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The Johns Hopkins University has chosen a Selected Topics Model for its Self-Study Report in fulfillment of the requirements for reaffirmation of its accreditation status by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). The topic selected is “The Challenge of Improving Undergraduate Education in a Research Intensive Environment.” The report focuses on the five schools of the University that offer undergraduate degrees: the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, the Whiting School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the Peabody Institute, and the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education.

The University’s self-study was directed by an Accreditation Steering Committee whose members were drawn from each of the academic divisions as well as several central offices. The Steering Committee reviewed the proposed self-study design, the timetable, the plans for demonstrating compliance with the MSCHE standards, and, ultimately, this Self-Study Report. The self-study was conducted in two phases, over two years. The first phase of the self-study involved an examination by a forty member Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE), appointed by President William R. Brody, with student, faculty, trustee, alumni, and staff membership. The Commission’s charge was to consider the core values that should characterize a Hopkins education and to develop recommendations for specific actions that would improve the quality of education, both inside and outside the classroom. Through its four working groups, the Commission addressed issues related to the undergraduate academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life. In order to secure the feedback of various University constituencies, the Commission issued its findings and initial proposals in an Interim Report that was widely discussed (and, with the exception of only a couple of controversial proposals, enthusiastically endorsed) in over two dozen campus meetings. With the benefit of that input, the Commission formulated 34 recommendations and issued a Final Report in May 2003.

In the second phase of the study, each of the five schools offering undergraduate programs was charged to assess the strengths and weaknesses of undergraduate education in their divisions in the context of the specific standards articulated by MSCHE. The Steering Committee selected seven standards as being particularly relevant to undergraduate education:

- Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives
- Standard 8: Student Admissions
- Standard 9: Student Support Services
- Standard 10: Faculty
- Standard 11: Educational Offerings
- Standard 12: General Education
- Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Consistent with the requirements of the MSCHE and the provisions for the Selected Topics Model, a separate process was designed to facilitate the review of documentation from across the University that would establish compliance with all fourteen standards for the graduate and professional schools and, for the schools with undergraduate programs, with the seven standards not addressed in the Self-Study Report.

For the second phase of activity, the five selected schools were to consider not only the MSCHE standards and to assess their programs and services against those elements, but also to reflect more
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broadly on the extent to which they have been responsive to the recommendations of the Commission on Undergraduate Education. To monitor implementation of the CUE recommendations, a “tracking chart” has been developed and periodically updated since CUE completed its report last spring. Accountability has been further maintained by reconvening the Commission to review the implementation status of its recommendations and by continuing to bring together the five deans of the schools with undergraduate programs.

More broadly, the self-study process has helped to sustain a focus on undergraduate education across the University and to continue the forward momentum. Progress in implementing CUE recommendations has been heartening, as there is movement on virtually every front, and signs of the effects of change are evident in strong admissions yields and our perception of enhanced morale (a perception that will be tested in the next administration of Student Satisfaction Surveys this spring). At the risk of overgeneralization, a summary assessment of the health of undergraduate education at Hopkins across all five schools against the template of the seven standards would include the following observations:

- There is strong commitment to the University’s distinctive mission, to the objectives articulated by CUE for undergraduate education, and to the specific charges for each school’s undergraduate programs.

- The admissions position is robust at each of the schools. Generally, application numbers are strong; the quality of applicants is excellent; and the yield on admitted students high. Financial aid budgets are constrained in each program, but fundraising for student aid remains a high campaign priority. It is especially important that the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School identify endowment funds that will allow the continuation of competitive financial aid packages and merit programs.

- As a result of aggressive recruitment, student bodies have grown more diverse in racial, ethnic, and international terms, but there still is significant room for improvement.

- Each school offers a range of effective student support services staffed by qualified professionals who are oriented toward student development. Some services need additional staff, and a few need to focus more heavily on customer service and/or communication.

- While all Hopkins divisions share a need for larger numbers of faculty, the current faculty reflects a level of academic excellence and a thoroughgoing dedication to original research, scholarship, and creative endeavor that is the hallmark of the University. However, the Hopkins faculty lacks a sufficient element of diversity, particularly with regard to underrepresented minorities, and efforts must be redoubled to address this weakness.

- The University offers a rich array of rigorous academic programs for undergraduates. Students benefit as well from an exceptionally wide range of educational opportunities outside the classroom, including the ability to become engaged in serious research, the chance to demonstrate civic concern through volunteerism or to take advantage of study abroad programs, and plentiful occasions to interact with national and international leaders. The schools are committed to serious evaluation of teaching. They must work to identify the best instruments and processes for measuring effectiveness and the proper weight to accord teaching in promotion and tenure decisions. One division has a more fundamental challenge to develop a consensus among faculty about its importance.

- While the schools differ in their approaches to general education, mechanisms are in place to assure educational breadth and the development of critical thinking, human relations, and oral
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communication skills. Partnerships with first-rate library professionals contribute in important ways to information literacy.

- A discipline of assessment and analysis has been established in a number of areas across the University, including benchmarking in the areas of competitive position, professional best practices, quality of services, and student satisfaction. The impressive success of Hopkins graduates, in terms of graduate and professional school placement and attaining places of leadership, remains the main evidence of learning outcomes. With the creation of an Office of Institutional Research, and initial steps to build appropriate databases to support assessment, the University must now construct more systematic approaches to evaluating outcomes.

The decision to focus our decennial accreditation self-study on improving the undergraduate experience in the research intensive environment of Johns Hopkins University has proved to be wise. Building on very strong foundations, we have enhanced undergraduate education in significant ways and created considerable momentum toward a goal of making Johns Hopkins a model for advancing knowledge and for demonstrating “Characteristics of Excellence” in all respects.
PART I: OVERVIEW
OVERVIEW

The decennial reaccreditation for Johns Hopkins University has been used as an occasion to take stock of the University’s undergraduate programs and to consider “The Challenge of Improving Undergraduate Education in a Research Intensive Environment.” We welcome the flexible approach to self-study afforded by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education’s new provisions in its Designs for Excellence and, consequently, our ability to choose a Selected Topics Model. By using the opportunity of the reaccreditation self-study to direct concerted attention to the undergraduate experience, we think we not only have fulfilled the University’s formal obligations for reaffirmation of accreditation, but also have improved Johns Hopkins. The completion of our official responsibilities to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) does not mean that the initiative we have undertaken in fulfillment of our obligation will cease. In fact, the initiative that has been set in motion reflects a long-term commitment, one that involves cultural change and institutional transformation. It is in that spirit that the following Self-Study Report is submitted to the MSCHE.

Among American colleges and universities, Johns Hopkins’ origins are unique. In contrast to private universities that developed around a core liberal arts college, Hopkins was established for advanced study with an express purpose to encourage research and discovery, and thereby to improve society. The University maintains the commitment to advancing knowledge through discovery and integrates that tradition into its undergraduate, graduate, and professional education programs. Hopkins’ first president, Daniel Coit Gilman, so eloquently laid out the University’s charge that, for more than 125 years, his vision has been the touchstone for the University’s development and his language, in various addresses including his inaugural speech, the most compelling articulation of institutional mission. The occasion of the current decennial reaccreditation process has provided an opportunity to reflect on our institutional mission and to formulate the following statement, more succinct than Gilman’s artful declarations, but equally true to our heritage and to our sense of our future:

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University is to foster independent and original research, to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.

The mission statement has recently been the subject of discussion by the Council of Deans and the Committee on Academic Affairs of the University’s Board of Trustees and will be formally presented to the Board at its March 2004 meeting. Once adopted, it will be published in the requisite places, although it is quite likely that President Gilman’s voice will continue to echo through future Johns Hopkins ages.

