous quality improvement and decision making. The intent of the plan is to foster comprehensive assessment of every administrative (University Community Experience) academic (College/School), and student service component (Quality of Student Life) of
the University. Each strategic initiative of SFA I and II is expected to be assessed for its impact on each of the University’s four strategic goals; *strengthening academic programs and services, promoting excellence in teaching and research, increasing private support, and enhancing national and community service*. Thus, initiative inherent in SFA I and II are to be linked with the comprehensive plan for outcomes assessment and institutional effectiveness. The chief targets of assessment are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Colleges/Schools</th>
<th>Student Support Services Quality of Student Life</th>
<th>Administrative University Community Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Science</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Residence Life</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Student Life &amp; Activity</td>
<td>Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Special Student Services</td>
<td>Faculty Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>Student Counseling &amp; Career Services</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
<td>University Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Student Financial Services</td>
<td>Internal Audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Architecture &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>Campus Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td>Government Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy, Nursing &amp; Allied Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Establishing the Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan**

Each academic, student support service, and administrative element of the University is expected to annually submit its assessment plan addressing the following template:
• Identifying characteristics of each unit

• Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose (a statement that demonstrate how the department/unit relates to the immediate parent structure; college/school, administrative structure, or student support service)

• Goals of Unit

• Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Results (Clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal)

• Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success (what will students/customers be able to do, to be, or perceive when the goal is accomplished?)

• Performance Activities (What will be done to achieve the goals and objectives?)

• Methods of Assessment (the procedures, strategies, or tools by which information will be collected to validate the outcome objective(s) and the method of analysis to be used)

• Use of Findings (Statement of how data will be used for improvement)

• Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline (who is going to collect the assessment data? When, and how often and to whom will results be reported?)

A copy of the Planning template is found in appendix D

Calendar for Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness Plan

The assessment and effectiveness plans are used at the unit and institutional levels, an important concept to reflect the integration and systems approach of assessment. Each unit is expected to have an outcomes assessment/ institutional effects committee that will oversee and direct the timetable, analysis, and use of findings in subsequent planning and decision making.
At the University level, annual assessment plans/updated plans are expected to be submitted currently to the Task Force for Outcomes Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness by _________________.

By _________________, the Assessment Report is expected. The intent of the report is for departments and administrative units to document the results of the assessment procedure conducted and identifying how and when the information is being used to improve academic or administrative programming at the institution. The report calls for indicators for each objective describing the results of the assessment activities and by documenting how the data are used by faculty and administrators to make decisions. The template for assessments is as follows:

- Intended Educational (Student), Research or Public Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives or Expected Outcomes (taken from the plan devised earlier)

- Indicators
  - Means of Assessment (the procedure, strategies, or means by which the data collected will be used to validated the outcome objective)
  - Criteria for Success (the criteria or benchmark established)
  - Assessment of Results (the results or findings of the assessment strategies)
  - Use of Results (documentation of how the results are used by the departments/units)
  - Reason/Hypothesis (why were the results obtained?) ????????
  - Feedback Process (who are the stakeholders; who will monitor the improvement process)

University plans call for summarization and consolidation of all data. This will allow the University to monitor accountability to its mission, measure overall academic
achievement and learning outcomes and by units, and identify opportunities for continuous quality improvement and decision making. (The template for the Assessment Report is found in appendix E)

As mentioned earlier, each strategic initiative of SFA I and II is expected to be assessed. For instance, the section of this document addressing the workload policy, discusses the assessment and analysis of data on faculty productivity in relation to the workload policy. These early findings are already informing decision-making and recommendations for change at the unit and institutional levels. Similarly, SFA I-7 drove as assessment of all graduate programs, the results of which are being used for strengthening initiatives, potential consolidation, and possible closures. It is anticipated that similar assessments will be made at the unit and institutional levels regarding the core curriculum (SFA I-1), the impact of the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (SFA I-8) on learning outcomes of students, and others. The assessment plan also acknowledges the contribution of specialized accreditation processes by certain of the academic units and the integration of these processes into the overall annual assessment plans. These units have benefited from outcomes assessment and measures of effectiveness for some time which has facilitated strengthening and modifications in programs, as well as informed future planning. Finally, as the over all assessment plans for the University matures and is fully implemented, it too will be assessed and modified to ensure that it remains current and maximally benefits the University.
Five Year Enrollment and Graduation Trends (Minor)

