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1. Executive Summary

Howard University has a strong reputation and a unique legacy that spans 141 years. At this juncture of its fabled history, Howard must be strengthened if it is to continue as one of our nation’s leading universities. The nation needs Howard. No other organization can do what Howard has done and continues to do, producing leaders for our nation and the world. Howard cannot let the nation down. It must prepare now to educate future generations of students, support its dedicated faculty and staff, and serve the nation through its education and research. At its founding and throughout its history, Howard has provided opportunities where none existed and been an irreplaceable portal of hope and opportunity. The need for Howard is as great today as it ever was.

There are opportunities for Howard to help address areas of critical societal and human needs. Our nation’s need for a diverse and increased cadre of faculty and other professionals, especially in science, technology, engineering and mathematics is urgent. There is a continuing need for new knowledge that informs the public debate about democratic principles and cultural and social values to ensure that we continue to advance the cause of social justice and equality. As our nation turns with a heightened sense of urgency to the need for universal access to high quality health care, cures for diseases, and the removal of related disparities, Howard must continue to make a unique research, teaching and service contribution.

There are many challenges that Howard must address. It must respond more effectively to increased competition from other institutions of higher education for faculty, students and staff. It must ensure that all of its academic programs are of high quality and offered by a competitive, diverse and engaged faculty that is continuously being renewed. Its educational programs and
services must be offered in an environment that is characterized by modern facilities and a technologically advanced infrastructure. Howard University must strategically deploy and efficiently use its resources; expending them over the university’s existing 181 degree programs is neither strategic nor sustainable.

Howard must change substantially to fulfill its mission and pursue its vision in a new age. Howard’s vision anticipates increasing the number of nationally recognized faculty within programs recognized for their excellence. As an institution whose future increasingly will rest on graduate education and research, Howard aspires to top 50 research performance and AAU membership, which will require an enhanced teaching, learning and research environment. Howard’s undergraduate programs must be of exceptional quality, as is true of the undergraduate programs of AAU schools. Quality graduate and undergraduate programs go together and are mutually supportive. The university’s Academic Renewal Plan is a key element of Howard’s methodology for advancing toward its vision; it will require the university to redeploy existing resources in a more focused and strategic manner. Academic renewal will draw on the breadth of experience and dedication of the campus community, particularly the faculty, to determine the programmatic areas on which Howard will strategically concentrate its efforts and resources in the future.

The renewal process is built around a presidentially appointed Commission for Academic Renewal; composed predominantly of faculty, but which also includes every stakeholder group along with nationally recognized university leaders and other external experts. The Presidential Commission, during the course of the 2009-10 academic year, will review each of Howard’s degree programs using an evaluation framework which will be refined through engagement with the campus community and make recommendations to the President. The university academic program enhancement process is planned as documented herein and will be open and transparent. All documents and meeting minutes will be shared with the campus community through a variety of media, and there will be ongoing opportunities for meaningful engagement for faculty, students, staff, alumni and other stakeholders. Beginning with the vetting of the evaluation
framework, through collecting data, reviewing, refining and interpreting it, drawing conclusions and developing recommendations, the Commission will draw on the collective wisdom of the campus community through active, ongoing communication and substantive engagement.

The university’s faculty and the Faculty Senate have a special role to play in the enhancement of the university’s academic programs. The Faculty Senate will select 6 members of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal, while 12 additional Faculty Senate members will serve through their nominations from their respective college or school. The Faculty Senate and the faculty, along with the entire campus community, will have access to all data and interpretive materials available to or produced by the Commission. In addition to their participation on the Presidential Commission, the Faculty Senate will have an independent opportunity to develop and present to the President recommendations regarding the university’s academic portfolio. The President will use the recommendations of the Presidential Commission and those of the Faculty Senate in formulating his recommendations, which he will share with the campus and present to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustee will make final decisions regarding the university’s portfolio of academic programs.

Because of the large number of programs that need to be evaluated by the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal, programs will be grouped into graduate professional programs in the health sciences, graduate professional programs outside the health sciences, graduate academic programs (i.e., mostly Masters and Ph.D. granting programs), and undergraduate programs. Separate working groups, drawn from the Commission and appointed by the Commission Chair, will take responsibility for assessing each group of academic programs. These assessments will then be coordinated to recognize program interdependencies and equilibrate standards, resulting in a consistent and coherent set of program recommendations.

Program changes approved by the Board of Trustees will be done over a three year implementation period, though this will be adjusted for individual program circumstances. Particular attention will be devoted to assisting students currently enrolled in these programs either as they complete their degrees or with other interventions. Resources that are captured
from program consolidations, downsizing or elimination will be redirected strategically using a proposal-based allocation methodology, directing resources from programs that are least central to the future of the university to those that are more central. Substantial incremental resources will be redirected to a wide range of critical program needs, including faculty salaries, professional development, faculty hiring and startup packages, local infrastructure, equipment, research support, student aid and stipends, postdocs for research projects, and other academic needs. The reallocation of resources will be somewhat different for each of the groups of programs.

Deans, department chairs and faculty have determined and repeatedly documented through reports, funding requests and plans that graduate academic programs are significantly underfunded. While no specific dollar or percentage reallocation is mandated, substantial reallocations are necessary to address critical unmet needs. As a way of providing a concrete example, achieving a goal of increased average funding for Howard’s graduate academic programs by 50% would require that approximately 30% of the existing resource support for programs to be redeployed from lower priority to the higher priority programs -- programs on which the future of the university rests. Small reallocations do not address the problem: substantial reallocation is necessary for each program that Howard offers to become more competitive and recognized as nationally distinguished.

Graduate professional programs will be subject to comparable analysis. Graduate professional programs, including those in the health sciences, will be moved towards far greater financial and operational autonomy, while still remaining within the university’s academic and administrative policy framework. Graduate professional programs will take more responsibility for their own revenue generation, including research support, fund raising, and tuition and fees, while making decisions locally about expenditure and capital priorities and operational matters. This approach, widely successfully applied elsewhere, puts additional critical decision making in the hands of those closest to and most familiar with local needs and issues. The leadership model for effective operation of significantly autonomous programs must change accordingly, with academic and administrative leaders putting greater emphasis on revenue generation, goal setting and planning, operational control and accountability.
Faculty are the university’s core resource, yet fully 75 percent of the tenured faculty in the Academic Affairs Division are eligible to retire based on age plus years of service. In addition to attention to program mix and resource allocation, academic renewal involves planning for faculty hiring, faculty development and retention. For those faculty who by reason of personal choice are ready to retire, academic renewal works best when its includes a process that makes faculty separation predictable and beneficial to faculty, while assuring academic leaders that they will have the needed number of faculty with the specializations and skill sets for each academic and health sciences program. This is a particular challenge in light of the program mix changes which will result from Trustee decisions in response to the President’s recommendation. To achieve these goals, it would be appropriate to consider a Faculty Voluntary Separation and Incentive Retirement Program (Faculty VSIRP) which would provide a retirement incentive and allow phased retirement where faculty continue university service, but at a level scaled to their interest and the needs of academic programs and limited to a designated number of years. The Faculty VSIRP with phased retirement or separation would provide a predictable planning base and adequate time for hiring the large numbers of new faculty that will be needed for reasons of faculty retirements, a revised academic program mix, and the growing emphasis on externally funded research.

Academic renewal at Howard is driven by the need to greatly strengthen program resource support to improve program quality and competitiveness. While the university needs to continue to reduce costs, academic renewal reallocates resources, and does not reduce them. The university needs to efficiently use its resources: academic renewal aligns use of resources with university priorities. Every arm of the university, including Academic Affairs and Health Sciences Divisions, needs to continue to examine its resource use, make tough decisions and reduce costs, but academic renewal is not the vehicle for cost reduction: academic renewal is about optimally directing needed resources to instructional and research programs that reflect the priorities and future of Howard.
2. Introduction

Context and Assumptions
Howard University must continue to compete on the basis of the quality of its academic programs and research and the environment it creates for its faculty, staff and students. After many years of incremental growth, Howard now offers 181 degree programs, excluding interdisciplinary programs. Incremental budgeting has failed to provide these programs the resources each needs to function at the highest level possible. While new revenues, strategically allocated, would be the preferred way to ensure that each program has the resources it needs, it is unrealistic to expect that the huge amount of incremental funds (conservatively estimated at an additional $100 million per year) will become available. Rather, a combination of aggressive revenue development, internal reallocation, program tracking and performance management, and strategic allocation of incremental resources is necessary if Howard’s academic programs are to be supported and institutionally aligned in a way that leads each program to be one of distinction. Howard University’s Academic Renewal Plan, described herein, addresses these issues in an integrated fashion.