The University has grown to include nine divisions, including eight degree-granting schools and an Applied Physics Laboratory. Within the context of our institutional mission and highly decentralized university structure, each of the nine divisions also has articulated its specific charge and has determined how best to fulfill its particular mission. While not a formal part of the self-study design, the graduate and professional programs of the Johns Hopkins’ School of Medicine, the Bloomberg School of Public Health, and the Paul H. Nitze School for Advanced International Studies (SAIS) are significant resources for students across all the academic divisions; the original research and advanced study undertaken in each contribute to Hopkins’ rich learning environment. The special focus of the present self-study is the five schools that offer undergraduate degrees: the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, the Whiting School of Engineering, the Peabody Institute, the School of Nursing, and the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. While they have distinct assignments, a common objective is
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academic excellence and academic leadership in each of their fields of endeavor. Underlying the academic programs is a strong belief that discovery, creativity, and learning are integrally linked processes and that research and teaching are complementary activities. The part-time programs in the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education reflect a variation on this theme by demonstrating that teaching and expert practice are equally complementary.

As confirmed in the University’s previous accreditation evaluations, Johns Hopkins demonstrates a commitment to excellence and a dedication to very high standards. The decision to focus on undergraduate education as the lens through which to view the University for purposes of this reaccreditation visit has as its rationale several factors. The most important is a frank recognition that, notwithstanding extraordinary strengths in many areas, there are aspects of the undergraduate program that should be strengthened to reflect the same quality that distinguishes the University in other realms.

There have been two major phases of our institutional self-study. The first phase began in January 2002 when, in recognition of both the practical necessity of initiating Hopkins’ self-study process and the timeliness of a thorough study of the undergraduate experience, President William Brody appointed a Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE). He and Provost Steven Knapp charged the Commission to develop recommendations for specific actions that would improve the quality of the undergraduate experience in all five of the University divisions that offer undergraduate degrees. During the twelve months of 2002, the Commission and its four working groups conducted a review of key aspects of undergraduate education in order to assess the current state of affairs and to formulate proposals for reforms. The Commissioners reviewed relevant reports from peer institutions and national associations, examined undergraduate survey data, spoke with key campus faculty and administrators, met with external consultants, and conducted focus groups. The resulting Interim Report, produced and distributed in late January 2003, outlined a large number of specific recommendations.

As important as the substantive recommendations of the Commission are, the extensive series of presentations about the interim CUE proposals to almost every significant campus constituency in the five schools, approximately two dozen in number, provided an opportunity to engage faculty, students, administrators, parents, alumni, and trustees broadly in the conversation, and to strengthen constituent support for undergraduate education. After consideration of all the comments and suggestions from those who attended the meetings and feedback from those who sent messages to a special e-mailbox, a Final Report was created, endorsed by the full Commission, and sent to President Brody and Provost Knapp.

At the outset, it should be noted that the initial approach embraced by the Commission on Undergraduate Education stands in contrast to the “bottoms up” strategy traditionally employed in University initiatives at Johns Hopkins. The decision to engage at the University-level in a conversation across the five divisions proved to be a constructive one that prompted productive discussion and good ideas. It has helped to create a University-wide commitment to undergraduate education and to maintain the sense of accountability for implementation of the CUE recommendations. There were intrinsic benefits as well, in opportunities for enhanced understanding, strengthened ties among the schools, and the members’ personal pleasure at working with colleagues from other campuses of whom too little is sometimes seen and known.

In its Final Report, the Commission asserted the belief that the mission of Johns Hopkins University with respect to undergraduate education is to prepare students to be informed and engaged global citizens. Undergraduates in all programs should be challenged to hone critical thinking skills and to develop their creativity. Those preparing for advanced study or the professions should achieve mastery of their disciplines. Graduates should be ready to engage in a lifetime of learning related both to their chosen career and to their personal interests.
In the Commission’s view, the University fulfills that mission to great extent. Hopkins students are offered a wide array of outstanding academic programs. Students who anticipate later graduate or professional study are prepared exceedingly well; those who enter the professions directly demonstrate high levels of professional competence. Moreover, undergraduate education takes place in a stimulating environment that is culturally diverse and rich in its international dimensions. Particularly large numbers of Hopkins students are, like their faculty mentors, engaged in the process of research and discovery, and in the case of SPSBE, expert practice.

Notwithstanding the many positive aspects of our undergraduate programs, students’ levels of satisfaction with both their academic and social experiences at Johns Hopkins were found to be lower than what we regard as acceptable; they do not reflect the educational experience that the University can and should provide. Too many students graduate disappointed in not having more interaction with faculty and in the quality of life outside the classroom, where we believe learning also occurs. Perhaps the most sobering finding was how acutely many students felt an absence of a sense of community that might be expected in a small university the size of Johns Hopkins. Without a strong and healthy co-curricular life to bring such excellent students together, we were concerned that the undergraduate experience does not realize its full educational potential. Johns Hopkins is an institution that accepts excellence as a threshold criterion for any undertaking. Since we expect to be competitive for the very best faculty and students and we expect to engage in world-class research, our goal should be to offer the very best quality undergraduate experience.

To meet this goal, the Commission identified work to be done and needs to be addressed. The single most important undergraduate need at Johns Hopkins is to strengthen the sense of community. The second is the need for better integration of the elements of the undergraduate experience and for a healthier sense of balance. A third need around which many of the CUE recommendations cohere is the need for undergraduate education at Hopkins to be more personal. There also is a need to reconcile the gap between the perception of others not caring and the reality that many do indeed feel passionately about the satisfaction and success of undergraduates. And, finally, the need to be more intentional about undergraduate education is a fifth need and the focus of many of the Commission’s recommendations.

Since the first phase of the self-study is detailed in the report of the Commission on Undergraduate Education which appears as Part II of this self-study document, there is little need to rehearse the complete findings and recommendations here. By way of summary, the Commission’s 34 recommendations cover four broad areas of undergraduate life at Johns Hopkins: the academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life. Not all the recommendations are equally important in the context of each of the different divisions. The Commission identified several that should be given priority because of their potential to enhance significantly undergraduate education in this research intensive environment. These are: the provision of small group or “capstone” experiences for upperclassmen; guaranteed University housing for Homewood students; and a significant increase in the diversity of the undergraduate student body. The Commission urged the five schools to develop plans to implement all its recommendations and to identify resources to support them.

And, indeed, that is what the schools are doing, as will be evident in the assessments offered in the school Self-Study Reports. Further, in order to ensure that the Commission report did not become simply another document gathering dust on the shelf, a “tracking” system was developed to record the status of implementation of the Commission’s recommendations in each division. Given the decentralized nature of the University, the responsibility for implementation of many proposals rests with the administration and faculties of the schools. Thus, on most recommendations, there is not one status, but rather five. Notwithstanding this cumbersome aspect, we have continued to update the CUE Tracking Chart, and a copy appears as Appendix 1.
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Equally important in continuing the forward momentum, near the end of this past fall semester, the Commission on Undergraduate Education was reconvened to hear a report on progress. A similar update will be provided to the Commission in the spring. The deans of the five divisions with undergraduate programs also plan to continue to meet each semester to sustain their collective consideration of progress and ways in which the schools can support one another’s efforts.

Since the Commission issued its Final Report last May, significant progress has been made in implementing recommendations to improve the undergraduate experience. Indeed, even before the report was published, implementation of several of the interim recommendations began. While the Self-Study Reports in Part III of this document will evaluate progress in the schools, it is worth highlighting some of the most important actions that have moved this agenda forward.

The infrastructure for addressing undergraduate concerns has been strengthened with formal responsibility identified in the schools and departments. Numerous aspects of the academic programs are being reviewed, and plans have been developed to conduct more comprehensive assessments of undergraduate majors in several divisions. Specific initiatives to develop curricular innovations in small group formats and to create or strengthen capstone experiences have been undertaken in some departments, and others will be encouraged through departmental reviews. In an ongoing conversation with faculty councils in several divisions, attention is being focused on the means for recognizing teaching excellence and the weight that should be given to teaching commitment and quality in appointment and promotion decisions. The proper way to evaluate teaching is the source of substantial discussion on several campuses. At Homewood, a consultant has been engaged to strengthen the course evaluation process and instrument for Engineering and Arts and Sciences courses; new procedures are to be implemented by the next academic year. The Peabody Conservatory faculty are continuing to consider what kind of evaluation is appropriate given the special relationship between music students and their primary faculty mentors. SPSBE has implemented a faculty development initiative focused on the assessment of student learning outcomes.