Five-Year Enrollment and Graduation Plans

Five-Year Enrollment Projection. Howard University’s current (2003-04) full time equivalent (FTE) student enrollment is 11,256. Its undergraduate FTE enrollment is 6,464 students; it graduate FTE enrollment is 1,784, and FTE enrollment in its professional schools and colleges is 1,274. The five year strategic enrollment projection is that its total enrollment (undergraduate, graduate and professional) will be 12,000 students by 2010. The full time equivalent university enrollment is projected to be 9,960 (see table 5 in the appendix F). The University’s student enrollment goal is to increase enrollment in its graduate and professional schools to the point where it is approximately 40% of the overall student enrollment. Most of the increased enrollment is projected to take place in graduate doctoral and masters level programs, while enrollment in professional schools will remain largely constant. During the five-year period, the University’s strategic student enrollment plan calls for undergraduate enrollment to decline slightly, as noted earlier.

Graduation Rates Projections. As part of its student retention effort, the University tracks the percent of undergraduate students who graduate from Howard University in four, five, six and seven or more years. The strategic goal of the University in this area is to improve undergraduate student graduation rates by two percent each year until the national average is surpassed. Table 1.1 contains data showing the graduation rates for
Howard University first time in college (FTIC) undergraduate students between 1995 and 1999. The data reflect students who were enrolled in the following schools and colleges: Arts and Sciences, Business, Communications, Education, Engineering Architecture and Computer Sciences, and the Nursing Division of the College of Pharmacy, Nursing and Allied Health Sciences. The seven year graduation rates for the fall 1995 and fall 1996 FTIC classes are presented. Partial graduation rates are presented for the fall 1997, fall 1989 and fall 1999 FTIC classes. Between 1995 and 1999, Howard enrolled 5,915 FTIC undergraduate students, and average of 1,183 students each academic year. The most populous class was the fall 1998 class (1,325) and the fall 1999 class had the lowest number of students (994). Among the 5,915 students that were admitted between 1995 and 1999, 33.8% (2002) graduated in four years. The number of fall 1995 and fall 1996 FTIC enrolled students was 2,337. Among these students, 32.1% (752) graduated in 4 year, 13.6% (319) graduated in 5 years, and 4.1% (96) graduated in 6 years and 1.5% (37) graduated in 7 plus years. During this period, 1,133 (48.4%) of the 2,339 students who enrolled as FTIC undergraduates did not graduate from Howard University. Of course, they may have transferred to another university or college or discontinued their pursuit of a higher education degree. The challenge before the University and each school and college is to discover the complex personal, academic and social factors that caused 51.7% of the FTIC students the University enrolled during this period not to graduate after 7 plus years of matriculation.
Table 1.1 Graduation Rates for Howard University First Time in College Undergraduate Students (1995 to 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Entering FTIC Class</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7+</th>
<th>Total Number of Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>553 (52.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>651 (50.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>752</strong></td>
<td><strong>319</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,204 (51.5%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,915</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,002</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five Year Fiscal and Enrollment Trends

This section addresses the five year fiscal trends for the University and incorporated enrollment and financial trends for the same period. As stated in the Moody’s bond rating report, Howard’s financial outlook is stable. The federal appropriation, the single largest source of Howard’s revenue, has grown moderately during the past five years and appears very secure given Howard’s historic mission and long history of significant federal support. It is projected that the federal appropriation will increase by an average of two and one half percent per year during the next five years. The other major source of Howard’s funding is tuition revenue. In spite of moderate tuition increases during the past two years, Howard’s enrollment has experienced small but consistent increases in the past few years and its tuition continues to be among the lowest in comparison to its peer institutions. Additionally, U.S. News & World Reports annual report on America’s Best Colleges ranks Howard as one of the fifty “best values” in the category of National Universities – Doctoral. Given its relatively low tuition and national ranking as one of
the fifty best values, we project that the University’s tuition can absorb increases of three
to four percent during the next five years without negatively impacting enrollment.
These projected moderate increases in the federal appropriation and tuition revenues are
expected to provide adequate funding during the next five years as the University
continues to stringently control expenses.

Consistent with national trends, the University continues to face increasing expenditures
for employee/retiree healthcare and utilities. However, as a result of the consistent
implementation of effective cost control measurers, Howard’s rate of increases for the
categories of expenditures continue to track lower than the national averages. The
University’s management continues to stringently manage its financial resources and has
already started an initiative to perform a major evaluation of its programs and resource
allocation for FY’ 2006.

