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I. INSTITUTIONAL OVERVIEW

General Description

Founded in 1867, Howard University is a federally chartered, private university offering over 100 fields of study in undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs through its 13 schools and colleges: College of Arts and Sciences; College of Engineering, Architecture, and Computer Sciences; School of Education; School of Social Work; School of Business; Cathy Hughes School of Communications; College of Medicine; College of Dentistry; College of Pharmacy; College of Nursing and Allied Health Sciences; the Graduate School; School of Divinity; and the School of Law. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching classifies Howard University as an RU/H (university with higher research activity) institution.

The University’s main campus is located in Washington, DC, within five miles of the United States Capitol and consists of over 900 buildings on more than 89 acres of land. The University also maintains a 22-acre West Campus in upper Northwest Washington, which houses the Law School and the Divinity School; and a 108-acre Beltsville, Maryland research campus, which houses a major atmospheric science research facility. The 450 licensed-bed university hospital (Howard University Hospital) provides services for a significant segment of the Washington, DC metropolitan community, in addition to providing a clinical setting for training physicians, nurses, and other healthcare providers.

History

On November 20, 1866, 10 members of the First Congregational Society of Washington, D.C. gathered for a missionary meeting. That evening, they decided to establish a seminary for the training of African American preachers. By early 1867, the founders had broadened their mission to include a liberal arts college and university. They decided to name the university for Major General Oliver O. Howard, a Civil War hero and Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, a U.S. government agency established in 1865 to aid freed blacks. General Howard was also one of the early founders of the institution in Washington. The first students entered Howard University in May 1867. General Howard, who was Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau from 1865 until 1872, directed considerable resources to the University, including the original 3-acre campus, the Main Building, and the Old Medical School. Before the Freedmen's Bureau was dissolved in 1872, it had helped in the building of 45 hospitals and the education of approximately 150,000 blacks who were formerly enslaved.

Over the past half-century, Howard University has become a comprehensive research university. Faculty in the University’s 13 schools and colleges are engaged in cutting-edge research. Undergraduates comprise an estimated 67 percent of the total enrollment. Six schools and colleges (Arts and Sciences, Business, Cathy Hughes School of Communications, Education, Engineering and Architecture, and Nursing and Allied Health) house undergraduate and many graduate programs. Graduate and professional degree programs are hosted by the Schools of Divinity, Education, Law, Social Work, the Graduate School, and the Colleges of Medicine,
Dentistry, and Pharmacy. Howard’s research active faculty train doctoral students in over thirty disciplines, and over one-hundred new PhDs are awarded annually.

Mission

Howard University, being a culturally diverse, comprehensive research intensive historically black private university, provides an educational experience of exceptional quality at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels to students of high academic standing and potential, particularly emphasizing educational opportunities for black students. Moreover, the University is dedicated to attracting and sustaining a cadre of faculty who are—through their teaching, research, and service—committed to the development of distinguished, historically aware, globally conscious, and compassionate graduates and to the discovery of solutions to human problems in the United States and throughout the world. With an abiding interest in both domestic and international affairs, the University is committed to continuing to produce leaders for America and the global community.

Core Values

Excellence, leadership, service, and truth are our core values. Howard’s aim is to forward the development of scholars, professionals, and other intellectuals who drive change and engage in scholarship that provides solutions to contemporary global problems, particularly ones impacting the African Diaspora.

Student Population and Key Student Metrics

Howard University enrolls approximately 10,260 students from 48 states, the District of Columbia, and 70 countries. In terms of student retention, 94% of full-time undergraduates who entered the University in the 2016 fall cohort returned the following fall semester, which is recent data based on the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Part-time students returned to Howard University at a rate of 100% during the same period, based on NCES data. Howard University’s full-time retention rate during this period exceeded Spelman College (89%), Morehouse College (84%), and Hampton University (78%), earning Howard the distinction of having the highest retention rate among the nation’s HBCUs. Such a retention rate was on par with neighboring Georgetown University (96%), University of Maryland College Park (96%), and George Washington University (91%).

Howard University’s six-year graduation rate (67%) for students who entered the university in 2011 exceeds overall national graduation rates. The University outpaced Hampton University’s (56%) and Morehouse College’s (55%) six-year graduation rates. The only HBCU to exceed Howard University was Spelman College (74%).
Strengths and Opportunities for Improvement and Growth

In January of 2016, the University began to lay the groundwork for a new strategic planning process. The Strategic Planning Commission, comprised of 15 faculty, staff and students, began the process of developing the University’s framework for the strategic plan under the direction and leadership of President Wayne A. I. Frederick and Provost Anthony Wutoh.