Academic renewal requires that Howard reallocate resources as necessary so that every program is one of excellence, positioning Howard to effectively serve new generations of students, faculty and staff. This means that additional funds must be provided to support the University’s academic programs. Additional instructional and research laboratories and other facilities must be developed with many existing ones modernized or replaced. Faculty and staff salaries must be increased as part of the effort to enhance the university’s teaching, learning and research environment and attract and retain the required number of competitive faculty and staff. The university must use effective tools such as the annual budget process, guided by the broadly representative Budget Advisory Committee, to analyze operations, reduce costs across the university, and apply the wisdom of the campus community to optimally realign resources with university priorities. Resources which currently serve duplicative or inefficient no longer necessary purposes need to be optimally redirected to support our core enterprise, education and research. Cost reduction guided by such broad-based and faculty led groups as the Budget Advisory Committee, taken together with strategic re-allocation of resources to support academic
and research programs will enhance the quality of Howard’s teaching and learning environment, its productivity and the standing of its academic programs.

While some people will view academic renewal primarily as a process of academic program review and prioritization resulting in a change (reduction) in the programs Howard offers, it necessarily is far broader than that. Sustainable academic renewal also deals with how incremental resources will be allocated both initially and on an ongoing basis; changes in faculty roles and responsibilities to maximize the benefit of incremental resources and program mix changes; providing more autonomy to those closest to the issues and in the best position to make informed decisions, specifically faculty, department chairs, program directors, and deans.

Academic renewal should not be a one-time exercise carried out when there are no other options left. Sustainable academic renewal provides ongoing assessment and management of programs to keep them aligned with Howard’s unique mission and vision, effective in achieving their goals and efficient in the use of resources.

Given Howard’s aspirations, one central element of a process for academic renewal and responding to academic challenges must be re-budgeting of resources for the development and ongoing support of the programs that best align with the University’s mission and vision. This means a significant reduction in the number of programs and an equally significant increase in the levels of support for the programs (existing and new) that will enhance the University’s reputation for excellence. Identifying the programs that will benefit from a reallocation of resources and those that will yield the necessary resources must be done with great care, collaborative discourse and transparency. Specifically, the process for doing so must include participation by key groups—particularly the faculty—whose perspectives are further broadened with the involvement of every stakeholder group and the inclusion of external experts. The process will produce recommendations that identify the programs that will yield resources and those that will benefit from the reallocations. The evaluation of programs must be data-driven and occur at a fine level of detail; specifically at the level of individual degree programs, rather than departments or schools and colleges.
The President will appoint the “Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal” (PCAR) to guide the process and undertake the review. Members will serve not as representatives of a constituent group, rather as citizens of the University. They will function in working groups that will look respectively at graduate professional programs, graduate research programs and undergraduate programs. Over a period of six months, the Presidential Commission will develop detailed recommendations that the President will use in making final recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The Board will approve changes in the portfolio of academic programs at the University. Over the implementation period, which is intended to be three years but for some programs may take longer and for others will be quicker, the financial resources supporting the least strategically central programs will be reallocated in support of those that are deemed central to the future development of the University.

Some of the least formidable aspects of academic renewal have been addressed by the university over the last few years; now the breadth, depth and pace of the process must increase to match available opportunities and the seriousness of the challenges facing the university. Academic renewal will continue in a carefully planned fashion and in stages.

In the sections below, the following elements of the Framework are addressed: environmental factors; purpose; scope; principles; mission, vision, directions and goals; phases of academic renewal; membership and leadership of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal; the President’s role, the Commission’s charter; staff support; the evaluation framework; organization and process; faculty renewal; resource allocation; and roles, responsibilities and accountabilities.

**Environmental Factors**
Howard University’s existing academic and health sciences programs can not be developed and maintained given current and projected resources. Consequently, to produce academic and health sciences programs of the highest quality and provide those programs the necessary financial support, the university must significantly reduce the range of its offerings. Outlined below is a snapshot of some of the key environmental factors that affect Howard’s planning for enhancing its academic and health science programs. A comprehensive and up-to-date
elaboration can be found in Howard’s 2009 Self-Study done for affirmation of accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Colleges and Schools.

a. **University Resources and Fiscal Status.** University costs have risen 4.3% annually over the last 5 years, while revenue has increased 2.1% annually. The university has run large and increasing operating deficits, this being inconsistent with Trustee policy which requires a balanced budget. Beyond maintaining spending within available resources, the university must invest at a level necessary to create its preferred future, which it has not done.

While Howard must work aggressively to increase resources, its current resource base available to support academic programs is relatively stable. It would be unwise for the university to count on using resources whose availability is speculative. Thus, the development and support of programs of enhanced distinction must predominantly, although not exclusively, rely on the strategic reallocation of existing resources.

b. **University Budget including Cost Reduction.** As a critical component of the university budget process, and bringing to bear the accumulated experience and wisdom of the university community, the representative Budget Advisory Committee annually reviews all aspects of the university’s budget resulting in recommendations of cost reductions, revenue enhancements and reallocations of resources. In keeping with transparency, extraordinary amounts of budget information are available to the BAC and the entire campus to inform their review. The Faculty Senate develops its own budget recommendations for the President, who uses both the BAC and Faculty Senate recommendations. In the first year of this process the President accepted and the university is now implementing almost all of their recommendations. On the revenue side, the broadly representative Tuition and Rates Advisory Committee (TRAC) annually updates the 5-year tuition and fee plan, using its campus knowledge to balance revenue needs with affordability and other concerns. The university has other processes, including a Budget Implementation Leadership Team and a newly formed Office of Institution Effectiveness that identify areas where costs can be
reduced and service levels need to be increased. Cost savings are available for reallocation to support core purposes.

c. **Program Support.** Howard’s academic programs require significant additional funding; faculty, deans and academic administrators have consistently indicated that additional resources are needed.

d. **Range of Programs.** Independent evaluation, as well as Howard’s own experience, confirms that the university offers significantly more degree programs than it can support at a level of quality consistent with best practice or national recognition.

e. **Faculty and Salaries.** Howard must increase the salaries of its faculty to compete more effectively with comparison and aspirant institutions. The progress made in recent years must be continued.

f. **Buildings and Other Infrastructure.** Howard occupies a historic campus in the geographic center of Washington, D.C. Its roughly 100 buildings include 5.3 million square feet of space. There are more than 40 buildings greater than 60 years old. Addressing deferred maintenance is estimated to cost $150 million, while modernization of existing facilities is estimated to cost an additional $350 million.

Looking beyond deferred maintenance and the modernization of existing facilities, and excluding two libraries and the Howard University Research Building (HURB-1) building, the last academic building at Howard was constructed over 25 years ago. Howard must in the near future begin to construct a wide range of new facilities to replace aging buildings and provide additional research and teaching spaces that meet modern requirements. Several dormitory facilities need to be renovated or replaced; new construction is needed to provide a net addition of residential space.

g. **Laboratories and Teaching Spaces.** Many of the University’s research and instructional laboratories need to be modernized or replaced; teaching spaces should be prepared and equipped to support multimedia-based instruction. Improvements in these areas are necessary to create the preferred teaching/learning environment for faculty and students, particularly in the health sciences and STEM disciplines.

h. **Technology.** While the university has made considerable investment in its high speed network and Enterprise Resource Planning (i.e., primary administrative) systems,
additional investments are required. Physical, network and server infrastructures need significant capital investment as well as substantial operating resources to provide enhanced levels of service; the human infrastructure needs strengthening to support required instructional and research needs. Strategic, rather than evolutionary reallocation into technology will be necessary to build an enhanced technological environment that will attract and retain top-notch faculty and students, support leading-edge research and allow the use of today’s broad range of instructional modalities.

i. **Student Support.** The lifeblood of graduate programs is the quality of students who apply and matriculate successfully. Financial support, including fellowships and stipends, must attract and enable the attendance of high quality graduate students. While Howard’s cost of attendance, including tuition and fees, remain below market levels, its net cost of attendance remains high for the best graduate students. Fellowship support must be increased. Similarly, faculty need financial support for postdocs to support their research initiatives. Because of the demographics of its student population, Howard does provide a great deal of financial aid, but student financial aid support must be significantly expanded for Howard to achieve the aspirations of its academic programs, particularly in graduate academic and graduate professional programs.