The following tables depict financial and tuition/fees projections for FY’ 2004 through
FY’2009: Table 2: Projected Revenue FY 2004-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>9,522</td>
<td>9,615</td>
<td>9,725</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>9,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUTION &amp; FEES</td>
<td>$127,623</td>
<td>$137,090</td>
<td>$142,254</td>
<td>$147,621</td>
<td>$153,199</td>
<td>$158,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL APPROPRIATION</td>
<td>207,732</td>
<td>208,764</td>
<td>213,533</td>
<td>220,254</td>
<td>227,236</td>
<td>234,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT GRANTS &amp; CONTRACTS</td>
<td>56,820</td>
<td>59,100</td>
<td>60,873</td>
<td>62,646</td>
<td>64,419</td>
<td>66,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS &amp; CONTRACTS</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,450</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>16,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDOWMENT INCOME</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,151</td>
<td>5,202</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>5,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALES AND SERVICES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENTS</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>1,947</td>
<td>1,957</td>
<td>1,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES</td>
<td>40,759</td>
<td>51,747</td>
<td>53,618</td>
<td>55,562</td>
<td>57,584</td>
<td>59,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY PRACTICE PLAN</td>
<td>18,645</td>
<td>15,030</td>
<td>15,782</td>
<td>16,533</td>
<td>17,285</td>
<td>18,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVESTMENT AND OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>6,650</td>
<td>6,660</td>
<td>6,717</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>6,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>$489,065</td>
<td>$500,409</td>
<td>$515,314</td>
<td>$532,448</td>
<td>$550,133</td>
<td>$568,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Projected Expenditures and Transfer FY 2004 - 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES AND TRANSFERS</th>
<th>$192,187</th>
<th>$192,235</th>
<th>$198,002</th>
<th>$203,942</th>
<th>$210,060</th>
<th>$216,362</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES</td>
<td>10,879</td>
<td>10,136</td>
<td>10,440</td>
<td>10,753</td>
<td>11,076</td>
<td>11,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAGES</td>
<td>58,596</td>
<td>62,918</td>
<td>66,504</td>
<td>70,295</td>
<td>74,302</td>
<td>78,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF BENEFITS</td>
<td>31,762</td>
<td>33,988</td>
<td>34,987</td>
<td>36,037</td>
<td>37,118</td>
<td>38,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBT SERVICE</td>
<td>13,773</td>
<td>14,162</td>
<td>14,162</td>
<td>14,162</td>
<td>14,162</td>
<td>14,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY SPONSORED CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>86,466</td>
<td>88,156</td>
<td>91,207</td>
<td>93,304</td>
<td>95,450</td>
<td>97,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>70,800</td>
<td>72,988</td>
<td>74,766</td>
<td>77,009</td>
<td>79,319</td>
<td>81,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER - RESTRICTED</td>
<td>708,065</td>
<td>500,409</td>
<td>515,314</td>
<td>532,448</td>
<td>550,133</td>
<td>568,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL E&amp;G</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Projected Tuition and Fees FY 2005 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tuition and Fees</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition</td>
<td>126,428</td>
<td>131,485</td>
<td>136,745</td>
<td>142,214</td>
<td>147,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees</td>
<td>10,662</td>
<td>10,769</td>
<td>10,876</td>
<td>10,985</td>
<td>11,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>137,090</td>
<td>142,254</td>
<td>147,621</td>
<td>153,199</td>
<td>158,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detailed Institutional Plans for Next Five Years

Strategic Framework for Action continues to inspire on-going planning into the next five years. The plan lays out a progressive vision in concert with its irreplaceable mission and sets incremental steps for growth and responsiveness to the culture shifts of higher education and the needs of America and the global society. On-going assessment of the effectiveness and impact of the initiatives are monitored and data generated will
continue to be used to inform decision making and support adjustments, where appropriate, in the strategic plan. The following initiatives organized under the four University strategic goals are envisioned and on target for the next five years.

**Strengthening Academic Programs**

Should there be another goal on outcomes assessment?

**Build the Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Center (SFA II-1); Co-locate a federal research activity (SFA II-2); Establish additional public and private partnerships.**

The Interdisciplinary Science and Engineering Center (ISE) will enrich Howard University's science facilities and provide a robust foundation for substantive research in emerging fields. The ISE will be the University's principal intellectual resource for interdisciplinary research activities.