A priority recommendation from the Commission on Undergraduate Education involved the development of additional residential options for students on the Homewood campus. Even as CUE was completing its work, initial planning was begun on a major project just across from the campus that, when completed, will provide about 615 residence hall beds for upperclassmen as well as dining and amenity space for additional students who live off campus. If final pro formas establish that the project can be undertaken, the Charles Commons will be a significant boon for the undergraduate residential experience. It can help to create an upper-class residential precinct that will build community and be a healthy complement to the freshman quadrangle anticipated on the campus proper. Consideration is now being given to engaging an architect to help complete a schematic design for the additional freshman housing. There is a consensus among the Homewood deans and student affairs officers that the ability to offer first-year students a common and traditional residential experience would go a long way toward creating a stronger sense of community among Hopkins students.

Although budgetary considerations constrain ambition, there are plans in most of the schools for new or refurbished facilities for teaching. Architectural consultants have been engaged to plan for a new wing of the School of Nursing that might provide classroom, laboratory, faculty office, and student space to relieve crowded conditions in a building that has been outgrown in record time, due to the success of its programs. Peabody has created exciting new space and remodeled some existing facilities in what is a welcome facelift for the Institute. At Homewood, a major planning exercise is focused on the “South Quadrangle,” formed by Garland and Clark halls, where it is hoped that a new computer science building and a Visitor’s Center can be developed, along with badly needed parking facilities. Another high priority and significant Homewood campus project involves the renovation of the home for the humanities departments, Gilman Hall. This renovation would not only enhance the physical space and
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eliminate troublesome heating and cooling issues, but also send a strong signal about the importance of the humanities disciplines. It would serve as well to strengthen the sense of community among students and faculty in the humanities. General classroom renovation needs on the Homewood campus also have been assessed, and it is hoped that work could begin soon on at least the first phase of a multi-year project. SPSBE already enjoys excellent remote classroom facilities that include informal study and gathering spaces, smart classrooms, and state-of-the-art technology labs.

No mention of the physical environment for undergraduate education would be complete without acknowledging the transformative gift that has allowed a major re-landscaping of the Homewood campus and the creation of attractive brick walks, plazas, and sitting areas that have dramatically approved the appearance - and morale - of those who live and work there. It is anticipated that, when complete, the facility enhancements at Peabody will prove equally salutary.

The only concern with regard to the Homewood campus refurbishment is that there is such a severe shortage of space where students can engage in informal play. Notwithstanding the severe land constraints, it is hoped that planning for a freshman quadrangle will allow the re-introduction of some areas where volleyball and frisbee can be enjoyed by the more energetic, without damaging the aesthetics that the rest of the campus community has come so thoroughly to enjoy.

Across each of the schools, as CUE urged, there is increased attention to academic integrity beginning with pre-orientation activities, continuing with freshman week programs, and sustained attention during the academic year. A task force has made a series of recommendations for strengthening academic integrity at Homewood, and these are being implemented with support from the faculty and administration. The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education is exploring an online tutorial on plagiarism and cheating that may serve as a model for education efforts in other schools. The School of Nursing also has a task force considering a new Honor Code and an academic integrity policy that would involve the formation of an Ethics Board.

The uneven distribution of students among the majors in Engineering and Arts and Sciences has been a source of concern to the Deans of both Homewood Schools. The admissions office has developed several programs to highlight academic programs with lower enrollments than can be supported by faculty resources, and recruitment initiatives are being targeted at these areas. Faculty have been called on to support these efforts, and the response is encouraging, although it will require a multi-faceted approach and sustained effort to convince prospective students that not everyone who comes to Hopkins has to study biomedical engineering or biology.

While minority student recruitment efforts have been strengthened and the results at Homewood and in the School of Nursing have been positive, and somewhat so at Peabody, there is room for further progress. More focused recruitment efforts are in place in several schools. Guidelines have been established for a Baltimore Scholars Program that would provide scholarship support for graduates of Baltimore City public schools, and an announcement of this program is anticipated this spring. By that time, it also is hoped that several other outreach and pipeline programs under discussion will be launched so that even students who may not be good candidates for Johns Hopkins will be encouraged in their aspirations for higher education. Less progress has been made on increasing faculty diversity across the schools, and this remains an ongoing challenge and one to which the University is giving serious attention. One major initiative is the creation of Presidential Professorships that will allow schools to hire a distinguished faculty member even in the absence of a faculty line.

The weekly course schedule for the Krieger and Whiting Schools emerged as a source of special concern during the CUE study. Of all the recommendations, the one for change in this area provoked the most vigorous negative response from some students but especially from Arts and Sciences faculty, many of
whom see great merit in the present system. After a semester cooling down period, a committee of faculty, staff, and students has been appointed to explore alternatives. A report is anticipated by the end of the spring semester.

As detailed in the *CUE Tracking Chart*, there is other news to report, but what should be noted here as being equal in importance to the progress on implementing CUE recommendations is the effect that the Commission and its report have had on the tenor of the University. As a faculty member of CUE recently observed, undergraduate education is now part of the conversation in every important venue, to an extent not previously entertained at Johns Hopkins University. The University remains firm in its distinctive commitment to research and discovery, but it is now established that the effect of decisions on the quality of the undergraduate experience should routinely be considered. CUE has become part of the campus vocabulary, and there is a new appreciation for the richness and diversity of the undergraduate programs across the University.

Against the back-drop of the priorities that emerged from the CUE study and report, the second phase of the self-study has involved a division-specific examination of strengths and weaknesses as measured against a subset of seven of the fourteen standards stipulated by the MSCHE. We identified as particularly germane to undergraduate education the following seven standards:

- **Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives**
  The institution’s mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution’s stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body, and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

- **Standard 8: Student Admissions**
  The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

- **Standard 9: Student Support Services**
  The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution’s goals for students.

- **Standard 10: Faculty**
  The institution’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

- **Standard 11: Educational Offerings**
  The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

- **Standard 12: General Education**
  The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.
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- **Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning**
  Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

This second part of the process bears more of the usual marks of a Johns Hopkins University exercise: recognition of divisional differences and the importance of school autonomy and entrepreneurial activity. Each school was asked to undertake its self-study in the context of its specific mission and with the input of its relevant campus governing councils. Instructed to address each of the seven standards, the divisions also were invited to emphasize those aspects that seem particularly important to their schools.

It is the University’s own assessment that, across the five divisions, Johns Hopkins essentially fulfills the standards required for compliance and certification as an accredited institution. This does not mean that there are no areas for improvement. Indeed, as we expect is the case with all complex institutions, and, in particular, with faculty driven research universities that foster an entrepreneurial environment, there is an inherent difficulty in imposing any standard other than excellence.

Primary considerations, and ones that Johns Hopkins takes as absolutely fundamental to its mission, are the quality of its faculties and its educational offerings. Across all five schools awarding undergraduate degrees, the quality of the faculty is of paramount importance, and each school maintains faculty quality as critical to fulfilling its missions of advancing knowledge, educating students, and serving society. Hopkins’ academic programs are designed to accommodate the educational interests of students who tend to be more goal-oriented and focused than many of their peers. Nonetheless, it is important to note the considerable variation in core and general educational requirements among these divisions. In the professional schools, the School of Nursing and the Peabody Institute, the existence and complexity of core requirements derive from the professions themselves. Moreover, the demands of professional training in these respective fields of music and nursing dictate a style of education that gives heavy emphasis to individual instruction in the former and mentoring in small group settings in the latter. The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education accommodates the needs of professional, goal-oriented, and focused adult students.