### 3. Purpose

Howard University needs to act overtly and methodically to more effectively strategically align its resource allocations with its academic priorities. As an organization whose core deliverables are education, research and service, this involves the thoughtful and careful review of the entire range of academic and professional programs that produce these core deliverables with the intent of assessing each of them, developing recommendations and making changes. The purpose of academic renewal is to help shape the university, including its programs, expectations, performance tracking and accountability, all directed around the accomplishment of mission and attainment of vision. The academic renewal process will result in directional clarity, more program support, enhanced program quality, and enhanced operational effectiveness and productivity.
Academic renewal is not a one-time exercise. It is an ongoing process that will consistently push the university towards excellence through its clarification of expectations, alignment of resources with priorities, performance tracking and accountability. To this end, academic renewal must include the development and implementation of processes that evaluate and guide programs on a continual basis to support the attainment of excellence.

Academic renewal is designed to accomplish the following goals:

a. **Identify, develop and support programs of excellence and distinction.** Resources should be allocated, and the use of those resources managed, so that every program Howard offers is externally recognized for its quality, or is demonstrably on the way to that level of recognition. Where the resources are adequate, but such distinction is not achieved, then issues of leadership and the internal use of resources within the unit need to be addressed. Because incremental resources to accomplish this goal are not presently available, resources must be redirected from programs of lower priority to ones of higher priority.

b. **Align resource allocation with priorities** in the initial exercise and on an ongoing basis. The goal is to maintain and significantly enhance Howard as a university that by reputation and practice is a preferred place to teach, research, work and study.

c. **Enhance operational performance** expectations and make the rubric for resource allocation explicit. Academic units and individuals will know the resource allocation system and avail themselves of its use.

d. **Enhance the HU “brand”** by building academic, research and support programs that maximally align with Howard’s mission and vision and where each program is of high quality, high productivity, distinctive and distinguished.

4. **Scope**

Academic renewal is a complex process involving many interrelated aspects of university life: policy and direction, program mix and size, faculty and human resources, financial and infrastructure support, leadership and performance management. While this plan touches on all
these areas, it emphasizes program mix and size, faculty renewal, strategic allocation of resources, leadership and performance management. It is anticipated that the decisions, directions and systems that arise from academic renewal will not only result in specific changes that will be implemented, but also set the stage for ongoing renewal that will avoid the accumulation of problems.

The program prioritization component of the academic renewal process will review all Howard University academic programs, including those that offer bachelors, masters, doctoral, professional and other degrees. Minor degree programs, certificate programs and specialized programs offered by regular faculty or under the auspices of the university will be included. This will include all programs whether offered on campus or off and whether taught by tenured, tenure track or adjunct faculty. Continuing education programs and programs offered on a contractual basis for cohorts of students or for companies will not be included.

Interdisciplinary programs will be separately reviewed though the review will be done in synchrony with the parent/supporting programs. Research-only programs, whether partially or fully funded by the university, or whether they are externally/grant funded, will also be included since these programs, as with all programs, draw human and other resources from a common resource pool.

Howard is actively taking other initiatives to review, improve the performance and reduce the cost of non-academic programs. These initiatives provide stringent cost controls, measure and improve performance, instill accountability, and reengineer processes to increase service levels and reduce cost. Because non-academic programs and functions are being addressed through these other initiatives, all non-academic programs (e.g., the Registrar’s Office, the purchasing function) are excluded from the academic renewal process described here.

Academic renewal will result in a revised portfolio of academic programs. The organizational structure that will be most appropriate for this revised portfolio will have to be determined after the full set of recommendations has been approved by the Board of Trustees. Thus, while the Presidential Commission may suggest possible interdisciplinary programs, identify opportunities
for program co-location or merger, recognize the potential for joint efforts and the sharing of resources, and so forth, final decisions about organizational structure will only follow decisions about program priority, size and the other specific recommendations of the academic portfolio process.

5. Principles
Academic renewal at Howard is not an ad hoc exercise. It is one based on explicitly stated principles, including the ones described below.

a. The basis for program continuation and support and the central touchstone of evaluation is program quality. The quality and productivity of Howard’s educational offerings and research and its working/learning environment will determine Howard’s competitiveness, its continued recognition as a national resource and its ability to achieve its aspiration to be a top-50 research university.

b. Externally accepted benchmarks should continue to be a major component in the evaluation of program quality at Howard. For example, Howard’s framework for ongoing assessment of graduate research programs should be heavily influenced by the nationally accepted measures used by the National Research Council.

c. The mission and vision of the university are not up for review -- they were recently reaffirmed by the Board of Trustees. These form the pole star on which Howard’s academic programs, research, services and environment need to align.

d. Academic renewal for Howard University at this time is not a luxury or an option: the evidence is unambiguous that Howard has more programs than it can support to a level of quality consistent with the expectations of its stakeholders and to its aspirations. Consequently, while there cannot be a rush to judgment, unnecessary delay is not in the university’s best interest. The proposed timetable balances careful consideration with the need for action.

e. The university’s Board of Trustees, President, Provost, Senior VP for Health Sciences and other academic leadership are unequivocal about the need for academic renewal. They have been clear that, despite its difficulty, academic program review and enhancement must proceed for the good of the institution.
The academic renewal process must be valid, open and transparent. The campus, and particularly the faculty, must have the opportunity to review and share in the refinement of the process, endorse its goals and methods, and recognize the types and timelines of the outcomes. Faculty must have a chance to provide data for consideration in the program evaluation process; help interpret that data, and review evaluations and recommendations drawn from the data.

The renewal process should involve a planned and scheduled set of steps that includes frequent and intense engagement with the campus. The process should draw upon campus and constituent knowledge of programs, their creativity, and their determination and drive to help the campus attain its vision.

Program evaluation must be data driven and apply the same evaluation criteria to all programs. While the program evaluation process compares all Howard’s programs as of one moment in time, it cannot be inward looking, but must also reference accepted standards and external benchmarks, including those of our comparison and aspirant institutions.

The unit of evaluation is the program (not the department, specialty, or school/college). Organizational units may house (or share) a number of programs, which may be of different centrality, quality, level and resource use, and be subject to differing recommendations and outcomes.

Academic renewal is neither a one-time fix nor a cure all. Rather, it is a guided, ongoing process that will help the university systematically deal with many interrelated aspects of program mix, resource support, faculty renewal, unit and individual responsibilities and the campus teaching/learning/research environment.

Academic renewal will be conducted consistent with the existing governance structure and processes. Presidential and Trustee approval will be requested for any changes or deviations to allow the academic renewal process to proceed, should that be needed.

In implementing the recommendations of the academic renewal process, where required, current students will be protected in a manner consistent with university policies and regulations.
6. **Mission, Vision, Directions and Goals**

In June of 2009, the Board of Trustees adopted a revised Mission Statement that increases the emphasis on research at all levels, explicitly includes internationalization and recognizes the role of the university in providing educational opportunities to students of high academic standing and potential. Howard’s revised Mission Statement reads:

*Howard University, a culturally diverse, comprehensive, research intensive and 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, with particular emphasis upon 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, 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.*

In September 2000, the Board adopted the *Strategic Framework for Action II* with its four overarching goals, two of which are directly related to academic programs: (1) strengthening academic programs and services and (2) promoting excellence in teaching and research. (Goals three and four are associated with increasing private support and enhancing national and community service.) Academic renewal explicitly addresses and helps to realize the two overarching academic goals.

After discussion and consultation with all campus stakeholders, President Ribeau has articulated a vision for Howard that reinforces an environment of academic freedom; sharpens academic offerings and quality; devotes increased attention to graduate programs; develops a more robust research agenda with increased productivity; expands service to the
nation and the world; improves the gender balance in enrollment, retention, and graduation; internationalizes academic and research activity; and diversifies and strengthens academic, public, and private sector partnerships in the United States and abroad. The vision anticipates the improvement of the student experience by providing access to programs, each of which is of unsurpassed quality, offers a rich personal and professional development experience, and supports these with access to first rate services. As a whole, these describe a future Howard that is the preferred place to learn, teach, research and work.

As articulated by President Ribeau, this vision of the Howard of the future is consonant with its mission and promotes the development of the quality of its academic and health science programs through a strong commitment to assessment, evaluation, and accountability. A substantive reflection of this vision and these long-term goals is that Howard will be an AAU school and in the top 50 research universities in the US as measured by extramural research dollars as well as by the nine quality indicators of top-50 schools specified by The Center for Measuring University Performance. External guidelines and benchmarks need to inform our internal assessments using National Research Council and related rankings and standards. In setting a goal of being a top-50 research university, Howard has explicitly recognized that external standards will continue to be embedded in its goals and in the way it will measure its own performance. Howard’s commitment to nationally competitive graduate programs is not competitive with and in fact is fully supportive of its commitment to top quality undergraduate education, as clearly demonstrated by the top rankings of undergraduate programs at all AAU schools.