Using strategic partnerships similar to the one that the University pioneered in SFAI with Fannie Mae, the ISE will be a substantive opportunity to co-locate part of a federal or private institution on the University campus. The three programmatic areas of activity are: biomedicine, computational sciences and engineering.

Two major efforts in biomedical research will be undertaken:

- Studies in cellular and molecular biology
- Studies in the genetics of complex diseases that disproportionately affect African Americans.
The current primary activity in cellular and molecular biology is the Human Genome Project. This research includes gene mapping, genomic analysis, and human DNA polymorphism; and raises ethical issues associated with genetic privacy, DNA databanking, and cloning.

Investigating the genetics of complex diseases that disproportionately affect African Americans, such as Alzheimer's, asthma, cancer, diabetes and hypertensive cardiovascular disease, will facilitate identification of hereditary characteristics associated with specific diseases.

As research becomes more sophisticated and centered on molecular structures and interactions, the need for mathematical modeling and computational analyses becomes more apparent. Science can now combine the experimental components with theoretical and computational approaches to better understand processes and, ultimately, systems. Howard University stresses interaction among mathematicians, scientists, engineers, and computer-based scientists. Advances in mathematics and computational theory and the availability of powerful, high-performance computing systems provide University scientists with tools to manipulate large databases, as well as simulate complex systems.

Research in metals, ceramics, polymers, semiconductors and combinations of materials called composites unites both science and engineering. On the science side, biology, biochemistry, chemistry and physics are applied. On the engineering side, chemical, electrical and mechanical engineers focus on processing and assessing properties. The
central objective is to generate and apply knowledge and insights to produce materials that solve important problems, and to improve our overall quality of life. One of the most important national goals is the search for an appropriate ecological balance with a robust economy. Environmental monitoring and issues such as biodegradation and the remediation of soil and water pollution are critical areas of inquiry.

The complexity of modern day scientific questions argues strongly for a multidisciplinary approach to research. As a comprehensive research university, Howard is committed to training its undergraduate, graduate and professional students to approach these issues and questions as members of a scientific team. The ISE, by virtue of its programmatic emphases and its physical layout, will strongly encourage this approach to scientific and technology research, and will provide an environment for faculty and students alike that fosters the 21st century approach to problem solving. Because research reveals that the disparity of African Americans and other minorities engaged in these fields begins at the middle school level, a public school of science and mathematics for children in grades 6 through 8 is included in the plan.

The middle school component of the ISE presents the University with a unique opportunity to abate what has become a national problem, especially with respect to the District of Columbia public school system, which ranks as one of the lowest in the Nation. By providing a curriculum that is indeed competitive, and by improving the quality of teaching through professional development programs, Howard University is
fully prepared to do what it can to prepare youngsters for our rapidly changing economy and workforce that are so dependent on science, engineering and technology.

The ISEC is a high priority of the University’s Strategic Framework for Action II, and is a direct response to the need for updating the current facilities and equipment. The design phase for the ISC facility began in the first quarter of 2004 and duration of construction is expected to be from 18 months to 2 years. The ISC will cost approximately $25 million. The dedication of the new facility is scheduled for the year 2007. The significant success of the current Capital Campaign for the University (surpassing the initial fund raising goals to date) demonstrates that the construction of the new ISC will become a reality.

**Build capacity for 1,000 additional parking spaces (SFA II-13)**

The University will add to its parking capacity by constructing, in partnership with an appropriate parking facility operator, a new 1,000 car facility. This facility will enable the University to provide more access to its academic and community programs. A developer has been selected, and negotiations with the City to double the site footprint are underway. There have already been small gains in parking availability by opening several smaller lots around the campus, such as at the site at 515 W Street and Georgia Avenue. These efforts to develop greater access to parking are consistent with recommendation #32 in the 1999 Self Study.
Build a replacement facility for the School of Communication and provide an appropriate facility for the School of Education (SFA II-4)

The School of Communications is one of the largest schools within the University and is housed in the former Freedmen's Hospital now known as the C.B. Powell Building. The facility has been extensively renovated and upgraded; however, the success of the School warrants a new facility consistent with its outstanding reputation. A campus site is reserved for the new School of Communications and a gift of four million dollars has been received from James M. Johnson, founder and publisher of Johnson Publishing Company. An off site locations for the new school is also being explored. The school was renamed in September, 2003 to the James M. Johnson School of Communication.