For 90% of our undergraduates who obtain their degrees in the two largest Homewood Schools, the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering, the historical and cultural norm for study has been a variation on the model for graduate study that has been called locally “the hand tooled education.” This concept derives from the original German research university model of mentoring in a graduate environment. At Johns Hopkins, its undergraduate iteration is found in the greater ability of many students to customize educational pathways. This translates to three characteristics: (1) freedom of choice of curriculum without core requirements-based on a belief in the ability of the independent and highly motivated students we attract to participate significantly in shaping their own academic programs and the premise that, with the help of faculty advisors, students will select a broad program if given a rich array of opportunities; (2) frequent opportunities for mentored learning in original and independent undergraduate research; and (3) small group learning in graduate style seminars. The system has its advantages. It appeals especially to the goal-oriented and focused student whose further academic ambitions include graduate or professional school. Superb preprofessional education has long been a primary objective for Arts and Sciences and Engineering students, and it is one that appears to be fulfilled in the case of a substantial number of them. However, the commitment to meeting that objective has, in some cases, caused a proliferation of departmental requirements that end up potentially compromising the very freedom that the system had been designed to ensure. The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences continues to address this tension between the strongly preprofessional (particularly pre-medical) interests of a large percentage of the undergraduate student body and the
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concerns of those faculty and administrators who think students would be better served by more intellectual exploration and broader academic experiences.

While significant investments have been made in amenities for students over the past decade, we know from the CUE study that Johns Hopkins must further improve the quality of life outside the classroom for undergraduate students - not just for the sake of being more competitive in attracting students to the University, but, more importantly, to ensure that students receive the maximum educational benefits that can be derived from their time here as undergraduates. The adequacy of both the facilities and the human infrastructure to support undergraduates in such areas as residential life and academic and career advising was considered by the Commission on Undergraduate Education, and each of the schools speaks to the quality of its student services in its Self-Study Report.

A key area in which our efforts are at an early stage is that of student learning assessment, an exercise that faculty members take as a given in their regular appraisal of student work. Historically, at Johns Hopkins, we have judged the quality of our endeavors by the success of our graduates. The preparation that students achieve for the pursuit of graduate or professional education is, we believe, superior, and the feedback from those who are in a position to judge the extent to which Hopkins has prepared its students for lifelong learning gives testimony to that effect. Yet, we know that we can be more systematic about collecting these data and subjecting them to critical analysis, and we have taken action to position the University to pursue this endeavor by developing the supportive institutional resources. We need to invest additional effort to develop and employ instruments that will allow us to know with more precision how well our graduates are prepared.

Those assessment mechanisms that are in place in the divisions have contributed to significant change. The power of both quantitative data and qualitative evaluations from student surveys has been demonstrated in the formation of CUE recommendations and school initiatives to enhance the undergraduate experience. And, we are increasingly seeing evidence of administrative units adopting the discipline of assessment in their own work, through benchmarking, comparative analysis, goal-setting, and critical review against professional standards.

In order to show compliance with all fourteen standards as required by the MSCHE, a third major activity was conducted in parallel to the school self-studies. This process involved the identification of existing documentation to show that the graduate and professional divisions of Johns Hopkins complied with all fourteen standards and that the schools with undergraduate programs could document that they met the seven standards that were not included in this Self-Study Report. This proved to be a significant activity involving staff from many units across the University who were asked to identify those reports, publications, studies, surveys, and analyses that would show that the University had in place the policies, procedures, and structures to demonstrate qualification as an accredited institution. Such an exercise at a highly decentralized university such as Johns Hopkins was a particularly challenging and cumbersome task since, with respect to demonstrating compliance with even those fundamental elements, there is generally not one sample document for the University, but rather one for each school. To take but one example, each school has its own faculty handbook.

The documents were listed in a “roadmap” that linked each document to one or more standards and served as a guide during the preliminary site visit by two members of the evaluation team who conducted a review of the document files to determine compliance with the standards. Over 900 documents, including websites, were cataloged.

Those documents most relevant to undergraduate education, and the seven specially selected standards, have been organized into several document resource files to support the Self-Study Reports of each of the
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Schools and will be made available to the Evaluation Team. Lists of the contents of each resource file can be found in Appendix 4.

A few words are in order about the organization of the accreditation process at the University. Guiding all of this activity has been a University Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) with representation from each of Hopkins’ eight schools, as well as several members representing central services and functions, such as the library, equal opportunity and affirmative action programs, the budget office, and the Provost’s Office. (See Appendix 3 for a listing of ASC members.) A breadth of perspective, range of experience, and sense of University citizenship has been reflected in the Committee’s discussions, and the process has been thus enriched. In addition to its oversight of the process, the Steering Committee also had the responsibility for reviewing and approving the draft Self-Study Report. The Provost’s Office provided the support for the accreditation process and made appropriate staff available.

Each of the five schools with undergraduate programs was asked to appoint a Working Group Chair to organize its self-study and to solicit input from the various school constituencies. Two of our schools, the School of Nursing and the Peabody Institute, have undergone reaccreditation reviews by their professional accrediting bodies during the course of the University’s MSCHE reaccreditation process. In fact, the School of Nursing actually had visits from two accrediting bodies, the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) and the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) within a year. Consistent with the provisions of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Nursing and Peabody were invited to draw upon the self-study documents prepared for their professional association reviews.

Several times during the course of this process, the Working Group Chairs were convened to discuss the preparation of the Self-Study Reports. They formed, in essence, a matrix organization that helped maintain some symmetry in the process of “drilling down” in each of the schools. These individuals also are those within the schools who bear important responsibility for undergraduate education.

There is no doubt among those involved in the preparation of this self-study that Johns Hopkins has enhanced its undergraduate programs as a result of this endeavor and, further, that the University will maintain its forward momentum on this important dimension of its institutional mission. Our work is far from finished. On the other hand, we have set in motion a large number of initiatives (perhaps too many!), and it will take some time to see them to fruition and, importantly, to evaluate their success.

We have undertaken an examination of “The Challenge of Improving Undergraduate Education in a Research Intensive Environment.” One hopes that, were he here to see it, Daniel Coit Gilman would feel that his legacy at Johns Hopkins is well-served by the efforts encouraged through the decennial MSCHE’s accreditation process.
PART II: FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
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Note: The text of the Final Report of the Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE), originally published and distributed in May 2003, is reproduced in this chapter without its Executive Summary since its contents have been incorporated in the Overview of the University’s Self-Study Report. Further, to avoid interruption, the appendices to the CUE Final Report have been moved to the appendix section of this Self-Study Report. Note, too, that some events that were listed prospectively have since taken place.
THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

THE NATURE AND MISSION OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Established in 1876, the Johns Hopkins University was the first institution of higher education in the United States built upon the primacy of research and graduate study. In his inaugural address, Hopkins’ first president, Daniel Coit Gilman, laid out the institutional charge by asking “What are we aiming at?” and answering his own question as follows: “…the encouragement of research…and the advancement of individual scholars, who by their excellence will advance the sciences they pursue, and the society where they dwell.” Johns Hopkins remains dedicated to advancing knowledge through discovery and to continuing, across all its constituent parts, a tradition of innovation that is part of the University’s legacy.

Today, the University’s mission is reflected not only in an ongoing commitment to discovery, but also in a commitment to the highest quality of teaching coupled with opportunities for undergraduates as well as graduate and professional students to do significant research; a creative and relevant sense of public service; the highest standards of health care; and a pervasive involvement in the international scope of scholarship, education, and training. While part of the University’s mission since its inception, undergraduate education, until recently, has not always received the priority attention that it warrants.