The Strategic Planning Commission noted that the pace of today’s market dictates the need for Howard University to be agile and compelled to move forward, faster. Howard will continue utilizing its considerable strengths to successfully pursue new opportunities for realizing its larger mission. Among Howard’s strengths are our global brand name recognition, our history-driven commitment to our mission, and the diversity and strength of our academic programs.

The University is increasingly directing attention and reallocating resources to scale innovation across the campus with new investments in a brand new wireless infrastructure and broadening online course delivery and learning, among other ways of leveraging technology in the education sphere. Beyond technology-based innovations, Howard also has innovative policies that enhance graduation rates. Such novel policies include tuition and fee remission for up to six credit hours during the summer, which supports students’ opportunity to earn a bachelor’s degree in three years, as well as a 50% tuition rebate the final semester for students graduating on-time or early.

To continue to be recognized as a leading university that produces global leaders, the campus community recognizes that it must innovate and transform itself at a faster pace than the world around it. All higher education institutions are confronting challenging environments marked by rapid technological, economic, demographic, and legislative and policy changes. The board, the administration, and the faculty recognize that standing still or slowly adjusting to threats and opportunities are not options. Such recognition and collaboration by University stakeholders constitute a strength for the University to transform and successfully pursue new opportunities.

II. INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES TO BE ADDRESSED IN SELF-STUDY

President Wayne A.I. Frederick was appointed Interim President in October 2013 and was named as the 17th President in July 2014, following a national search. The President emphasized the following vision priorities in his inauguration address on March 6, 2015:

- Building a culture of academic excellence and rigor
- Engaging in scholarship and research grounded in solving contemporary problems
- Revitalizing the manner in which the needs of both students and the world are met today
- Infusing service into the University culture
- Increasing the philanthropic efforts of the University community

Consistent with the President’s focused priorities along with our greatest areas of opportunity identified by the Strategic Planning Commission, the current Self-Study is anticipated to address
the institutional priorities below. The Standards cited in relation to each institutional priority are not exhaustive, but rather suggestive of how efforts are made by the Self-Study team to align institutional priorities with accreditation standards. On some level, elements of each Standard have bearing on each institutional priority, but some more prominently than others.

- Enhancement of Academic Excellence (MSCHE Standard: I, III, & IV)
- Inspiration of New Knowledge (MSCHE Standard: I, III, & V)
- Service to Our Community (MSCHE Standard: I, II, & IV)
- Improved Efficiency and Efficacy (MSCHE Standard: V, VI & VII)
- Strengthening Finances for New Opportunities (MSCHE Standard: VI & VII)

III. INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

Howard University’s MSCHE Institutional Steering Committee identified seven Self-Study outcomes:

1. Reaffirmation of accreditation
2. Identify innovations and efficiencies that will position Howard as a top 100 up-and-coming university based on established criteria
3. Further demonstrate the University’s commitment to student success by developing academic support initiatives that target specific populations (i.e., Pell-eligible students); aligning University policies and procedures with best-practice research on retention and degree completion strategies; and utilizing technology to efficiently monitor key academic performance indicators
4. Re-energize our research intensiveness and achieve R1 status
5. Demonstrate with ongoing survey data improved actual and perceived stakeholder engagement of major constituent groups in shared responsibility for the success of the University
6. Provide development, teaching, and research support to faculty to enhance their impact on student success
7. Identify the five critical areas where innovation and transformation—and plans for achieving them—can have the greatest impact on our campus to help achieve our mission.

IV. SELF-STUDY APPROACH

Howard University will adopt the Standards-Based approach for self-study review. This model will enable the institution to fully address the Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation, while providing significant opportunities for members of the University community to reflect on the areas of strategic focus identified above. The charges to the Working Groups will define a process of analysis and assessment that will culminate in the development of specific recommendations for improvement in each area relative to the standards and to our strategic aspirations and priorities for the next five years.
Each of the seven standards for accreditation will be assigned to a Working Group chaired by a member of the Steering Committee. An eighth Working Group, also chaired by a member of the Steering Committee, will address the requirements of affiliation and the Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations. The reports submitted by these eight Working Groups will provide Howard with recommendations for the further implementation of its strategic plan.