Similarly, the School of Education warrants a better and more central campus location. To achieve this end, the former Human Ecology building will be renovated to serve as the new home of the School of Education.

Build a comprehensive Health, Recreation and Student Life facility designed to support intramural as well as intercollegiate athletic activities, and to improve and maintain the health and physical activity of the student body (SFA II-12)

The University must also respond to the clear need for a replacement facility for Burr Gymnasium. For nearly forty years, Burr Gymnasium has served as the principal facility for the 400 students who participate annually in intercollegiate sports. It also serves the general student body, for whom intramural activities are more relevant. The useful life of the gymnasium for these purposes is clearly nearing its end. A new arena located near the main campus should include a 10,000-seat basketball arena and space for both varsity and intramural sports. Such a facility will be built through a public-private partnership
Promoting Excellence in Teaching and Research

Do we need to add a goal pertaining to Howard University Research Building I?

Develop a coherent incentive system for faculty research (SFA II-15)

In determining individual workloads, the recently approved Faculty Workload Policy seeks, in part, to recognize faculty research contributions. Similar consideration is given to research when determining merit pay increases. The University must also reward faculty members who provide research mentoring to undergraduate, graduate and professional students. In association with an incentive program for individual faculty research, the University must also devise ways to properly encourage and reward units for collective research activity. Recognition of research at the unit level will greatly facilitate the supportive institutional climate necessary for increased research activity. The section of this report pertaining to deepening the research program of the university also speaks to additional financial incentives for faculty engaged in research.

Strengthen the research professorship track (SFA II-16)

Note to Dr. Taylor requesting more information.

Draft recommendations are under review by the Office of the Provost, including revamping the Mordecai Wyatt Johnson Research Award Program to be a centerpiece in a strengthened research professorship track.
Increase the number of endowed chairs (SFA II-17)

One way to attract distinguished faculty is to offer them endowed chairs. Currently, Howard University has 22 accounts that exist for endowed chairs, several of which are fully funded. Among these are developing chairs in Architecture, Business, Medicine, and Nursing. The M. Elizabeth Carnegie Endowed Visiting Professorship in Nursing Research is laying the foundation for a full-fledged research chair. An initial gift from United Technologies will establish an Endowed Professorship that will rotate between Mechanical Engineering and Business. Collectively, close to $14 million has been committed toward chairs. However, Howard still has significantly fewer endowed chairs than other research universities of comparable size. It must continue to increase its number of endowed chairs, particularly in strategic areas where it stands at the threshold of achieving national prominence in its academic and research programs.

SFA II (19) Create new interdisciplinary research groups.

Interdisciplinary research has emerged as a major trend in higher education in recent years. The value of working in teams has been espoused by many groups, including the National Research Council and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It has become clear that many research topics cannot be answered completely by any single discipline, but rather by teams of individuals working together, and from perspectives that capture several disciplines. Moreover, interdisciplinary research reduces redundancy and costs. The Board of Trustees has established guidelines to encourage establishment of interdisciplinary graduate programs. As the University moves forward in the new millennium, more interdisciplinary should be encouraged work in the
undergraduate, graduate and professional programs, along with incentives for the faculty to secure increased research funding from external sources.

Relevant initiatives are underway in several schools and colleges. The Keck Center for the Design of Nanoscale Materials for Molecular Recognition is an example of a new interdisciplinary research group. An Interdisciplinary Graduate Environmental Studies Program has been approved by the Graduate faculty and is undergoing further review.

Encourage the faculty to pursue membership in National Academies based on faculty honors and achievements in research, publications and pedagogy. Recognize such membership publicly (SFA II-20)

The National Academies have been engaged regarding creation of fellowships for ethnic minorities to help them to become more familiar and aligned with the work of the academy, and that will provide benefits towards the pursuit of future memberships. Proposed guidelines for fellowship programs have now been developed. Recently, another Howard faculty member was elected to membership in the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Science.