The University has made significant investments in amenities for students over the past decade, and a variety of academic programs have enriched the education experience, but we know that Johns Hopkins must further improve the quality of life inside and outside the classroom for undergraduate students - not just for the sake of being more competitive in attracting students to the University, but, more importantly, to ensure that students receive the maximum educational benefits that can be derived from their time here as undergraduates.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Over the past decade or two, undergraduate education has been the subject of a great deal of attention on college campuses, in education journals, the popular press, and the halls of some legislatures as well as of regional accreditation bodies. Additionally, a number of higher education associations have undertaken serious efforts to strengthen undergraduate programs through research programs, conferences, publications, and various collaborative networks. The national discussion has resulted in various recommendations, most notably those of the 1998 Boyer Commission sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The idea of re-envisioning undergraduate education at Hopkins and the challenge of improving it within the unique confines of a research intensive environment comes from many directions and reflects the convergence of a number of lines, including the national discussion of these issues; campus conversations about how we might better serve our undergraduates; recognition of peer competition, as underlined by the Trustees’ Task Force on Competitiveness (1999-2001); and President William Brody’s and Provost Steven Knapp’s keen interest in the quality of the undergraduate experience. Perhaps the most immediate impetus, however, has come from responses to two institutional surveys of Hopkins undergraduates. The
response data show that, in a number of areas, the undergraduate program does not offer the quality of experience that distinguishes Johns Hopkins University in other realms, particularly as compared to our peers. While many students feel extraordinarily well-served by their academic programs and their preparation for advanced study, too many students express disappointment in access to faculty, the size of classes, life outside the classroom, and lack of a sense of community that might be expected in a small university the size of Hopkins. We know also that our retention rate, while extremely high compared to national norms, is not as high as that at distinguished peer institutions.

In addition to the above motivations, the creation of the position of a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and the possibility of preparing a “selected topics” self-study for the University’s reaccreditation made it seem propitious to undertake this initiative. The University will undergo its decennial reaccreditation review during the coming year, and the Commission’s report will provide the core of the institutional self-study that is an essential part of the process. Further, since resources will be needed in order to implement some of the recommendations, a new development campaign provided additional motivation to begin this enterprise at this time.

THE FOUNDATION ON WHICH WE BUILD

In undertaking this initiative, we begin with the proposition that the undergraduate experience at Hopkins can be enhanced, but it should be recognized that we are building on considerable strengths and that we wish to achieve a standard matched by only the very best programs in the country. While students have been free with their criticisms, many cite equally strong praise for the academic opportunities they have enjoyed: courses with faculty who are “amazing,” research experiences that were “outstanding,” and faculty whose support and mentoring was “incredible.”

Over the past few years, undergraduate programs have already been strengthened. New major programs have been developed, and additional study abroad experiences have been promoted. Curricular diversity has been broadened, as with the institution of a Jazz Studies program at the Peabody Institute and the introduction of a major in East Asian Studies in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences. Some departments have already devoted considerable time and attention to a review of their majors; the writing requirement has been studied and changes are underway; and new freshman seminars are in the planning stages. Pre-major advising at Homewood has been strengthened. Building on its historic strength in providing clinical experiences for its students, the School of Nursing has expanded its community health opportunities. A Center for Educational Resources in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is helping faculty introduce technology into their classes in creative and engaging ways. The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education created a Division of Undergraduate Studies and is working towards an outcomes-based curriculum. The Whiting School has added a new major in Environmental Engineering and new concentrations in biomolecular engineering, aerospace engineering, biomaterials and biomechanics. The number of opportunities for freshman seminars that introduce students to engineering concepts has been increased. The Peabody Institute strengthened its in-house ESL offerings by adding a second ESL specialist on a part-time basis. For the last two years, Peabody has also offered a Writing Assistance Program to all undergraduate and graduate students (in addition to a full-fledged tutoring program for students with academic problems) and is in the process of expanding this initiative into a Writing Center under the supervision of a full-time faculty member from the humanities department.

Facilities have been improved on each of our campuses. A recreation center, an arts center, and a superb new classroom building with state-of-the-art technology have been built on the Homewood campus. Since opening in the spring 1999, the Interfaith Center has welcomed nearly 100,000 visitors. The Center’s volume of programming and use increased 50% over nearly four years and still continues to grow. Also, new laboratory facilities for biomedical engineering have been occupied, and more are being
constructed for chemistry. Early in AY 2002-03, Peabody was able to open seven new practice rooms, some of them outfitted with new grand pianos. By the beginning of the next academic year, Peabody hopes also to have a new 100-seat performance hall and a suite of new percussion studios ready for use. And, in East Baltimore, plans are underway to increase the infrastructure for nursing instruction. The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education opened new computer laboratories at Johns Hopkins campuses in Downtown Baltimore, Columbia, and Montgomery County. Students will benefit from access to all these resources.

WORKING ASSUMPTIONS

As the Commission considered its charge, it seemed important not only to recognize the position from which we start, but also the distinctive features of the Hopkins environment that we want to preserve. Accordingly, the Commission articulated a set of working assumptions that reflect both a philosophy of undergraduate education and an understanding of our institutional character. The recommendations put forward by the Commission proceed on the basis of the following desiderata:

- Discovery is the hallmark of Johns Hopkins and should form the centerpiece not only of graduate education, but also of undergraduate education at the University. Any reinvention or enhancement to the undergraduate experience must build upon on this research university’s focus on discovery.

- Likewise, the Johns Hopkins undergraduate experience should take advantage of the University’s distinction as a relatively small-sized institution (in comparison to its peers). That is, undergraduates should experience close relationships with faculty in their major; have ample opportunities to partner with faculty in the discovery process; have opportunities for small group experiences and classes; and enjoy a sense of community.

- Close student-teacher interaction (e.g., seminars and laboratory experiences) is essential to the learning process in a research intensive institution. Graduate students are also essential partners and a resource for undergraduates.

- Undergraduate education should seek to integrate the intellectual and social lives of students within a caring and diverse community of scholars. Commission members believe that student life outside the classroom should not only complement, but also enhance student life inside the classroom.

- The students who thrive best in the University’s undergraduate programs are those talented applicants who are mature and self-directed learners and who are able to take advantage of the extensive research and learning opportunities available here. The majority desire advanced study beyond the baccalaureate, and all, it is hoped, will take leadership roles in their professions. While Hopkins offers especially good preparation for these students, in order to have a vibrant intellectual environment, it must also welcome students who enter less certain of their focus but open to the joys of intellectual exploration.

In recognition of Hopkins decentralized structure, the revitalization of the undergraduate experience should be the responsibility of the academic divisions offering undergraduate programs and should respond to the particular educational mission and the unique needs of the School.

Finally, the Commission recognizes that Johns Hopkins is an institution that accepts excellence as a threshold criterion for any undertaking. We expect to be competitive for the very best faculty and students. We expect to engage in world-class research. Our goal should be to offer the very best quality undergraduate experience.
CHAPTER 2: THE NATIONAL LANDSCAPE

It is quite remarkable that the university, an institution that has changed so little in some ways since the Middle Ages, is now under such pressure for reform of undergraduate education. Perhaps it is also comforting that the Johns Hopkins University is not alone in its reexamination of the undergraduate experience. As our nation approached the 21st century, dozens of campuses, associations, regional accrediting bodies, research institutes, and state legislatures initiated reforms for U.S. higher education, particularly undergraduate education.

Early in the last decade of the 20th century, Johns Hopkins was one of the first institutions of higher education to form a Committee for the 21st Century to examine critically the entire University in order to recommend ways in which it could remain at the forefront of higher education in the next century. President William C. Richardson established eight “strategic study groups,” one of which focused on undergraduate education. The Committee’s Final Report, issued in September 1994, suggest a set of institutional imperatives and 23 specific recommendations to strengthen Johns Hopkins. The recommendations related to the Hopkins undergraduate experience were to devise tangible ways to encourage and reward excellence in undergraduate teaching and advising; make the undergraduate experience more personal; build greater educational coherence over the term of study; increase flexibility in the length of programs; and involve faculty from across the University in undergraduate education. Readers of the recommendations from the current Commission on Undergraduate Education will find this language familiar.

Stanford University established a Commission on Undergraduate Education to conduct its comprehensive review of the undergraduate experience in 1994. Based on the Commission’s findings, Stanford developed a series of new programs that allow more students to pursue original work. As a result, there are more seminars and research projects that offer every student the opportunity for first hand discovery. More recently, in May 2000, Stanford’s Faculty Senate endorsed “The Undergraduate Major: Guidelines and Policy,” prepared by its Committee on Undergraduate Studies. The policy document provides criteria for reviewing all undergraduate majors at Stanford and specifies that each school should adopt a suitable process by which to review each departmental major every six to eight years. Finally, Stanford has linked its renewal of undergraduate education to the “Campaign for Undergraduate Education” with the goal of raising $1 billion, mostly in endowment, to sustain campus innovations in undergraduate education.