The Self-Study full-time staff to facilitate the work of Working Groups and Steering Committee consists of the following: Project Manager, Administrative Assistant, Data Specialist, Communications Specialist, and Editor. Additionally, a doctoral student has been assigned to assist with the research and other matters concerning the Self-Study.

V. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE AND WORKING GROUPS

The work of the Self-Study will be organized and overseen by a Steering Committee, which will provide regular updates to the University’s President and the Board of Trustees. The Steering Committee will guide and collaborate with eight Working Groups. The Working Groups represent one standard each (1-7) with an additional small, specialized Working Group (8) that will address the MSCHE Requirements for Affiliation. The following chart outlines this organizational structure:

Figure 1: Howard University MSCHE Self-Study Organizational Structure
The Self-Study Steering Committee includes broad and diverse membership from across the University, with members holding key expertise around specific Standards, educational programs, student support services, finance and operations, institutional research, and institutional policy and compliance. Several members were part of the team that created this Self-Study Design. Membership on the Steering Committee was also developed with attention to a diversity of faculty rank as well as roles and experiences at the University.

Following is the membership of the Self-Study Steering Committee:

**STEERING COMMITTEE**

Ariana Arnold  
Senior Associate General Counsel, *Office of the General*  
David Bennett  
Vice President of Development and Alumni Relations, *Office of Development and Alumni Affairs*  
Crystal Brown  
Vice President and Chief Communications Officer  
LaTrice Byam  
Executive Director, *Office of Admissions and Registration*  
Melanie Carter  
Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies, *Office Undergraduate Studies*  
D. Jason DeSousa  
Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, *School of Education*  
Anthony Dixon  
Senior Manager, FP&A, *University Budget Office*  
Tashni-Ann Dubroy  
Executive Vice President & Chief Operations Officer  
Constance Ellison  
Professor & Senior Associate Dean, *Graduate School*  
Terrence Fullum  
Professor of Surgery and Vice Chair of the Department of Surgery, *College of Medicine*  
Moses Garuba  
Professor & Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, *College of Engineering and Architecture*  
Ping Harman  
Director of Institutional Research, *Institutional Research and Assessment*  
Dana Hector  
Director of Sponsored Programs, *Office of Research Administrative Services*  
Mustafa Hersi  
Chief Compliance Officer, *Office of Compliance*  
Kenneth Holmes  
Vice President, *Office of Student Affairs*  
Gracie Lawson-Borders  
Dean, *Cathy Hughes School of Communications*  
Michael Masch  
Vice President and Chief Finance Officer, *Office of Finance*  
Kyndra Middleton  
Associate Professor & Program Coordinator, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, *School of Education*  
Thomas Obisesan  
Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, *Office of Regulatory Research Compliance*  
Rubin Patterson  
(Self-Study Chair) Professor & Chairperson, Department of Sociology and Criminology, *College of Arts and Sciences*  
Glen Phillips  
Director Institutional Assessment, *Institutional Research and Assessment*  
Nikki Taylor  
Professor & Chairperson, Department of History, *College of Arts and Sciences*
Each of the Working Groups has a chair who possesses leadership and knowledge in the Standard area. The appointment of the Working Group members was made using the following principles as a guide:

- Build each Working Group around members with expertise relevant to the Standard while also having out-of-area representation that allows for new insights
- Build Working Groups with attention to the Evidence Inventory, and the connection individuals have to the kind of evidence that is important for that Standard
- Represent various departments and divisions of the University specific to the assigned Standard
- Build diversity (of gender, race, role, and rank at Howard) into all Working Groups
- Represent students if and where their experience will advance the work on that Standard
- Represent members of the Faculty Senate on each Working Group for shared governance
- Keep the Working Groups small (8-12 members) so that they will be as functional as possible and will not overburden Schools and College or the service commitments of our staff, faculty, and students
Following is the membership of the Working Groups:

**WORKING GROUPS**

**Standard I - Mission and Goals**

**Nikki Taylor (Chair)** Professor and Chair, Department of History, *College of Arts and Sciences*

- Mohamed Camara - Professor and Chairperson, *Department of African Studies*
- Pamela Clark - Program Manager, *Office of Research*
- Hazel Edwards - Professor and Chair, *Department of Architecture*
- Ruby Gourdine - Professor, *School of Social Work*
- Debra Roberts - Interim Chair, Professor, Department of Psychology, *College of Arts and Sciences*
- Denise Hart - Associate Professor, Department of Theatre Arts, *College of Arts and Sciences*
- Crystal Brown - Vice President, *Office of University of Communications*
- Monique McClung - Data Analyst, WBHR-LSAMP Program; *HUSO President*
- Dexter Lee-Associate Professor, Department of Physiology, *College of Medicine*
- Keona Carter - Associate General Counsel for University Business Affairs, *Office of General Counsel*