Develop collaborations and establish stronger academic linkages and professional peer interactions with other leading universities and colleges (SFA II-22)

Relevant initiatives are underway in several schools and colleges to promote linkages and partnerships with other leading universities. Collaboration with Vanderbilt University regarding an international program with Brazil is a prototype. The Division of Nursing has established the Yale University -Howard University Nursing Partnership to Reduce
Health Disparities, taking the form of a federally funded P-20 research center, a summer research immersion experience for undergraduate nursing students in New Haven, and faculty collaboration research projects across institutions. The Graduate School has formed a new partnership with area schools to enhance the Preparing of Future Faculty program. Additional collaborations have been established with colleges in Bermuda: University of the West Indies in Jamaica: the University of Addis Ababa, and the Department of Energy. The official website for the HBCU Library Alliance has been designed, and is maintained on a Howard library server.

**Establish a Teaching and Learning Center (SFA II-23)**

The teaching and learning space devoted to the College of Arts and Sciences consists primarily of Douglass Hall (1936), Childers Hall (1960), and Locke Hall (1964). The Teaching and Learning Center will provide much-needed new and technology-filled space. This new facility will be built on the site of the now-closed Women's Gymnasium (1922). This new facility will be designed to strengthen the College's programs in the humanities, social sciences, fine arts and foreign languages (From SFA II).

Plans to accelerate the deployment of the Center have been developed and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is working with the University Advancement to identify sources of funding.
Develop a plan for Howard University North Campus in Beltsville, Maryland (SFA II-24)

In this regard, the University will develop a plan to create a Research and Technology Park on the North Campus in Beltsville, Maryland. The plan would encourage the transfer of technology from the University to the marketplace and vice versa; foster close interaction between the University and the private sector; nurture start-up and emerging technologies; and promote economic development and revenue enhancement.

As the academic and research worlds have grown more complex, competitive and costly, it is virtually impossible for any single institution to work in isolation from industry, government, and the wider academic community. Many universities, including Howard, have established important partnerships to buttress their teaching, research and service missions. The University must expand these strategic partnerships.

Howard University must especially reemphasize the importance of connecting research with teaching and service. The new Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library and the new School of Law Library (capital projects set out in SFAI) will serve as models of how new campus construction can help to encourage interdisciplinary teaching, learning and research.

Discussions are on-going with the Prince George’s County Executive to explore a strategic partnership, as well as a federal agency co-location. The Beltsville Campus is primarily a research operation which has as its major funders the National Oceanic and
Aeronautic Administration (NOAA) and the National Science Foundation. We intend to expand and enhance our current relationships with these two organizations and seek additional research partners to help develop and coordinate beneficial programs between HU and the scientific research organizations. We have been the recipient of research machinery and equipment that are housed at the Beltsville Campus and used by both faculty and students for research and development projects.

**Increasing Private Support**

Should there be a new objective about continuing Capital Campaign?

**Enhancing National and Community Service**

**SFA II (26) Continue to invest in Howard University Hospital's capacity to provide area residents with high quality healthcare, independent of their ability to pay.**

Historically, Howard University Hospital has been the area's flagship private safety net institution, training healthcare professionals and providing millions of dollars in uncompensated health care to uninsured and underinsured residents. SFAII assumes that HUH will revisit its existing strategic plan to ensure that this mission continues to be fulfilled, mindful of the changing dynamic of health delivery in the District of Columbia. In the next five years, HUH is envisioned to be part of a two hospital system with the proposed National Capital Medical Center. In July, 2001, the Southeast sector of the City loss its major source of health care with the closure of D.C. General Hospital, the City’s public hospital, which also served as a major site of health professional training. In
continuing to serve its historical mission, the University will address these unmet health care needs by establishing a National Capital Medical Center (NCMC) on the grounds of the former D.C. General Hospital. The result will be an expanded health system better equipped to meet greater demands of education, training and service to a larger community. The Center will be a state-of-the-art trauma facility that will provide health care to the city's neediest residents, and will include a physician office building, a major research facility. The NCMC will be designed to be a data source for research and disease that disproportionately affect the population we serve and will have built in capabilities to address issues related to homeland security, bio-defense, and bio-hazard response. It is also planned that the new facility will double the size of the clinical faculty, thus expanding training opportunities for medical, dental, and other health professional students.

Create the Howard University Center for Public Service (SFA II-28)

The Howard University Center for Public Service would provide a setting for analyzing policy, and for policymakers to assess the impact of their decisions. It would be one of the principal engines for important interdisciplinary research and action, especially related to urban areas. It is anticipated that the School of Social Work, the School of Law, the College of Medicine and Howard University Hospital will contribute to this center through active support and encouragement of faculty and student interdisciplinary research.
Howard University has an opportunity to build an intellectual powerhouse with a capacity to address the major challenges facing African-American people in the United States and throughout the African Diaspora. America needs a well-grounded center to systematically conduct research that will address major health, mental health, family, child, adolescent development, community, neighborhood and policy issues. The goal is to educate future social scientists who can change the world, who are skilled and gifted, and who can address the important issues of our time, empowered with the very best education.