7. Phases of Academic Renewal

Academic renewal is an ongoing process of alignment of institutional direction with the academic and research programs that instantiate that direction. Renewal involves changes in program mix through the differential allocation of resources, changes in emphasis within existing programs, and changes in the leadership direction and administration of programs. Academic renewal at Howard has been delineated as occurring in three phases. Phase 1, which ran between September 2006 and July 2009, used the administrative structures of each school and college to examine program demand, availability and use of resources, and the
efficiency in the use of those resources. Phase 1 resulted in cost reduction strategies and
improvements in efficiency in some areas. Deans, in consultation with their department
chairs and faculty, made university-wide and program specific assessments and
recommendations. The data and analysis of Phase 1 shaped $11 million of budget reductions
in Academic Affairs and $5 million of reductions in Health Sciences, which were necessary
to address a $43 million university budget deficit for FY 2010.

Phase 2 of academic renewal will run from July 2009 through July 2010. Phase 2 focuses on
putting systems in place that will measure and assess cost and performance and provide the
basis for ongoing accountability. A goal of Phase 2 is to create a system that proactively and
on a continuing basis aligns resources with priorities, avoiding the future accumulation of
issues around program mix and resource adequacy. Phase 3 of academic renewal engages
the campus (September 2009 to May 2010) to evaluate and prioritize all of Howard’s degree-
granting programs. Using a Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal to lead the
process, all of Howard’s programs will be assessed and prioritized resulting in
recommendations to the President about changes in program investment, size, and direction.
The President will use the Commission’s recommendations together with those of the Faculty
Senate to formulate his recommendations. The President will forward his recommendations,
together with those of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal and those of the
Faculty Senate to the Board of Trustees. The Board will consider and formally approve
policies that encompass overall academic direction, program mix, and the program
investment and development strategy.

The goal is to implement changes in program mix over a three year period, though based on
individual program circumstances in some cases this will take longer and in some cases this
can be shorter. Given Board approval sometime after the end of the 2009-10 academic year,
primary implementation can be expected to extend through AY 2013-14. As program mix
changes are implemented, resources will be reallocated, programs will reach or move
towards their recommended size, new modes of operation will be implemented, and a new
system will be put in place to maintain alignment of resources with priorities. It is expected
that implementation will provide each of Howard’s academic programs with substantial
additional resources for faculty salaries, modernization, laboratories, local infrastructure, equipment, research and student support and other pressing needs. Phase 3 of academic renewal is described in detail below.

8. **Phase 1 (September 2006 – July 2009)**

   In a process that began in the 2006-07 academic year, each program in the Academic Affairs Portfolio was assessed for efficiency, use of resources, and demand for the program. The size of various graduate specializations was a particular focus. Deans provided recommendations about possible program changes based on demand, cost and strategic fit (i.e., alignment of the programs with the university’s mission and vision). The evaluation considered detailed performance measures of demand for programs, the prevalence of low-enrollment courses and faculty workload. Phase 1 also looked at the possible restructuring of the undergraduate experience, interdisciplinary research centers and new initiatives for libraries and continuing education.

   The use of data collected during Phase 1 allowed Academic Affairs to reduce its costs (primarily related to voluntary staff separations) and make efficiency improvements of approximately $11 million. Health Sciences reduced its costs by approximately $5 million. Several program changes recommended by departments and approved by the relevant Dean were made. Major changes to the university’s portfolio of academic/health sciences programs were not made during Phase 1.

9. **Phase 2 (July 2009 – July 2010)**

   Building on the earlier work, Phase 2 focuses on standards, systems and accountability. Working with deans and department chairs, the Provost and Senior Vice President for Health Sciences will refine/develop and implement systems for record keeping and performance tracking for faculty and for academic units. Workload expectations across the realm of faculty responsibility including levels and types of teaching, research/scholarship/creativity activity, and service, will be refined and documented. Systems and standards are foundational tools for the data-based administration of programs and serve as guides for faculty assignment, performance evaluation and advising. Measured performance will
inform academic leadership in its decision making; be a central factor in the allocation of financial, space and human resources; and provide input into the faculty performance evaluation system.

The goal of Phase 2 of academic renewal is to put systems in place that measure and report the alignment of (unit and individual) performance with organizational objectives. Faculty/units that are performing better (knowledge derived from measurement) with respect to institutional goals should receive preferential access to resources. Phase 2, therefore, is about measures, standards, and systems that define, assess and drive effective performance – allowing assessment of efficiency for the purposes of improving resource allocation. Many of Howard’s degree programs both now and going forward are inherently high cost ones, such as those in the health sciences and STEM areas. Howard should focus on programs that are central to its mission and that it can deliver with excellence, regardless of whether the program is of high cost or not. It is not a goal of academic renewal to have the university identify and then specialize in low cost programs. Rather, as more resources are deployed to various programs, the university needs to know their costs and productivity to ensure that allocation of limited resources directs these resources into areas where they will be most effectively used.

10. Phase 3 (Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal: September 2009 – May 2010; Implementation: Three year period following Trustee approval though varying to accommodate individual program circumstances)

Overview. Phase 3 of academic renewal is multi-faceted, but will inevitably be seen as focusing on the review and modification of Howard University’s portfolio of academic and health science programs. Phase 3 also includes components that integrate with and support a revised portfolio: faculty renewal, resource allocation, organizational structure, and leadership/accountability. Each of these components will be described in detail.

The academic renewal process utilizes the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal – a broad-based group representing the campus and consisting predominantly of distinguished academics from Howard and Howard’s comparison and aspirant schools – which will refine,
guide, and carry out an evaluation of each Howard academic/health science program over the course of the 2009-10 academic year. The Presidential Commission will produce findings which describe the performance and potential of each of Howard’s degree programs. These findings will serve as the basis for recommendations about each program including whether each should be expanded, maintained or consolidated, downsized or eliminated. The portfolio review and reshaping will lead to redirecting resources from the lowest priority programs to the programs that are to be retained and strengthened; as discussed earlier, each program that Howard offers in the future must be given the resources and direction that enables success. While success of a program cannot be guaranteed, failure is guaranteed if resources and their appropriate direction are not provided. The goal, through an open and engaged process of program prioritization, is to offer a narrower group of programs each of which is supported to a level that enables excellence, and staffed and led in a way that will achieve that excellence.

**Program Prioritization.** Portfolio assessment for strategic purposes is different than the “program reviews” often required by governing boards. Program reviews, often done every five years on a rotating basis, sometimes utilizing off-campus reviewers, are self-assessments primarily intended to guide program improvement. Program prioritization is a strategic process that allows the comparison of the relative merit and centrality of programs to the institution’s mission and vision. Prioritization compares all programs as of a given moment in time and serves as the basis for resource decisions, specifically the allocation of the institution’s limited resources to best accomplish the mission and pursue the vision. Both program review and program prioritization provide information useful for program improvement, but the primary purpose of each is quite different. Program prioritization explicitly evaluates and compares the university’s entire portfolio of programs for purposes of resource allocation and decisions about program investment/growth, consolidation/reduction, or even elimination, where program review does not compare all programs nor strategically align the program mix with the university’s mission and vision within the institution’s prevailing environment.
Membership and Leadership of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal. The University President will appoint the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal with membership including Howard faculty, staff, students, administrators, and external members. Faculty, including some of Howard’s leading scholars and educators will form a majority. External members include senior academic/health science administrators from some of the country’s most distinguished universities, distinguished scholars and researchers, one Trustee, one alumnus and one representative of the DC community. It should be emphasized that this is a Howard Commission, not an external review, with Howard’s outstanding scholars and educators playing the central role. The Commission will be chaired by the Interim Provost and Chief Academic Officer.

The President will request that the Faculty Senate, the Academic Council of each School/College, the Howard University Staff organization, and the Howard University Student Association nominate members, as per Table 1 (see p. 23). The President may appoint additional ‘at large’ members. Members of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal, while bringing their unique perspectives, will serve not as representatives of a particular group, constituency, college/school or department, but as citizens of the university. In a very real sense the future of Howard, its reputation and its ability to move towards its vision depends on the ability of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal to come together, confirm methodology, meaningfully engage the campus, collect and assess data, and make recommendations that reflect difficult but necessary change.