**Standard II - Ethics and Integrity**

**Constance Ellison (Chair)** Professor & Senior Associate Dean, *Graduate School*

- Linda Jones - Assistant Dean for Administration and Finance, *Graduate School*
- Sylvia McDonald Kaufman - Assistant Dean for Assessment and Evaluation, *Graduate School*
- Anjerikka Bean - Graduate Student - PhD Sociology Candidate
- Elizabeth Ricks - Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, *School of Education*
- Cristobal Rodriguez – Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, *School of Education*
- Lennon Jackson - Chief of Operations, *Office of Student Affairs*
- Candi N. Smiley, Esq. - Title IX Coordinator, *Office of the Provost*
- Charles Pugh - Director, Employee Relations & HR Services, *Office of Human Resources*
- Jamie Triplin - Director for Communications and Development, *Graduate School*
- Teneele Bailey - Director for Retention and Recruitment, *Graduate School*

---

1 Faculty Senate, HUSA, and GSC will submit names of members to be added to Working Groups.
- Calvin Hadley - Student Ombudsperson, Office of the President
- Yvonne Towers - Executive Director, University Budget Office
- Elaine Bourne-Heath - Dean of Student Services, Student Affairs

Standard III - Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

Dana Williams (Chair) Professor and Chair, Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences

- Greg Carr - Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Afro-American Studies, College of Arts and Sciences
- Kenyatta Gilbert - Associate Professor, School of Divinity
- Jules Harrell - Professor, Department of Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Kanika Magee - Assistant Dean of Student Affairs, School of Business
- Bradford Grant - Professor, Department of Architecture, College of Engineering and Architecture
- Gracie Lawson-Borders - Dean, Cathy Hughes School of Communications
- Yong Jin Park - Professor, Department of Communications, Culture, and Media Studies, Cathy Hughes School of Communications
- Debra Ford - Associate Professor, Vice-Chair, Department of Surgery, College Medicine
- Anthony Wilbon - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Administration, School of Business
- Kareem Washington - Chair, Department of Genetics and Human Genetics, College of Medicine

Standard IV - Support of the Student Experience

D. Jason DeSousa (Chair) Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, School of Education

- Joan Browne - Executive Director of Academic & Career Success, Career Services
- Karen Bussey – Alumna, School of Education
- Brandy Jackson - Assistant Dean for Student Recruitment & Academic Advising, School of Education
- Bahiyyah Muhammad - Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Criminology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Tonia Navas - Director, Ralph J. Bunche International Affairs Center
- Sonya Woods - Archivist, Moorland-Spingarn Research Center
- Melanie Carter - Associate Provost for Undergraduate Studies
- Kenneth Holmes - Vice President, Office of Student Affairs
- Katherine Outlaw - Director, Office of Student Life & Activities, Student Affairs
- Kunle Kassim - Professor, Department of Microbiology, College of Medicine
- Alma Kemp - Administrative Manager, College of Arts and Sciences
Standard V - Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Kyndra Middleton (Chair) Associate Professor & Program Coordinator, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, School of Education

- Woojae Kim - Professor, Department of Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Celeste Malone - Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, School of Education
- Kenneth Anderson – Associate Professor, Interim Associate Dean, for Research and Sponsored Programs, School of Education
- Justin Hansford - Associate Professor, School of Law
- Dexter Lee - Associate Professor, Department of Physiology & Biophysics, College of Medicine
- Tracy Whitaker - Associate Professor & Associate Dean, School of Social Work
- Niambi Carter – Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, College of Arts and Sciences
- Kunle Kassim - Assistant Professor, Department of Microbiology, College of Medicine
- Scott Dantley - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, School of Education
- Glen Phillips - Director of Assessment, Institutional Research and Assessment

Standard VI - Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Terrance Fullum (Chair) Professor and Vice Chair, Surgery, College of Medicine

- Leslie Jones - Department of Ophthalmology, College of Medicine
- Nikki Stewart - Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Howard University Hospital
- Andrew Gavil - Professor, School of Law
- Anthony Dixon – Senior Manager, FP & A, Office of Finance
- Jacqueline M. Caemmerer - Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, School of Education
- David Bennett - Vice President, Office of Development and Alumni Relations
- Dana Hector - Director of Sponsored Programs, Office of Research Administrative Services
- Tashni-Ann Dubroy - Executive Vice President & Chief Operations Officer
- Anthony Dixon-Senior Manager, University Budget Office
- Ping Harman - Director of Institutional Research, Institutional Research and Assessment
- Shomari James, Executive Director of Strategy Deployment, Office of the Provost
Standard VII – Governance, Leadership and Administration