In the fall 1994, the University of Pennsylvania’s 21st Century Project began with six committees that dealt with: “(1) the challenge of engaging freshmen and sophomores in research activities; (2) the academic standards and models for service-oriented academic programs; (3) the issue of advising; (4) the curriculum; (5) the issue of symbolic reasoning across the curriculum; and (6) enhancing internationalization.” In the following year, the Provost’s Committee on Undergraduate Education (PCUE) set the stage for Penn’s Undergraduate Experience Initiative. At the same time, Penn’s Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) released a “White Paper on Undergraduate Education.” In addition to a curricular restructuring of each undergraduate school, the SCUE paper proposed a holistic approach to learning and a common intellectual experience for all undergraduates. New course offerings in each of the three “Penn Sectors” - Community, Society, and Traditions - emphasize citizenship, cross-disciplinary study, and practical application of theory as well as writing, speaking, analysis, research, interpersonal skills, and technology.

In 1998, the University of California at Berkeley formed a Commission on Undergraduate Education that was charged with assessing the University’s efforts to provide the highest quality undergraduate education at Berkeley and recommending further steps that it might take to enhance the undergraduate experience. The final report, issued in September 2000, made four key recommendations: “(1) integrate inquiry-based learning into every phase of the undergraduate education; (2) ensure that all undergraduates
have the opportunity to become literate and numerate across a broad range of disciplines by the time they graduate; (3) improve the availability and quality of advising for both declared and undeclared students; and (4) regularize the institutional assessment of undergraduate education on the Berkeley campus.”

Columbia University’s 1998 comprehensive review of undergraduate education was aimed at upgrading facilities and improving the quality of student life both inside and outside the classroom. As a first step, the institution undertook a thorough overhaul of student services, including dining services. As a result, construction of a new student center was authorized. In addition, reforms taken at the departmental-level included the restructuring and resequencing of courses, the institution of capstone senior projects, and the design of specialized courses intended to introduce students to the approaches and techniques of their major.

In October 2001, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University embarked on an ambitious review of the undergraduate experience, with an emphasis on curricular and space planning. In March 2002, the faculty voted to reduce the number of Core Curriculum requirements, the first change since the Core was implemented in the 1970s. The review continues in 2002-03 with four foci: concentrations, general education, forms of teaching, and students’ academic experience, including extracurriculars.

More recently, in the spring 2002, President Richard Levin of Yale University commissioned a “Committee on Yale College Education” to focus on the state of undergraduate education, the first in 30 years. Four working groups were created to examine how to integrate undergraduate education into various University-wide initiatives and to consider how undergraduates can take better advantages of University resources, such as graduate and professional schools, arts institutions, and libraries. The final report was issued in the spring 2003.

As states confronted tight budgets in the mid-1990s, a number of higher education reforms were initiated by their legislatures and implemented by their higher education governing bodies. Leaders in both Virginia and Illinois required colleges and universities to demonstrate that they were addressing issues of quality and productivity. As a result, Illinois cut over 200 low-priority and duplicative academic programs and reinvested more than $100 million in undergraduate education and other priority areas through its “Priorities, Quality, and Productivity” initiative. Virginia required campuses to develop plans for reducing costs and focusing their efforts on the highest public priorities, including an expected growth in undergraduate enrollment.

In 1996, the state of California, facing significant fiscal constraints, increasing enrollments, declining instructional quality, and the early retirement of 2000 faculty, contracted with the Rand Corporation to review the purposes and design of its Master Plan for Higher Education (also known as the Kerr plan), adopted in 1960.

Several national higher education associations have in many ways taken the lead in the review of higher education at the turn of the century. Often they focused on teaching and learning as well as assessment of student learning at the undergraduate level. Early in the last decade of the 20th century, three associations - American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) - collaborated to form a Joint Task Force on Student Learning to analyze how instructors can be most helpful in facilitating student learning. Their report established ten principles of learning that are widely used today and often form the backbone of campus-based reform initiatives.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) chose to focus on undergraduate education in the context of America’s research universities. The report of the 1995 CFAT Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University entitled Reinventing
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*Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities* provided a “call to action” for American research universities. The report outlines ten priorities: “(1) make research-based learning the standard; (2) construct an inquiry-based freshman year; (3) build on the freshman foundation; (4) remove barriers to interdisciplinary education; (5) link communication skills and coursework; (6) use information technology creatively; (7) culminate with a capstone experience; (8) educate graduate students as apprentice teachers; (9) change faculty reward systems; and (10) cultivate a sense of community.”

The CFAT Boyer Commission reconvened in 2001 to examine the development of undergraduate programs in the years since the first Boyer Commission report. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: Three Years After the Boyer Report* records the current state of affairs and describes the extent to which research universities are dealing with the first report’s recommendations. Simply stated, its conclusion is that although some progress was made, conversion to a new model of undergraduate education is not complete.

Most recently (September 2002), after two years’ work, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) released *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*. The initiative outlines a vision for a “New Academy” that provides a high quality liberal education to all students in an era of near-universal access.

A number of research organizations also examined American higher education in the last decade of the 20th century. The National Research Council of the National Academies focused their activities on a much narrower slice of American higher education, that is, biology education. In 2000, it convened a Committee on Undergraduate Biology Education to Prepare Research Scientists for the 21st Century. Their final report, *Bio2010: Undergraduate Education to Prepare Biomedical Research Scientists*, called for more research and interdisciplinary study opportunities for undergraduates as well as more seminar-type courses.

In fall 2001, the Policy Center on the First-Year of College initiated a project called “Strengthening First-Year Student Learning at Doctoral/Research-Extensive Universities.” This project resulted in a searchable database of programs and strategies supporting positive learning outcomes for first-year students at research universities and builds on over two decades of work on the freshman year by John Gardner at the University of South Carolina.

In a three phase, five year study, the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement at Stanford examined organizational and administrative support for student assessment in postsecondary institutions.

Finally, during the past several years, regional accreditation organizations have undergone a series of revisions in their approach to standards for accreditation. In general, these modifications have shifted the bodies’ emphasis from assuring that institutions meet basic standards to using accreditation to enhance effectiveness. The Middle States Commission on Higher Education, which accredits Johns Hopkins, approved changes in January 2002 that place greater emphasis on institutional assessment and assessment of student learning. Similarly, in order to strengthen institutional ability for systematic quality improvement, the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools designed an alternative accreditation review process called Academic Quality Improvement Project (AQIP).

All of these initiatives seek to enhance undergraduate education by more self-conscious focus and systematic evaluation. There is a growing public consensus that, given its cost, undergraduate education should be better than it is and that the stakes are high enough to warrant the investment in improving the undergraduate experience.
CHAPTER 3: THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

With counsel from the Deans, and input from faculty and student government leaders, commissioners to the Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE) were appointed on the basis of their commitment to undergraduate education, their vision, their group skills, and their standing with their colleagues. Intentionally diverse, CUE cuts across the entire University, and includes 10 faculty, 14 undergraduates, 13 senior administrators and staff members (of whom five are also faculty), 2 trustees, and 3 Hopkins alums, approximately 42 members altogether. The Provost’s Office provided the administrative leadership for this initiative, as well as appropriate staff support.

The charge to the Commission on Undergraduate Education was to identify the core values that should characterize a Hopkins undergraduate experience and to develop recommendations for specific actions that would improve the quality of undergraduate education, both inside and outside the classroom, in all five Hopkins schools that offer undergraduate degree programs: the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, the Whiting School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the Peabody Institute, and the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education.

After receiving its charge from President William R. Brody in January 2002, the Commission on Undergraduate Education began monthly meetings as a committee of the whole. During these meetings, the Commission identified four sets of issues related to enhancing the undergraduate educational experience in its broadest sense and established the following working groups: academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life.