Presidential Role. The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal is appointed and initially convened by the President, who will remain actively engaged throughout the process. The Commission, through its leadership, reports to the President. The Commission’s role is to make clear recommendations based on its charter and this plan. The President is responsible for Howard’s academic renewal; he will assist the Commission as it plays its central and critical role. Among its duties, the Presidential Commission is to review the group’s purposes and charter, clarifying these with the President as needed. They will organize themselves and develop the internal structure of working groups as described below.
### Table 1
Membership of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Number of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate nominates 6 members, whom the President has agreed to appoint</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Councils for each of 12 Schools and Colleges; each nominates two faculty members and President selects at least 1 from each Council</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Deans recommended by the Provost and SVPHS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 External Commissioners which will include at least one alumnus and one community representative; each of the 4 working groups will have 2 External Commissioners</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUSO nominates 8 staff; President selects 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUSA nominates 8 students (two from each program group: undergraduate, graduate academic, graduate professional in the health sciences, and graduate professional from other than health sciences); President chooses 4 (one from each category)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustee (will participate in all the working groups)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair (Provost); Vice-Chair (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential at-large appointments</td>
<td>39 plus at-large appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>39 plus at-large appointments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Charter of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal.** It cannot be overemphasized that where program prioritization is being done with important outcomes hinging on the result, process is critical. The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal will be responsible for taking the process described in this plan, refining it as necessary and executing it to produce recommendations of program size, continuation, investment and direction by May 2010. Despite the status and position of the Presidential Commission, it is only through the Commission’s engagement with the campus that the recommendations derived from its work and ultimately forwarded to the Board will have the credibility to be accepted and confidently implemented by the campus over succeeding years.
As a first priority, the Presidential Commission must ensure that the campus is well informed throughout the program assessment and prioritization process and that the campus is given regular and planned opportunities to engage and contribute. This will require developing a communications plan, maintaining a website, providing regular communications throughout the year (email, advertisements, etc.), having open fora, responding to email inquiries, sharing data developed during the process and giving individuals and units an opportunity to improve the accuracy and completeness of data, and evaluate and comment upon recommendations.

The Presidential Commission will review and refine the program evaluation and prioritization process, including the framework and methodology guiding the assessment of programs. They will review the timelines for carrying out their responsibilities, while recognizing that recommendations to the President must be received by the President by May 2010. Recognizing that valid assessment is based on relevant, reliable data, the Commission will determine what data it needs to evaluate programs and oversee staff that will ensure that this data is collected, organized and available. The Commission will analyze the data and develop recommendations, which it will provide to the President.

**Support of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal.** The chair of the Presidential Commission will designate staff to support the work of the commission. This will include two staff members for data management and analysis, two to work with schools/colleges and departments in collecting and confirming data and securing their analysis, and one full-time communications person to keep the campus informed of the work of the Commission and support the broader engagement process. The offices of the President, Provost, and Senior VP for Health Sciences will each designate an individual to ensure that their offices are supporting the work of the Commission.

**Evaluation Framework.** Early in its work the Presidential Commission must refine the specific framework against which academic programs will be evaluated. While often this type of evaluation uses five to ten composite criteria, the following six are to be used unless otherwise changed or modified. At the will of the Commission, these could be further separated into a
larger list, further combined, and otherwise modified. Any request to substitute a totally
different evaluation framework would have to be approved by the President.

The university has said it is committed to STEM and Health Sciences. It is up to the Presidential
Commission to recommend a coherent, consistent set of programs, including STEM and the
Health Sciences, that it believes best captures Howard’s historic legacy and role as applied for
new generations of students. As the Commission carries out its role in evaluating programs and
making its recommendations, it must keep in mind what was stated earlier: the nation needs
Howard; Howard cannot let the nation down; and no other institution can do what Howard does!

Howard’s role has been and must continue to be to produce leaders for the nation and the world,
including the next generation of the nation’s professors, persons who will make exceptional
contributions in public service and highly educated professionals who will reach the highest
ranks of their fields. While quantitative measurement and the use of algorithms can inform their
evaluation process, the Commission should recommend degree programs in those areas in which
the nation has the greatest need for leaders, and specifically leaders that are best and often
irreplaceably produced by Howard University. Thus the decisions about Howard’s program
portfolio should not be based just on whether Howard can attract enough appropriately qualified
students into a program, nor even whether Howard could offer a high quality program in a
particular area or discipline -- the Commission’s analysis must be informed by wisdom about
those areas in which the nation and the world need Howard’s irreplaceable contributions.

Howard needs to provide great programs, both undergraduate and graduate, in the context of
Howard’s distinct role and national responsibility. The starting point for the refinement of the
criteria for the prioritization of Howard’s programs is outlined and described below. Once
conceptually refined, each criterion within the evaluation framework must be operationally
defined. For example, under the academic quality criterion, the Commission needs to determine
which aspects of academic quality will be included in the assessment, and how they will be
measured. It must assign weights to the various components that form the composite academic
quality assessment. The relevance and importance of each criterion in the framework, as opposed
to the availability of data or the ease of measurement must be the determining factor in the
establishment of the evaluation framework. The initial framework for the Commission, which will be refined and adopted by the Commission, is described below. Similarly, initial weights for each criterion within the evaluation framework are provided, but the Commission will determine the weights it will use.

1. **Tie to Mission/Vision**: [Weight 20%] Relationship of each program to Howard’s distinctive Mission, Vision, and goals. This includes recognition of Howard’s legacy, distinctiveness and irreplaceable role in producing leaders in their fields to serve the nation and the world. “Tie to Mission/Vision” also recognizes the university’s presence in the nation’s capital and Howard’s responsibilities that accrue from its annual receipt of very substantial Federal financial support. The contribution of each program to Howard’s commitment to public and community service is included here, as well as the development of new knowledge that supports its service, social and economic roles (i.e., this includes each program’s research / scholarly products and its creative activity in support of Howard’s Mission). Of particular significance is each program’s contributions to the African American community and the African Diaspora.

2. **Academic Quality**: [Weight 30%] Academic quality is the key to Howard’s enduring value, ability to deliver on its historic mission and its future competitiveness. The definition or measurement of academic quality incorporates academic reputation; student success; graduate placement; faculty vitality including innovation, scholarship and creative activity; program visibility and recognition; program performance in producing graduates and graduation rates; performance against externally defined learning outcomes; performance against internally specified learning outcomes; quality of student scholarship; and academic awards and honors.

3. **Research**: [Weight 20%] Howard’s most distinctive and irreplaceable contribution in the future will be its education of scholars and researchers (including undergraduates who will continue on and become leaders in their fields), and production by faculty and students of new knowledge. The operative definition of research within the evaluation framework includes: externally funded research; scholarly publications, books, citations; honors and awards; scholarly/creative productivity unrelated to funding; quantity and quality of graduate and undergraduate student research; extent to which research addresses problems of national importance or makes significant contributions to human
knowledge (with special recognition of research that relates to issues distinctive to HU’s Mission and Vision and the African American community).

4. **Academic Centrality and Necessity:** [Weight 10%] The extent to which a particular program provides core academic components or is it a needed precursor to other programs (i.e., are the program or are the faculty necessary to be able to offer other programs that will be in the university’s portfolio); comparative advantage vis a vis other providers of comparable educational/research services.

5. **Enrollment:** [Weight 10%] To be successful a degree program must be able to attract enough students, have them matriculate and successfully complete their course of study. The enrollment criterion includes having sufficient numbers of students and the ability to develop and maintain the desired student profile for its student population including: measured performance/potential (e.g., entrance scores and other qualifications), areas/disciplines of preparation, geographic distribution, gender, and so forth. The ability to manage enrollment including matriculation, retention and graduation rates and the time to degree are included here, as well as Howard’s own and national enrollment trends and their impact on being able to mount and continue an academic program.

6. **Sustainability:** [Weight 10%] Sustainability includes the ability of a program to access resources including external resources and then to use those resources effectively for the achievement of program goals. Sustainability includes cost effectiveness and the efficient use of resources; access to external resources; fund raising; being a source of national prestige and visibility for itself and the University as a whole; and the strength of the program’s support network as established by a demonstrated record of external support and assistance.

**Organization and Process.** The unit of evaluation will be the degree program, and not the organizational unit such as department or school/college. University records indicate that there are 181 distinct degree programs, in addition to interdisciplinary degrees which may be awarded. Because of the scope of the work in evaluating such a large portfolio, the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal will do much of its work through four working groups. There will be a working group for each of the following groups of degree programs:
• Undergraduate programs (Group A)
• Graduate academic programs (Group B)
• Graduate professional programs in the health sciences (Group C)
• Graduate professional programs other than in the health sciences (Group D)

While the working groups will each be dealing with a different set of degree programs, their work will be coordinated. Recommendations of the Presidential Commission will be taken from these coordinated results, with the Commission operating in plenary session.