**Develop Phase 2 of the LeDroit Park Initiative. (SFA II-29)**

The LeDroit Park Initiative continues to be a vitally important strategic partnership between Howard University and Fannie Mae. It grew out of the Howard University Community Association, which was an objective in SFAI. The initiative is an urban redevelopment project incorporating a 151-block area near the Howard main campus. The initiative began with the University relocating several important functions from the interior campus to the Georgia Avenue corridor. The second phase was the rehabilitation or construction of all of the University's boarded and vacant properties within a half-mile radius of the campus.

The LeDroit Park Initiative has clearly changed Howard University's relationships with its neighbors. The initiative has been called the most significant redevelopment plan in the City since the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Project. It has received numerous awards, and is being replicated by Fannie Mae in more than fifteen states. There are three remaining phases:
• Reopening McMillan Park for citizen access: Plans to open the park for greater citizen access have been placed on hold in anticipation of objections based on concerns regarding homeland security.

• Creating a cultural district near the Metro stop at 7th & S Streets, NW.

• Developing the Georgia Avenue corridor from Florida Avenue and U Street to Columbia Road to enhance employment opportunities and the quality of life for local residents and businesspersons.

• Location of key components of the ISE and Town Center has been agreed to by principals. Site assembly of the Cultural District is complete. The Town Center described in the LeDroit Park Initiative is designed to revitalize the Georgia Avenue corridor, and the developers have been selected to carry out this project, which includes the development of a grocery store, 275 units of housing and a 520 space parking garage.

• The University is participating with the City and area stakeholders in a planning process sponsored by the D.C. Office of Planning to determine the idea uses and densities for what is being called the Uptown Destination District. This is the area described in the LeDroit Park Initiative as the cultural district. Consensus has been reached by all involved that the area’s focus should be on the development of cultural arts and African American heritage activities.

• The establishment of a public charter middle school of mathematics and science has been approved by the public charter school authority, and negotiations are about to begin that will determine the parameters for it development.
Build a National Digital Network to support urban education (SFA II-30)

Starting in LeDroit Park and expanding citywide, the National Digital Network could connect students, parents and teachers with area schools, libraries and after-school programs. Using a web platform, chat rooms, and white boards and instant messaging, the digital network would also link University volunteers to DC public school children in need of tutorial assistance. Initially the Network will be integrated into the ISE Middle School of Mathematics and Science.

Restructure Continuing Education to create the Howard University Metropolitan College (SFA II 31)

The proposed Metropolitan College would provide robust continuing education opportunities in the evenings, on weekends and on-line. It would service high technology firms in the metropolitan area and the regional public sector, including school educators and municipal and federal employees. The University will build upon the successes of the Division of Continuing Education, the Leadership Academy and the growing information technology capacity and partnerships of the University. A draft proposal is under final review before development. The intent of this initiative is in harmony with self study recommendation #18 that promotes the movement of Continuing Education toward greater self sufficiency.

Demonstrable Relationship Between Planning and Budget

During the administration of President H. Patrick Swygert the Howard University operating budget has grown by $151 million or 44 percent. Success in generating new revenues from both unrestricted and restricted sources has fueled spending in pursuit of
strategic objectives. Total spending has grown considerably faster than inflation over this period, as funding allocations have followed the blueprint laid out in Strategic Framework for Action I and II and several of the recommendations pertaining to repairs and maintenance (#29) and building renovations (#30) found in the 1999 Self Study.

The annual University budget funds both operating expenses and an item for University Sponsored Construction, ensuring that an appropriate level of investment in the maintenance and improvement of the physical infrastructure is funded from current revenues. The University Sponsored Construction line item funds both on-going maintenance and renewal, and some strategic projects. Other strategic capital projects are supported by debt, and by federal appropriations. Gifts raised through the capital campaign will be a significant source of funding for strategic capital projects in the future.