Moses Garuba, Professor & Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Engineering and Architecture

- Keeva Terry - Associate Professor, School of Law
- Allison Morgan Bryant - Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Information Systems and Supply Chain Management, School of Business
- Cheryl Fryer - Assistant Professor, College of Dentistry
- Janelle Burke- Assistant Professor, Department of Biology, College of Arts and Sciences
- Krishna Kumar - Professor, College of Pharmacy
- Carla Williams - Associate Professor, College of Medicine
- Veronica Thomas - Professor, Department of Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies, School of Education
- Nefertiti Burton - Professor and Chair, Department of Theatre Arts, College of Arts and Sciences

Verification of Compliance

Mustafa Hersi (Chair) Director of Compliance

- LaTrice Byam - Executive Director, Office of Admissions and Registration
- Ariana Arnold - Senior Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel
- Thomas Obisesan - Associate Vice President for Research Compliance, Office of Regulatory Research Compliance
- Anthony Jones, Associate Provost & Assistant VP of Enrollment Management
- Michael Masch, Vice President and Chief Finance Officer, Office of Finance

VI. CHARGES TO THE WORKING GROUPS AND GUIDELINES FOR REPORTING

The charges to each of the Working Groups for the seven MSCHE Standards for Accreditation and the Requirements of Affiliation are listed below. The aim of these charges is to provide clear guidance to the Working Groups regarding the focus of their research and reporting, and to connect their work to the overall goals and intended outcomes of the self-study process.

The charges and research questions direct each Working Group to conduct research and analysis and develop a report that is aligned with Intended Outcomes 1-6 (listed in section III above). The research questions direct attention to three specific areas of focus that are within those outcomes: 1) MSCHE Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation; 2) alignment with
Howard University’s mission and vision; and 3) recommendations and priorities for strategic planning. Each Working Group will produce a report no more than 10 single-space pages.

At the end of this phase of the Self-Study, the Working Groups will deliver a report that will be comprehensive with respect to addressing the requirements for their Standard. Each report will also contain recommendations that may be incorporated into Howard’s Strategic Plan, which will be completed in Fall 2018. The research questions presented below for Working Groups associated with each Standard are only preliminary. As Working Group members engage in technical discussions they will generate and pursue more probing questions tailored for each Standard.

**Standard 1: Mission and Goals**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 1: Mission and Goals will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data and documentation regarding the institutional mission and goals. The Working Group will evaluate Howard University’s current mission and goals using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 1 and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore relationships between Howard’s Mission and this institution’s aspirational priorities that are being developed for the Strategic Plan that addresses Howard’s adherence to Standard 1, and it provides prioritized recommendations relating to mission and goals that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report that addresses Howard’s adherence to Standard 1 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to institutional mission and goals that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**
1. To what extent and how does Howard meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 1?
2. In what ways is Howard communicating its mission and goals to both internal and external stakeholders?
3. How are the mission and goals being integrated into planning, program development, and resource allocation to assure consistency in application across the campus?

**Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and documentation regarding the ethics and integrity of Howard’s institutional practices, policies and operations. The Working Group will
also explore relationships between institutional ethics and integrity and Howard’s aspirational priorities that are being developed for the Strategic Plan.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the Working Group will provide prioritized recommendations relating to institutional ethics and integrity that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does Howard meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 2?
2. How does Howard’s mission and vision statements provide direction for addressing issues of ethics and integrity in institutional practices, policies, and operations?
3. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of Howard, relative to this Standard, link with the university’s aspirational priorities?