Key steps in the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal process include:
• Clarify the charge and timeline with the President
• Set up internal structures of the Commission, working groups and any needed policies
• Refine the evaluation framework and establish operational definitions of each criterion
• With staff support manage the data collection process
• Develop findings and preliminary assessments
• Develop and publish preliminary recommendations
• Develop and publish final recommendations
• Presidential review, development of recommendations and publication
• Trustee approval

The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal must share its progress and outcomes with the campus at each step above. For example, the evaluation framework and the operational definitions of each criterion must be made available to the campus, and the campus must be given an opportunity for meaningful participation and to provide feedback. Similarly, when program data have been collected from central and departmental sources about individual programs, that data must be made available (for example via the Commission’s website) so that not only may the specific department correct and comment upon the data, but campus members generally may see, reflect upon and forward comments as well.

**Recommendations.** The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal will publish preliminary recommendations and after receiving feedback from the campus submit final
recommendations to the President by May 2010. The elements of the recommendations for each
degree program will include:

a. Narrative text about status, strengths, issues and problems
b. Program assessment using the agreed evaluation framework on the accumulated
   program data and its interpretation
c. Program recommendation including growth, maintenance, downsizing, consolidation or elimination.
d. Program prioritization indicator (rank order or otherwise)
e. Program size (denominated in students), with a recommended size trajectory year by year over the next 5 years
f. Optionally, narrative text about directions or possible directions, as appropriate. In some cases the Commission may wish to indicate the program’s potential for utilizing investment/additional funds or may highlight key resource needs.
g. Optionally, the Commission may make organizational suggestions or identify the opportunity for consolidation or program merger.
h. Interdependence. This includes the identification of interdependencies across levels, disciplines and specialized resources. Specifically the role of the faculty, coursework and research support by the program or unit in support of other degree programs should be identified.

Formally approved interdisciplinary programs will be evaluated with the same approach as programs within a single discipline or department. Organizational changes may optionally be suggested by the Commission. Given the scope and complexity of its task, the Commission’s primary responsibility is the evaluation of every program against the agreed common framework, along with prioritization and a size recommendation for each program.

Interdependencies of Programs. Each academic program has various dependencies. Graduate programs ordinarily use faculty and classes that are offered by other areas, at other levels and in other degree programs. Core and support courses in an undergraduate degree program are also often required or optional courses in other academic units and academic programs. The recommendations for program changes must take these interdependencies into account. For
example, it would not be internally consistent to recommend keeping a Ph.D. program whose instructional requirements include academic coursework in a program that is being eliminated. However, the need for a cadre of faculty who offer specialized coursework or research support in a particular area does not necessarily require that degree programs continue in that area. Faculty and coursework/support can be offered through another area or the attachment of these people/resources to an interdisciplinary center, for example. Academic renewal requires that we disavow the assertion that since we have specialized faculty and offer specialized support in a particular area, and thus since “it won’t cost us any more,” we should offer degree programs in all our areas of specialization. Deans and faculty will be key resources in identifying these interdependencies and developing recommendations that take them into account. The final recommendations of the Presidential Commission must recognize interdependencies across degree levels (e.g., bachelors, masters and Ph.D. degrees in a particular area), programs (e.g., biochemistry and health science programs), and access to specialized resources.

**Four Categories of Programs.** The following sections describe the differences in the prioritization process for graduate professional programs in the health sciences, graduate professional programs outside the health sciences, graduate academic programs, and undergraduate programs.

**Graduate Professional Programs.** One working group of the Presidential Commission will review, prioritize and make recommendations about graduate professional programs in the health sciences (e.g., Medicine, Dentistry), while another will work on those programs outside the health sciences (e.g., Law, Business).

An overarching goal and related plans for academic renewal for graduate professional programs is to make them more independent and autonomous fiscally and operationally with significantly greater latitude for school/college leadership by deans and faculty. Mutually supportive and cooperative relationships across organizational units need to be maintained and even strengthened as units operate with increased autonomy within the university’s common goals and policy framework. The prioritization process needs to be done in light of this increased autonomy. Within the policy framework established by the university and with its general
oversight (though with continued use of many centrally provided services to avoid duplication),
graduate professional programs will assume more responsibility and operate with far greater
independence in the following areas:

1. Creation of the learning, research and work environment
2. Hiring and compensation consistent with the university’s goals, strategies and
   performance ranges
3. Developing tuition and fee recommendations for the President who will make his
   recommendations to the Board of Trustees
4. Fellowships and other forms of student aid
5. Grant development and securing research-based external support for salaries and
   infrastructure, coordinated through Research and Compliance
6. Fund raising, coordinated with the university’s central advancement efforts and those of
   other units
7. Maintenance and development of local infrastructure. Local plans will be coordinated
   and consistent with the campus master plan and the major capital needs planning process
   as well as the university’s centrally managed deferred maintenance and modernization
   program. This will allow local needs to be prioritized in awareness of university plans
   and avoid duplication of centrally provided infrastructure such as technology
   infrastructure.
8. Leadership and administration of the unit’s academic and fiscal enterprise

Graduate professional programs will move towards negotiated, relatively fixed or slowly
evolving levels of University support. Within the university’s policy envelope, under the
leadership of the dean, each graduate professional program will manage its own affairs.
Increased revenues for faculty salaries and support, research, infrastructure, student stipends,
postdocs, and other needs, consistent with university policy, will increasingly become the
responsibility of the unit. The goal of each graduate professional degree program must be to
deliver education and research of the highest quality and which achieves national distinction; if
the university’s support level will not allow a program of the desired quality for, say, 200
students for example, it will become the unit’s responsibility to raise additional revenues,
improve operations, narrow specializations, and downsize or in some cases eliminate programs in favor of those with greater promise and centrality.

As the locus of responsibility evolves so does the role of the dean. Each dean, working with faculty and other stakeholders, will assume more administrative and financial authority, including responsibility for developing resources in support of the school/college’s degree programs and research. Since Howard’s goal is that every program be of high quality and meritorious of national recognition, deans, working with department chairs and faculty will be responsible for establishing metrics and consistently applying them for measuring and assessing performance including against externally recognized standards. Disciplinary accreditation is an important accomplishment but not necessarily an indicator that a program has achieved the highest levels of distinction.

For each graduate professional program in the health sciences the working group, in keeping with the evaluative model, will produce recommendations including for each program at least a program narrative, recommended continuation and size pattern covering the next five years, and priority ranking. Based on recommendations approved by the Board of Trustees, resources within the health sciences will be redirected from programs of lower to higher priority. Once approved, implementation of the recommendations will occur as quickly as possible consistent with the need to assist current students, manage faculty availability and effectively use the resources which will be redeployed.

The working group for graduate professional programs outside the health sciences will produce recommendations for each program that include at least a program narrative, recommended continuation and size pattern covering the next five years, and priority ranking. Program recommendations approved by the Board of Trustees will guide resource reallocation across degree-granting programs, including in some cases the downsizing or elimination of programs. Following reallocation, intermediate-term levels of university financial support will be set for each graduate professional program. Operating more autonomously as described above, it will then be up to the dean and school/college to achieve the requisite level of program quality and
national recognition while operating within the specified level of university financial support, as supplemented by additional resources developed under the aegis of the school/college.

**Graduate Academic Programs.** Howard leads the nation in awarding Ph.D.s to African Americans and it is through this role, particularly its contribution to the nation’s future professoriate and research community, that much of Howard’s reputation and influence will be based. One of the Presidential Commission’s four working groups will prioritize Howard’s Master’s and Ph.D. granting programs using the methodology described above and producing recommendations including program narrative, program continuation and size, and others as set forth above. These recommendations will be coordinated with the work products of the other working groups, with recommendations from the Presidential Commission going to the President. He will make his recommendation to the Board, which will make final decisions.

While no specific dollar or percentage reallocation is mandated, substantial reallocations are necessary since reallocations on the order of 5 - 10 percent will not address the significant underfunding that is universally recognized. As an example only, in order to increase average funding levels for Howard’s graduate academic programs by 50% to address their critical resource needs and provide them the necessary resources to allow them to effectively compete, graduate academic programs representing approximately 30% of the cost of graduate academic programs would have to be redeployed from lower priority to those higher priority programs on which the future of the university rests. The Commission’s responsibility is to produce program recommendations that include priorities and size trajectories among other deliverables. The Commission is not being asked to specify percentage or dollar amounts of resources which will be reallocated.

Reallocation will take place over a three year implementation period, varying based on individual program circumstances. Students currently enrolled in programs will be assisted in completing their programs or will avail themselves of special arrangements. Incremental allocations will be strategic. Using the numbers above as an example, a 30% reallocation would provide the median program an incremental increase of approximately 15% per year for 3 years so that, after three years, the representative graduate academic program would have
approximately 50% additional resources beyond that with which they presently operate. Consistent with the university’s goals, strategies and policies, these funds will be used to:

1. Increase salaries
2. Provide professional development opportunities and support professional accomplishment (e.g., research needs, student assistants, travel, etc.)
3. Provide graduate students with competitive fellowships and stipends
4. Bring postdocs to Howard to support major research projects
5. Modernize and acquire local (program specific) infrastructure including labs and equipment
6. Support research including funding for capacity building, exploratory work, small initial grants, grant writing, and start ups (specialized labs) for promising new and continuing faculty
7. Provide technical and staff support.