A number of the capital projects identified in SFA I and II have already been completed, funded from a variety of sources. Of particular importance has been the confidence in the University and the support for its strategic vision demonstrated by the federal government. The two new state-of-the-art libraries for Health Sciences and Law were federally funded, as was the extension of the campus network to ensure that full-time faculty has access to this critical resource. The HU Television network, the creation of which was an objective of SFA I, was support by federal funding. Planning funds for the new interdisciplinary and engineering center (ISE), designed to upgrade the University's facilities in the basic sciences and engineering and to provide a robust foundation for
substantive research in emerging fields, have also been provided through federal appropriations.

However, other strategic capital projects have been funded through the University operating budget. These include construction of the multi-million dollar iLab for student and faculty use. Co-located with this important new facility is the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLA), designed to assist faculty in staying abreast of the new knowledge, instructional methods, and technologies that affect learning. Additional millions have been spent to construct “smart” classrooms throughout the campus, and to enhance the basic infrastructure that supports information technology and telecommunications, including ensuring that every Howard student be provided access to appropriate computing resources, as described earlier in this report.

In addition to the tens of millions of capital funding required to construct these important projects, millions of dollars of additional funding was required for their support. The University’s annual operating budget has grown significantly over the years, as funds have been provided to support the on-going costs of operating, maintaining, cleaning and securing the two new libraries, the iLab, the smart classrooms, and the computer centers and the voice/video/data initiative in the residence halls. The CETLA was a new program for which a staff and operating costs had to be provided in the University’s annual budget. Additional staffing and other support were also funded in the University’s central information technology organization, so that the requisite support could be provided for the University’s many strategic initiatives in this area.
Chief among the strategic initiatives funded over the past several years in the University’s annual operating budget has been a merit pay program for staff and faculty. The establishment of such a plan for staff was one of the major elements in SFA I’s superordinate goal to promote excellence in teaching and research, by creating a formal evaluation program to recognize and reward performance and thus to make exceptional performance the rule rather than the exception at Howard. In addition, the merit pay program for faculty helps the University move toward this goal by providing a mechanism to recognize faculty research contributions and that faculty who provide research mentoring to undergraduate, graduate and professional students. Every year for the nine years between fiscal years 1996 and 2004 some form of compensation adjustment has been made, based on the performance pay program. In fiscal year 1998 the faculty received an additional equity salary increase, designed to help Howard continue to compete for nationally and internationally renowned faculty.

Other significant initiatives of SFA I and II that have required substantial support from the University operating budget including the following:

- The highly successful Fund for Academic Excellence
- An up-grade to FacNet equipment
- An increase in the number and amount of graduate stipends
- Scholarships for graduate students
- Upgrading campus environment
• A major new system to support student services inclusive of recruitment, registration, and financial aid

• Initiatives to enhance campus safety

• New programs for the Leadership Academy and the Howard University Community Association

• Funds to help ensure success of new College of Medicine Practice Plan
FACULTY BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE AND GENDER, FALL 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL/COLLEGE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FACULTY BY SCHOOL AND COLLEGE AND RANK, FALL 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL/COLLEGE</th>
<th>PROF</th>
<th>ASSO</th>
<th>ASST</th>
<th>INSTR</th>
<th>LEC</th>
<th>ADJ/VISIT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Assessment Plan Template 1

Department/School/Administrative Unit

Submitted by: Academic Year:

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose (In this section, please provide a statement that demonstrates how your department/unit relates to your college or school’s statement of institutional purpose, and through the college/school to the Howard University’s mission and goals)

Mission:

Goal(s):
HOWARD UNIVERSITY

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Assessment Plan Template 2

Department/School/Administrative Unit

Submitted by: Academic Year

Program Title and Degree (If applicable)

Intended Educational (Student), Research or Service Outcomes, Administrative Objectives of Expected Results (In this section, clearly articulate the expected results related to each goal. Try to make the objectives results-oriented). It is best to specify the objectives for each Goal - e.g. Goal 1 may have two objectives labeled as Objective 1a and Objective 1b. (Duplicate and use this page as often as necessary).

Objective:

- **Performance Criteria/Indicators for Success** (What will students/customer be able to do, to be, possess or perceive when the goal is accomplished?)

- **Performance Activities**: (What will be done to achieve the goals and objectives?)

- **Methods of Assessment** (The procedures, strategies, or tools by which you will collect information to validate the outcome objective and the method of analysis to be used.)

- **Use of Findings**: (Statement of how data will be used for improvement.)

- **Feedback Channel and Assessment Timeline** (Who is going to collect the assessment data? When, how often and to whom will the results be reported?)