**Standard 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the design, delivery and assessment of all academic programs at Howard University. The Working Group will evaluate the rigor and coherence of the student learning experience at Howard using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 3 and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore relationships between Howard’s current academic programs and methods of delivery and the aspirational priorities that are being developed in the Strategic Plan.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report that provides prioritized recommendations relating to the design and delivery of student learning experience that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does Howard University meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 3?
2. How does Howard’s articulated mission and vision statement provide new direction for the design and delivery of its academic programs with an emphasis on academic excellence and innovation? To what extent does the learning experience at Howard provide opportunities for students to develop the skills and abilities to create purposeful and satisfying lives and careers?
3. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of Howard, relative to this Standard, link with the university’s aspirational priorities? What critical priorities for improvement and/or transformation of student educational experience should be included in our Strategic Plan?
4. How does the learning experience include relevant and translational knowledge where theory is put into practice?
Standard 4: Support of the Student Experience

Charge: The Working Group for Standard 4: Support of the Student Experience will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the recruitment, matriculation, retention, year-to-year persistence and support of all students at Howard University. The Working Group will evaluate the alignment of Howard’s enrollment strategies with our mission and offerings and the coherence and effectiveness of our student support systems using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 4, and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore relationships between Howard’s enrollment and student success.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report that addresses Howard’s adherence to Standard 4 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to enrollment and support of the student experience that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

Research Questions:
1. To what extent and how does Howard University meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 4 across the range of student backgrounds, expectations and experiences?
2. What direction does Howard’s mission and vision statement provide for the development of enrollment strategies and/or student support services? To what extent do the services, programs, and interventions that support student learning facilitate desired outcomes? To what extent do the services and organizations that support student learning address the needs of an increasingly diverse and globally oriented student population?
3. How does student engagement in “high impact practices” create enriching educational experiences, enhance graduation rates, and promote good health and psychological well-being for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students?
4. How can support services be enhanced to improve student satisfaction and increase graduation rates at the undergraduate, graduate, and professional student levels?
5. In what direct ways does your evaluation of, relative to this Standard, link with the university’s aspirational priorities, such as academic productivity and excellence, and community engagement? What are the most critical practices to be included in our Strategic Plan for institutional improvement and/or transformation that will better support students and their learning?

Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Charge: The Working Group for Standard 5: Educational Effectiveness Assessment will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, policies and reports regarding the assessment of student learning and the use of these assessments for improving the student educational experience at Howard University. The Working Group will evaluate the institutional plan and the current practice for assessing student learning and improving programs using the MSCHE criteria
for Standard 5 and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore how learning outcomes assessment and program review can support the aspirational priorities that are being developed as a part of the Strategic Plan.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report that addresses Howard’s adherence to Standard 5 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to the assessment of student learning and program review that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.
Research Questions:

1. To what extent and how does Howard University meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 5?
2. To what extent are Howard’s mission and vision statements apparent in the goals for student learning and educational effectiveness? What critical work remains to align Howard’s assessment practices with its renewed mission and vision?
3. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of Howard, relative to this Standard, link with the university’s aspirational priorities? What are the critical priorities for enhancing educational effectiveness and improving teaching and learning at Howard?

Standard 6: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Charge: The Working Group for Standard 6: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, planning documents, policies and reports regarding Howard’s processes for planning, resource allocation, and institutional strategic and financial planning. The Working Group will evaluate the alignment of different planning processes with each other and with the mission and vision of the university using the MSCHE criteria for Standard 6 and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore how improvements and/or innovations in planning processes and resource allocation can support the aspirational priorities that are being developed as part of the Strategic Plan.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the Working Group will complete a report that addresses Howard University’s adherence to Standard 6 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to institutional planning processes and resource allocation that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

Research Questions:

1. To what extent and how does Howard University meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 6?
2. How does Howard’s financial planning and budgeting process align with the university’s mission and vision statements? How does Howard assess the effectiveness of its planning and resource allocation processes? Are institutional objectives, both university-wide and by individual units, clearly stated, linked to Howard’s mission statement, and reflective of conclusions drawn from assessment results?
3. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of Howard, relative to this Standard, link with the university’s aspirational priorities? What are the most critical areas of priority for improving our institutional planning and resource allocation processes to optimize our ability to pursue our strategic goals?
**Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, and Administration**

**Charge:** The Working Group for Standard 7: Governance, Leadership, and Administration will collect and analyze relevant statements, institutional data, planning documents, policies and reports regarding the effectiveness and integrity of Howard University’s governance and organizational practices. The Working Group will evaluate Howard’s governance structure using theMSCHE criteria for Standard 7 and the appropriate MSCHE Requirements of Affiliation. The Working Group will also explore the relationship between Howard’s current governance structure and the aspirational priorities that are being developed as a part of the Strategic Plan.

Using the research questions below as a guide, the working group will complete a report that addresses Howard’s adherence to Standard 7 and provides prioritized recommendations relating to the effectiveness of Howard’s governance structure that will lead to improvements in this area and/or inform Howard’s strategic planning process.