Effective academic renewal for graduate academic programs requires that very substantial funds be reallocated. To ensure that these funds are used strategically, incremental funds will be allocated using the proposal process described in the ‘Resource Allocation and School/Department Planning’ section of the Academic Renewal Plan. Each academic program requesting funds for a particular purpose (for example to modernize a lab; hire a new faculty member and provide her with the requisite startup package; or to offer a specific number of competitive graduate stipends) will submit proposals which will determine the allocation of incremental funds.

As with graduate professional programs, graduate academic programs will operate with more autonomy than in the past, though predominant responsibility for fiscal support of graduate academic programs will remain with the university. Department chairs, deans and faculty will develop and implement more of their own plans, make more of the decisions about the allocation of available resources, and take more responsibility for the development and execution of extramurally funded research. Faculty, department chairs and deans will establish metrics for measuring and assessing performance including against externally recognized standards. These metrics must then applied, year by year, with the results being published to the university so it
can track and celebrate each unit’s progressive success in achieving long term performance goals. Deans, department chairs and faculty will assume greater responsibility for developing partnerships and securing gifts.

**Undergraduate Programs.** The majority of Howards’s students are undergraduates. Academic renewal is as critical for undergraduate programs as it is for graduate and professional programs, but because of the nature of undergraduate programs program assessment and prioritization will proceed a somewhat differently. Specifically, academic renewal for undergraduate programs has to recognize the varied roles undergraduate courses fulfill in undergraduate curricula. Departments offer undergraduate coursework to create major programs of study. They also offer courses that serve as required and support courses for the core, and for majors and minors offered by other departments. One of the Commission’s working groups will review undergraduate programs. This review in its approach and recommendations will differentiate between major degree programs (“majors”) and courses offered in support of the undergraduate core and academic programs offered by other departments (“service courses”).

**Undergraduate major programs** will be simultaneously reviewed per the evaluation framework and criteria specified above, producing recommendations that include each of the stated elements. Additionally the Commission may offer recommendations for quality and efficiency improvements that may include program changes, narrowing of offerings or specializations, faculty development, hiring, infrastructure and support, faculty deployment, infrastructure modernization, staff support and other requirements to achieve departmental and university quality goals.

As with graduate academic programs, for undergraduate programs no specific dollar or percentage amount for reallocation is mandated, but the goal of academic renewal is to substantially align resources with priorities, and not merely take tentative or timid steps albeit in the right direction. Substantial reallocation in undergraduate programs is needed since most programs are seriously underfunded. As an example only, in order to increase average funding levels for undergraduate degree programs by an average of 33%, the resources supporting approximately 25% of the overall cost of undergraduate programs would have to be redeployed.
from lower priority to the higher priority programs. The Commission’s responsibility is to produce recommendations that include program priorities and size trajectories among other deliverables. The Commission is not being asked to specify percentage or dollar amounts of resources which will be reallocated.

Resource reallocation will occur over a 3 year implementation period, which will vary based on individual program circumstances. Students enrolled in affected programs will be assisted in completing their programs and special arrangements will be offered where necessary.

Resources will be reallocated strategically, not across-the-board, using methodology in which departments propose the use of incremental funds for specific purposes consistent with the university’s policy and strategy. Resource uses include modernized local infrastructure, facilities and equipment; faculty salaries; improved support; and other needs as identified by the faculty, department chair and dean. The intent is that in the future every one of Howard’s undergraduate programs will have the resources it needs to become and maintain the status of a program of distinction.

Service courses will be subject to a different review. The intent is to review service offerings for purposes of improving quality and increasing efficiency. The Presidential Commission working group for undergraduate programs will identify the number of faculty (not specific courses) who are necessary to teach the anticipated number of FTE students who will take service courses offered by the department. In addition to observations about quality and the needed faculty resource for delivering the service load, the Presidential Commission may make recommendations about the overall number of different courses which are offered (not comments about specific courses), general observations about curricula, methods, infrastructure, needed resources and leadership. Guided by the Office of the Provost, over the implementation period, departments will make changes in their delivery of service courses to respond to quality-related recommendations as well as to capture the savings from rightsizing and improved efficiency in the delivery of service courses.
**Managing the Academic Enterprise.** Academic renewal extends beyond analysis and reconfiguration of the academic portfolio to include different ways of managing the academic enterprise on a continuing basis. Changes include:

1. New roles for academic leadership including deans and department chairs as they use increased autonomy to improve the teaching/learning, working and research environments
2. Systematic measurement of performance at the level of the Dean/school/college, department chair/department/unit, program and the individual faculty member; ongoing quality assessment using agreed-upon and externally grounded standards
3. Larger role for research (particularly externally funded research), scholarly and creative activity and inclusion of students in graduate and undergraduate research
4. More attention to external fund raising, reputation-building activities, outreach to prospective students and to faculty recruitment.

**11. Resource Allocation and School/Department Planning**

One major outcome of the academic renewal process will be to provide significant incremental resources to programs on a strategic basis. To ensure that the funds that are being redeployed are used in an optimal way, academic programs will propose how they will use incremental funds to sustain or strengthen levels of excellence in instruction and research. Uses of incremental funds (such as for faculty salary increases, faculty hiring, local infrastructure, modernization, equipment, faculty development, student stipends and financial aid, postdocs, new faculty ‘start-up packages,’ etc.) must clearly contribute to program capacity and delivery, while being aligned with and helping achieve broader university goals. With increased local decision-making and autonomy, increased attention will be directed to ensuring that resource allocation and use are consistent with university policy and strategy. The allocation of incremental resources must strategically support, help attain and/or further strengthen excellence in teaching and learning and research as measured by externally grounded standards of performance.

In preparation for this allocation of incremental resources, during AY2010-11 and concurrently with the work of the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal, each program through its parent department(s) will prepare plans for how it would use incremental resources of 15% per
year to move to, sustain or enhance excellence. While, as noted throughout the plan, actual resource reallocations have not been determined, the 15% figure is useful as each program develops (or refines existing) plans for how it would strategically utilize a significant increase in resources. Plans are also being requested for each program’s/department’s proposed use of an additional 15% budgetary increase in each of the following two academic years, though these plans for later years will necessarily be less specific. Proposals prepared by programs/departments for their use of incremental resources will be reviewed after programmatic recommendations have been approved by the Board of Trustees, with the first annual allocations being made as quickly as possible after program recommendations have been received. Program/department plans will be updated and new allocations made on a year by year basis thereafter.

12. Faculty Renewal
Faculty are the central and most important resource of the university; the university’s core deliverables are the product of faculty expertise and effort. Howard’s legacy is built on faculty contribution, and Howard’s ability to deliver on its mission for generations of new students and to address the nation’s problems depends on having a vital, motivated, skilled and up-to-date faculty engaged with students, their disciplines and the life of the mind. Supporting faculty in teaching, research and professional development, while also anticipating and planning for phased transitions as new faculty are hired, faculty advance throughout in their careers, separate from the university or retire – faculty renewal – is a key element of broad-based academic renewal at Howard.

The following sections should not be seen as commitments but suggest the university’s current proposed alternatives for faculty compensation goals and strategy, faculty professional development, and a Faculty VSIRP and Phased Retirement program.

Faculty Compensation Goals and Strategy. The success of academic renewal with respect to faculty availability and productivity will require increasing average faculty salaries while aligning expectations and incentives with organizational goals. Recognizing this need, in January 2008 the university increased the salaries of tenured and tenure-track faculty members
based on salary levels of a comparison group of Carnegie classification system schools drawn from the Research Universities with High Research Activity category. This established minimum salary levels for each discipline and rank, with the salaries of all faculty members below the respective minimum being adjusted upward. The adjustments were envisioned as the first phase of a multi-year salary adjustment program. The latter phases, which were envisioned at that time but which have not been implemented, included further salary adjustments based on various criteria, chief of which was productivity.