**Research Questions:**

1. To what extent and how does Howard University meet the criteria for MSCHE Standard 7?
2. What are the key relationships between Howard’s governance structure and the mission and vision? What adjustments or changes in governance structure may be required to achieve better alignment between mission/vision and governance at Howard?
3. In what ways, if any, does your evaluation of Howard, relative to this Standard, link with Howard’s aspirational priorities? What are the most critical areas of priority for improving our governance structure and processes to optimize our ability to pursue our strategic goals?

**Requirements of Affiliation**

Along with the seven Standards, Middle States requires institutions to demonstrate compliance with 15 “Requirements of Affiliation.” Compliance with some of these requirements (7-13 & 15) will be addressed in the chapters pertaining to various standards; others (1-6 & 14) will be demonstrated via submission of MSCHE’s “Verification of Compliance Report.”

**Charge:** The Working Group for Requirements of Affiliation will complete the Verification of Compliance Report by gathering, reviewing and summarizing, as necessary, existing university documentation and procedures.

**VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL SELF-STUDY REPORT**

Working Groups will draft initial reports in the Googledoc form found in SharePoint. Since there is a 100-page limit for the final Self-Study document, Working Groups should adhere to the 10-page single-space limit previously noted. Additionally, since the individual reports from
Working Groups will be edited and organized into a single cohesive final report. Groups should focus on writing concisely while addressing the research questions articulated in their charge.

Consistent formatting and voice will help the Steering Committee read and edit the working group reports quickly.

- **Margins:** 1 inch top, .75 left, right and bottom
- **Justified:** Left
- **Font:** Times New Roman 11 pt, single-spaced
- **Main headings:** Times New Roman, title case, left justified, 16pt
- **Subheadings:** Times New Roman, italic, title case, left justified, 14pt
- **Page number:** Bottom center
- **Tables:** All tables should be numbered and titled. Please reference source materials in the working group’s Canvas document library.
- **Citations:** Footnotes are acceptable and all supporting documents should be uploaded to the working group’s Canvas document library.
- **Voice:** Third person, present tense, active voice
- **Style:** follow AP style (a brief guide is available here; contact ETS if you would like access to the online materials.)
- **Acronyms and Abbreviations:** Howard University can be referred to as Howard or HU

**Outline of the Final Self-Study Report**

I. Executive Summary  
II. Howard University: Institutional Overview and Context  
III. Self-Study Methodology  
   a. Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study  
   b. Organization of Working Groups  
   c. Collaborations and Communication  
IV. Standard 1: Mission and Goals [REPEATED FOR EACH STANDARD]  
   a. Questions Addressed and Evidence for Standards  
   b. Challenges and Strengths  
   c. Recommendations for Improvement and the Strategic Plan  

V. Conclusion  
   a. Summary Comments  
   b. What Was Learned relative to Application for the Strategic Plan  

VI. Relevant Appendices to Include in the Evidence Inventory
VIII. VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE STRATEGY

With accreditation-relevant federal regulations developed by the US Department of Education, a separate Working Group has been established to collect the evidence in conjunction with the other seven Working Groups as needed with respect to all pertinent regulations. The Verification and Compliance Working Group will start with the full universe of pertinent federal regulations and proceed with demonstrating Howard University’s compliance with each one through a review of policies and outcomes. Recommendations for improvement, as needed, will also be reported by the Verification and Compliance Working Group.

IX. EVIDENCE INVENTORY

To facilitate and best ensure that the Self-Study is a full campus community project, an ePortfolio site will be created in September 2018. The ePortfolio site will be a tool for maximum transparency and a platform for broad input. There will be three components of the ePortfolio site that will be accessible via a conspicuous button on the University’s homepage. There will be a regularly updated open accession component where relevant documents, meeting minutes, and event announcements will be available for everyone to review. Another component of the ePortfolio that is equally important is its service as a means for the campus community to post feedback on previous draft-writing and other activities as well as recommendations for future researching and writing of the Self-Study report. The final ePortfolio site component will be a password-protected area where only Working Group and Steering Committee members can upload and post report drafts, meeting minutes, and other documents that will provide additional information to the public regarding project background and process.