As academic renewal proceeds, additional adjustments to faculty salaries, based on a clearly defined policy with specific goals and objectives, must be a first-order priority. It is anticipated that future salary adjustments, based on Trustee policy, will predominantly if not exclusively be based on performance and that persons who perform well against established standards will benefit while those who do not will not. Defining faculty compensation goals will require specifying the appropriate peer group (which should increasingly be based on the aspirational group of Research Universities with Very High Research Activity versus the current group of Research Universities with High Research Activity) and the appropriate target percentile for this comparison group. A recommended strategy would be to annually create a salary increase pool which would use annually be based on an inflation estimate plus an agreed percent above that, perhaps 1.5 or 2.0 percent, which would also go into the salary pool. So, for example, if inflation is estimated at 3 percent for next year, the salary increase pool would be 4.5% which is 3 percent for inflation plus 1.5% above that, assuming the university has opted to use 1.5% above inflation. The salary pool would be used to fund faculty salary increases based on sustained performance (as measured on an established rubric), increases associated with promotion to a higher rank, and competitive salaries for new hires. Such a compensation strategy would create a strong and predictable upward trajectory for faculty salaries, and over a period of just a few years move Howard average salaries up significantly in comparison to its selected comparison institutions. For example, if the university used 2.0% above inflation, after five years the median faculty member would have kept up with inflation and additionally be 10% beyond that, thus likely climbing significantly in salary levels as measured against Howard’s benchmark schools.
Faculty Professional Development. The dedication of adequate resources to faculty professional development helps assure faculty currency and vitality. To address the current uneven state of funding for such purposes, it is proposed that each school and college annually spend a minimum of 1% of the unit’s faculty salary budget on faculty professional development. Funds will be used to support travel to professional meetings and workshops, to advance research capabilities, to improve instruction, and engage in activities that clearly enhance faculty professional development. Funds from the faculty professional development pool will be allocated by the dean with the advice of the department chair. The intent would be that most faculty would receive professional development support each year.

Faculty VSIRP and Phased Retirement. Howard’s faculty is an aging one, with age distribution skewed substantially towards the top. Many faculty have served Howard and its students for decades with service of more than 30 years not uncommon. Within Academic Affairs, approximately 75 percent of tenured faculty are eligible to retire (i.e., have reached their Normal Retirement Date or are currently eligible for early retirement). Thus, irrespective of other aspects of academic renewal, Howard is facing a generational turnover in its core resource, tenured faculty, as many of these faculty chose to retire or otherwise separate over the next few years. In awareness of the age profile of faculty and the impact of the revised mix of programs that will arise out of the Presidential Commission process, academic programs need to be actively planning for the generational turnover of faculty and the requisite hiring of faculty new to Howard who will assume the teaching and research responsibilities as faculty depart. Therefore, the overriding goal of the faculty renewal component of academic renewal is to assist faculty in planning and achieving their professional and personal goals, while aligning the available faculty resource with the forward looking range and size of programs based on the Trustee decisions about program mix, and to do this without involuntarily adversely affecting tenured faculty.

With that in mind, it is anticipated that Howard will offer tenured faculty a Faculty Voluntary Separation and Incentive Retirement Program (Faculty VSIRP), which will be coordinated with the program mix recommendations approved by Howard’s Board of Trustees. The faculty renewal component of academic renewal will provide voluntary retirement incentives (and where
tenured faculty are not eligible to retire, separation incentives) for tenured faculty affected by significant program consolidations, downsizing and elimination, and elsewhere in those cases where tenured faculty are eligible and interested in retiring and whose loss of availability could be addressed by timely hiring or other means. To support the interests of faculty who wish to participate in the Faculty VSIRP and address the planned need for faculty, tenured faculty separating under the Faculty VSIRP may be invited by their Dean to participate in Phased Retirement. The Phased Retirement program would be offered to retiring faculty at the university’s discretion based on its instructional, research and service needs.

Phased Retirement would provide an incentive payment for retiring tenured faculty upon their voluntary choice to retire, at which point they would begin to receive their retirement benefits. Additionally, the faculty member could serve the university on a reduced time basis for a period of up to 5 years. The agreement would provide hourly wage payment based on the faculty member’s final salary but would be pro-rata on the agreed reduced time base. The time base would be negotiated by the Dean and faculty member based on the needs of the department and the interest of the faculty member. The time base would be constant or decline over the period of continued employment, but could not increase. For example, the Dean and tenured faculty member could agree, based on the faculty member’s interest and the Dean’s approval, that, by way of example, the faculty member would work a 2/3 time appointment the first year, and ½ time for the succeeding 3 years. No Faculty VSIRP appointment could be extended beyond 5 years, though the rights of faculty emeriti that apply to all faculty emeriti would not be abridged. Tenured faculty who are not eligible to retire but are in programs that are being consolidated, significantly downsized or eliminated could participate in Phased Separation that would provide an incentive payment and optionally allow for a negotiated work assignment that would have the same five year time limit.

Tenured faculty in departments affiliated with programs that are being consolidated, significantly downsized or eliminated might continue in their current department with no change or move to a different department for which they are well qualified, or for which they could become well qualified with a reasonable amount of professional development support. All program changes derived from academic renewal including any formal discontinuance of a program or department
will be based exclusively on educational considerations; where such a discontinuance would affect a tenured faculty member, every effort will be made to move that tenured faculty to another unit where possible.

Every faculty member, regardless of whether they were tenured, tenure track or adjunct, whose assignment is in any way affected by academic renewal, will receive appropriate notice of any changes that affect them as specified in existing university policy.

13. Roles, Responsibilities and Accountabilities

**Faculty and the Faculty Senate.** The Faculty Senate has a central role in academic renewal. The Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal will be broadly representative with faculty making up most of its membership. At the Faculty Senate’s request the President agreed to appoint to the Presidential Commission specific Faculty Senate nominees. The Commission’s process will be exceptionally open, with the various key processes engaging the entire campus. Faculty on the Commission will be charged with keeping the faculty generally, the Faculty Senate in particular, and the whole campus fully informed through its communications. Faculty will actively participate in each stage as the Presidential Commission engages the campus, establishes the framework for the evaluation of programs, collects data, reviews the collected data for accuracy and completeness, interprets the assembled data, and develops and presents recommendations.

The Faculty Senate will have access to all data available to the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal including that collected specifically under the direction of the Commission. Apart from and beyond faculty participation in the Presidential Commission process, under this plan the Faculty Senate is being asked to prepare its own recommendations about academic renewal which it will submit to the President. The President will use both the Presidential Commission’s recommendations and those of the Faculty Senate in determining his recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The President will forward his own recommendations to the Board of Trustees, and will accompany these with the recommendations from the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal and those of the Faculty Senate.
**Staff.** Howard’s staff have an important role to play in both planning and carrying out academic renewal. To ensure that the views and concerns of staff are well represented throughout, the Presidential Commission will include staff nominated by the Howard University Staff Organization (HUSO). These members will be charged with keeping all university staff informed about the renewal process, encouraging their direct participation and helping staff fully engage throughout.

**Students.** Students have immediate and ongoing interests in Howard’s academic renewal and bring invaluable perspectives to the renewal process. The Howard University Student Association (HUSA) nominates both undergraduate and graduate representatives to the Presidential Commission on Academic Renewal. While taking an active role in Commission activities they are charged with keeping the whole student community fully informed and engaged with the process. While academic renewal will result in changes in the mix of the university’s programs and in other areas, every effort will be made to minimize the impact of the implementation of these changes on current students.

**Deans and Department Chairs.** Deans and department chairs are critical to the successful accomplishment of academic renewal at Howard University. Deans serve as educational leaders, program and enterprise managers, visionaries, and communicators who know their programs well and are advocates for them. As academic leaders Deans recognize that academic renewal is absolutely essential if Howard is to compete successfully and thrive in the years ahead. Their participation will help Howard identify and develop a coherent set of well supported and well led programs: distinctive programs, doing important work, and growing in national and international stature for excellence in teaching and research.

As academic and educational leaders, advocates and decision makers, academic deans and department chairs are expected to:

1. Explain the need for and be advocates of change
2. Serve as channels of communication up, down and laterally, responding to questions, voicing concerns raised by others and their own
3. Facilitate engagement and full, timely participation of all degree programs with the academic renewal process and the work of the Presidential Commission
4. Participate and offer assistance to the data collection process, ensuring its accuracy and completeness; verify and interpret the data including providing information on trends, explanation of anomalies, and relevant organizational histories
5. Vet assessments and recommendations both as (1) advocates of programs and (2) influential citizens of the university who bring a broad perspective
6. Identify interdependencies among programs, recognizing that programs operate not independently but with mutual support in areas of faculty, programs/courses, infrastructure, library resources, grants and so forth
7. Participate in goal setting and the development and implementation of systems for ongoing measurement and assessment of performance including against externally recognized standards; guide and participate in systems that reward performance and work to achieve accountability
8. Lead and participate in unit planning around faculty availability, recruitment, retirement and other separations; ensure competitive compensation and other aspects of faculty renewal.