X. TIMETABLE

Year 1: Fall 2017 – Spring 2018

Oct-Nov 2017     Howard staff attended MSCHE Self-Study Institute
March 2018        Self-Study Chair Appointed
March 2018        Working Group Chairs and Steering Committee Selected
March 2018        Self-Study Kickoff Meeting
Year 2: 2018-2019

Aug 2018  Working Group Members Selected

Aug 2018  Self-Study Design Drafted and Disseminated to Steering Committee

Sept 2018  Self-Study Design and Documentation Roadmap submitted to MSCHE Liaison and to Howard University Campus Community

Sept 2018  Campus visit by MSCHE Liaison

Sept-Dec 2018  Steering Committee Oversees Research/Reporting of Working Groups

Sept-Dec 2018  Working Groups Engage Campus, Analyze Data, Prepare Draft Chapters

Dec 2018  Working Groups Submit First Draft Chapters to Steering Committee

Jan 2019  Steering Committee Provides Initial Feedback to Working Groups

Jan-May 2019  Working Groups Engage Campus, Analyze Data, Prepare Second Draft Chapters

April 2019  Second Draft of Working Group Chapters Submitted to Steering Committee

April-Aug 2019  Steering Committee Uses Second Draft Chapters to Produce First Self-Study Draft

Year 3: 2019-2020

Sept 2019  Self-Study First Draft Disseminated to Campus Community for Feedback

Sept-Oct 2019  Self-Study Second Draft Based on Campus Community Input

Oct 2019  Second Self-Study Report Draft Submitted to Evaluation Team Chair

Nov 2019  Self-Study Second Draft Disseminated to Campus Community for Feedback

Nov 2019  Evaluation Team Chair Visits Howard

Dec 2019  Verification of Compliance Report Submitted to MSCHE
Jan 2020  Revisions and Edits to Self-Study Report Based on Evaluation Team Chair Feedback

Jan 2020  Howard Disseminates Final Self-Study Report to Campus Community and Submits Final Report to MSCHE

March 2020  Evaluation Team Visits Howard

June 2020  MSCHE Commission Meeting and Official Action Regarding Howard’s Reaffirmation of Accreditation

XI. COMMUNICATIONS PLAN

The Communications plan is multifaceted and designed to facilitate campus-wide engagement and encourage input from various stakeholders, including the Howard University board of trustees, faculty, staff and student constituencies. Updates regarding the process and progress will be made via the ePortfolio microsite, email blasts, the Howard University electronic newsletter, and the President’s newsletter. In person communications will also play a vital role in ensuring the community is well-versed on the progress of the Self-Study. Members of the Self-Study staff will conduct a series of meetings with the members of the Faculty-Senate, Howard University Student Association, and other faculty and student organizations to ensure they are briefed on the effort. Town Hall meetings will round out the communications effort, with all campus constituencies invited to attend, hear updates and ask questions. Alumni and the local community will be briefed via email blasts and the Howard University Community newsletter and all will be encouraged to provide input.

The Self-Study Communications Specialist will be responsible for uploading and posting all Self-Study materials for the campus community, and that Specialist will facilitate communications from the community to the Self-Study Steering Committee, Working Groups, and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To update the campus community about the Self-Study process</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Website; Board representatives on working groups; presentations at Board meetings</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Campus newsletters; email blasts; Website; Town Hall meetings; student representatives on Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups; representatives report out at Howard University Student Association (HUSA) and GSA meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Campus newsletters; email blasts; Website; Town Hall meetings; faculty representatives on Steering Committee and relevant Working Groups; representatives report out at relevant faculty governance meetings and departments as needed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To gather feedback about the Work Group reports</td>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Feedback gathered at Board meeting discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Feedback from HUSA and GSA Working Group members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Feedback from Steering Committee and Working Group members after sharing relevant report drafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Feedback from staff HUSO Steering Committee and Working Group members after sharing relevant report drafts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To gather feedback about the Work Group reports</th>
<th>Board of Trustees</th>
<th>Feedback gathered at Board meeting discussions with plans to finalize and approve before final is submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Representatives present and gather feedback at HUSA and GSA meetings; feedback from HUSA and GSA Steering Committee and Working Group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Feedback from faculty Steering Committee and Working Group members; feedback from draft shared at Faculty Senate meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Feedback from staff Steering Committee and Working Group members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alumni Feedback gathered at Alumni discussion and via email

|  
| X:II. EVALUATION TEAM PROFILE  
We request that the Chair be a President or Provost of a comprehensive university that has undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs. We also request that the team has representation in the following areas:  
- From an HBCU  
- From residential campuses that are in a major metropolitan area  
- From campuses that have a substantial international student population  
- With curriculum design/assessment/faculty development experience  
- With strategic planning experience |  

|  
|  
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