The Chair of the Commission, Dr. Paula Burger, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs and Acting Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, established an Executive Committee, comprised of the four working group chairs, two associate deans and a student representative. Dr. Burger also chairs the University’s accreditation steering committee that serves as the liaison between the University community and its accrediting body, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, to which will be presented the University’s Self-Study Report on undergraduate education.

After several full Commission meetings, the working groups met independently from June to August, to concentrate on fact-finding and formulating draft recommendations. During this time, they met with numerous University administrators and external consultants. The Johns Hopkins Office of Institutional Research provided much-needed information to the working groups and the Commission. Survey data were particularly important and informative, especially data from the 2002 Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) Senior Survey and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) administered to Hopkins undergraduates in the Homewood Schools in 2002. These data are both quantitative and qualitative, providing comparisons with norm groups and sometimes searing testimony from enrolled Hopkins students who took the time to write thoughtful comments in response to open-ended questions. The Commission also reviewed reports from similar commissions at peer institutions and such national reports as the seminal report of the Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research Universities, described in Chapter 2 of this report.

In September, the Commission reconvened to begin to develop consensus about the qualities that should characterize a Hopkins undergraduate education and to develop specific recommendations that would help achieve these goals. The outcomes of this discussion can be found in Chapter 4.

In October, the working group chairs reviewed their scopes of work (found in Appendix D) and preliminary recommendations at a meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs of the University’s Board of Trustees. In November and December, the working groups discussed their recommendations at
Commission meetings and received comments and suggestions for revision and further consideration. The Provost and deans of the five schools offering undergraduate programs as well as the Krieger School Department Chairs, the Homewood Academic Council, the Homewood Graduate Representative Organization (GRO), and the Whiting School’s Dean’s Search Committee were briefed separately on the Commission’s progress and provided an opportunity to comment in December 2002.

An Interim Report was prepared and distributed broadly in January 2003. CUE’s Interim Report also was made available to the general public via the Johns Hopkins website, and an Internet mailbox was set up to receive feedback. Over two dozen community meetings with various Hopkins constituent groups were held during February, March and early April. A complete list of these presentations can be found in Appendix B. Comments expressed during community meetings and sent via e-mail were overwhelmingly positive and supportive of the report and its recommendations. Many specifically expressed gratitude for the hard work of the Commissioners and for tackling some very difficult issues at Hopkins, and some noted that the interim recommendations were “long overdue.” While different levels of support were expressed in different quarters for different recommendations, there was especially widespread support for many of the student life recommendations (particularly guaranteed student housing); for the diversity recommendations (especially the Baltimore Scholars Program); and for some of the academic experience recommendations (especially expanding the number of small courses). The two interim recommendations that prompted the most dialogue (both for and against) regarded the Homewood 13-week academic calendar and the weekly course scheduling arrangements. After additional discussion, the Commission chose not to pursue its interim recommendation on the length of the semester and instead chose to emphasize the importance of studying adjustments to the weekly course schedule.

During the February-March comment period, Commission members were especially pleased to learn that the schools had already acted upon some of the interim recommendations. Finally, during this period, several favorable editorials, articles and letters related to the Commission appeared in the student newspaper, The News-Letter.

With the benefit of the input thus solicited, the Commission met in mid-April to reconsider its interim recommendations before finalizing and submitting its Final Report to the President and Provost. While not all the comments and suggestions received during the 25 community meetings and via e-mail could be incorporated into the Commission’s Final Report, they have all been recorded and will be forwarded to the appropriate offices for attention and/or will be addressed by the group of senior academic administrators for undergraduate education, as recommended in Chapter 6. Additional discussion is contemplated.

This report and its recommendations will be shared at a June meeting with the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Board of Trustees, as a follow-up to the presentation in October 2002 when the process and issues were outlined. It will also be the subject of a feature article in the Johns Hopkins Magazine which is distributed to thousands in the Johns Hopkins family.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this report will form the centerpiece of the University’s decennial accreditation by the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education during 2003-04, as mentioned earlier. Each of the five Hopkins schools offering undergraduate programs will be asked to establish a small working group to prepare a plan to implement CUE recommendations within the School and to advise the Dean about School priorities.
CHAPTER 4: MISSION AND VISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT JOHNS HOPKINS

The Johns Hopkins University has developed traditions and strengths based on its founding as the first research university in the United States in 1876. At that time, the German research university, which was one of the most successful academic models of the era, exerted a strong influence on the community of scholars that came together to start the new university. A particular goal of Johns Hopkins was to attract talented faculty either from the U.S. or abroad who were committed to developing new knowledge and who would train students in the research context. Less emphasis was put on mastering the Greek and Latin corpus that formed the core of the curriculum for most American liberal arts colleges in the 19th century. This tradition continues to influence the Hopkins approach to education today.

Notwithstanding our traditions and strengths, notions of a more perfect undergraduate education were inherent in the Commission’s deliberations, and, before reviewing our recommendations, it is worth outlining the mission that we see for the University in its undergraduate programs and the Commission’s vision for the experience that should be offered undergraduate students.

The mission of Johns Hopkins University with respect to undergraduate education is to prepare students to be informed and engaged global citizens. Undergraduates in all programs should hone critical thinking skills and develop their creativity. Those preparing for advanced study or the professions should achieve mastery of their disciplines. Graduates should be ready to engage in a lifetime of learning related both to their chosen careers and to their personal interests.

In particular, the following dimensions should characterize a Hopkins undergraduate education:

- critical thinking, effective writing, and competent oral communication
- educational breadth that is demonstrated by familiarity with the subject content and approaches to understanding the world carried out by humanists, natural scientists and engineers, and social scientists
- familiarity with the origins and diversity of U.S. culture and history as well as with other world cultures to foster a sense of civility and an appreciation for diversity
- intellectual depth that demonstrates a mastery at a high technical level of the findings and methods of a field of choice for advanced study and a mastery of discipline standards as defined by appropriate national professional organizations
- experience with the process of knowledge creation and understanding of the research enterprise, especially as it is implemented in the major
- possession of technological literacy
- appreciation for the necessity of continuous professional and personal development in the post-baccalaureate years
- opportunities to develop the habits of community service and civic engagement

A Johns Hopkins education should thus prepare all undergraduates for leadership and achievement within their chosen career paths.
To fulfill this mission, the Commission envisions an education that is characterized by excellent teaching and advising, opportunities for research and creative endeavor, a high degree of faculty-student interaction, curricular diversity, the opportunity for small group learning experiences, and the development of international perspective. The vision is that of an education that is, to the extent possible, both individualized and personal.

The Commission also embraces the notion that a superior undergraduate education seeks to integrate the formal academic experience with students’ lives outside the classroom. It values both intellectual and personal development. It reflects awareness that education takes place in many venues and that students have a lot to learn from one another. Residential life thus stands as an important aspect of the undergraduate experience since, in addition to the classroom, it is one of the chief ways in which students can take advantage of the extraordinary resource represented by their fellow students.

The Commission also is convinced that good education values diversity and that diversity of experience and curriculum is essential to a liberal education. A university that offers a broad intellectual range of courses and curricular programs, and that provides rich diversity in the make-up of its faculty and students contributes to a better learning environment and enhances the preparation of all students to make significant achievements once they graduate. A respect for and genuine welcoming of diversity is essential to the kind of civic engagement that we trust our graduates will embrace.

Finally, the vision for undergraduate education is one characterized by a strengthened sense of community that reinforces the intellectual life of undergraduates and the University as a whole. We like the formulation of the 1990 Carnegie Foundation report, *Campus Life: In Search of Community*, which espouses a vision of a campus community that is purposeful, open, just, disciplined, caring, and celebrative, and many of the Commission’s recommendations are designed to achieve those ends.

In order to fulfill this mission and achieve this vision for undergraduate education, the University must summon its resources, but, more importantly, all members of the University community must collectively commit to this endeavor. The Commission believes that Johns Hopkins can bring its already fine programs to a new level of excellence, one fully worthy of our distinguished institutional heritage.

**CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS AND COMMON NEEDS**

The Commission’s examination of undergraduate education was informed by survey data, structured interviews with academic and student affairs administrators, many informal conversations with students and faculty, and thoughtful discussion within the Commission’s working groups.

Notwithstanding the complexity of its charge to address undergraduate education in five different school environments and the limited institutional research data available about some of the divisions, the Commission was struck by the amount of consensus about the strengths of a Hopkins education and about areas in which the undergraduate experience needs improving. This is true with respect to all four areas of inquiry: the academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life.

**FINDINGS**

**THE ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE**

Many aspects of the academic experience get deservedly high marks. Students value the opportunity to take courses with faculty at the forefront of their fields and appreciate the intellectual excitement of being engaged with expert practitioners, researchers and scholars who are influencing the course of their
disciplines, and in the case of Peabody students, renowned artists. The main advantage of education in a research intensive environment is the opportunity to participate directly in the process of discovery. At Hopkins, this is clearly an institutional strength. Significant numbers of students (in fact, larger percentages than at our peer institutions) work with faculty on their research endeavors, with many students producing poster sessions and some contributing to published findings. We heard and read plenty of testimony from students who had found wonderful faculty mentors and had been gratified by the degree of interest shown by an individual faculty member or an advisor. We also learned of opportunities in some departments for the kind of engagement with the faculty that more often characterizes small, liberal arts colleges. Clinical supervision presents nursing students with active mentoring through a capstone experience, and all SPSBE students complete Senior Research Projects under the guidance of a faculty sponsor and accompanied by a supporting research seminar. We know too that those students who intend to pursue advanced education in graduate or professional school leave the University extremely well-prepared. The depth of specialized knowledge that Hopkins students attain stands them in good stead.

On the other hand, we found evidence that, despite these positive aspects to the experience of many undergraduates, there are still too many students who are dissatisfied generally with access to faculty, class sizes, and the perceived degree of faculty commitment to the undergraduate experience. Some of the frustrations are no doubt discipline-specific and byproducts of uneven demand for certain majors or related to additional challenges of pre-medical education that we offer to an unusually high number of students. Many “gateway” courses are very large, and students contend that not all are well-taught. Nor are laboratory experiences that accompany some of these courses uniformly excellent. These problems contribute also to an environment characterized by excessive competition and by less true intellectual exchange than is desirable.

In addition to the positive aspect noted previously, the academic depth that many departments at Hopkins encourage has a negative side. Extensive requirements for the major and related coursework deny some Homewood students the opportunity for the degree of educational breadth that would serve best their long-term goals or stretch fully their intellectual horizons. Further, too many students are graduating without the gains that we would like to see in analytical, writing, or speaking skills.

**ADVISING AND CAREER SUPPORT**

Our five undergraduate divisions offer a variety of resources to assist students with the academic choices that they must make as well as with their plans for advanced education or job placement. In a number of areas, these services have been enhanced in recent years. However, at the risk of over-generalization, despite these enhancements, such services at Hopkins have not been as fully developed as at some of our peer universities. More should be done to provide the best level of advising assistance. Students are not satisfied with academic advising in some departments where they perceive some faculty as inaccessible, uninterested, or over-burdened by advising loads. They experience too few opportunities to participate in mentored relationships that might guide their academic and career choices. Career counseling is not perceived in some divisions to serve well the interests of those students not headed for graduate study. Coordination and good communication among the elements of the advising system have not been fully achieved. While we are now actively cultivating alumni involvement, we have not reached the level of engagement that represents the best practices in these areas.

**DIVERSITY**

In many respects, Johns Hopkins University is a culturally diverse institution. We draw students from all corners of this country. Need-based financial aid allows us to enroll students from various socio-economic groups, although Hopkins, like our peer private universities, struggles to achieve higher levels
of such diversity. Some Hopkins divisions also have large cohorts of international students, and we attract significant numbers of students from some racial and ethnic groups. Hopkins majority students value their exposure to this diverse student body and interaction with students from different backgrounds and cite higher levels of satisfaction with this aspect of their undergraduate experience than their colleagues at peer institutions. There have been few overt racial incidents or situations of intolerance to students because of sexual orientation.

However, not all is well in terms of diversity. The experience reported by ethnic minority students as well as students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans-gendered is quite different from that perceived by their majority classmates. These students do not have a comfortable place in the Hopkins community. The University does not have a significantly diverse student body in terms of race and ethnicity. We particularly lack the number of African-American and Hispanic students that would allow these students to feel fully comfortable. In addition, we have not sufficiently developed support systems and structures to assure that all admitted students can enjoy equal success. The absence of adequate numbers of African-Americans and Hispanics on the faculty and in senior staff leadership roles deprives the underrepresented minority students of the role models so important for intellectual and social development. Further, we recognize that there are gender related concerns, such as percentage of males in nursing and women in engineering.

STUDENT LIFE

For many Hopkins students, there is no shortage of outlets for an active life outside the classroom. There are myriad clubs and organizations covering a full spectrum of interests. Occasions abound for community service. The tradition of entrepreneurship at Hopkins shows itself in the number of activities that Hopkins students initiate or for which they take virtually full responsibility. The opportunities for leadership thus presented are manifold. New facilities and staff at Homewood have resulted in expanded support for the arts, for recreational past-times, and for religious expression and exploration. Beyond the borders of the campuses, Baltimore exists as a city rich in culture and social resources. There are excellent museums, symphony, opera, and theatre; fine restaurants; professional sports events; and sufficiently interesting and “funky” areas to allow ample venues for the adventurous.

Yet, Homewood undergraduate students report a feeling of fragmentation about their residential lives, and more generally a serious absence of community. They lack sufficient contact with faculty outside of purely academic settings; upperclassmen live off campus and therefore are too detached from campus social and intellectual life. They also lack spaces to socialize and to engage in group study. There are few shared rituals and traditions that would bind the community together. Many Peabody students feel a similar sense of isolation and feel disconnected from the rest of the University. Nursing students experience the effects of social space limitations and are concerned about safety and parking issues. SPSBE undergraduates have special concerns about fragmentation, both with respect to the particular geographic dispersal of academic programs and also the demands on adults who balance full-time work with family and school. And, there is almost universal criticism of the food services on campus.

COMMON NEEDS

As we assessed each of these four broad areas, identified specific concerns with the undergraduate experience, and contemplated our findings, several themes recurred and certain common needs emerged. These are the common needs around which our recommendations cohere.

The single most important undergraduate need at Johns Hopkins is to strengthen the sense of community. Survey data and anecdotal testimony give ample and compelling evidence of the central importance of this objective. Many factors at Hopkins conspire to create a lack of a sense of community.
Surely, realities of campus geography play an important role, but so, too, do certain conventions and practices that weaken the bonds of community that develop naturally when talented people who share interests come together.

We face the further challenge of creating an undergraduate community across five schools and multiple campuses, each with a different focus, scope and student expectations. Each of these communities shares a strong interest in more and better programming, more space for informal relaxation, and more interaction with students in other divisions of the University. The old-fashioned yellow school bus is the official mechanism for bridging the distances. Like other urban universities, our campuses are also severely constrained in terms of land available for facility expansion. This problem manifests itself in the absence of informal gathering places and lack of adequate student union facilities and outdoor recreational space that would support undergraduate student needs for stress-relieving pastimes. More importantly, the dearth of campus land on which to build traditional residence halls increases the challenge of developing a sense of community within the student bodies of each Hopkins school.

On top of these physical obstacles, there are, in fact, other problems, some of our own making. We need to consider how Homewood course scheduling practices affect the academic and social environment for students. Administrative decentralization as well as incongruent class schedules work against interdivisional programs. While the programmatic infrastructure has tended to provide good support to groups and individuals with specific, focused interests, it has served less well the cause of bringing the student body together in school-wide social events or celebrations. Further, Hopkins lacks the kinds of shared traditions that form bonds among students and, over generations, sustain a sense of place.

The essential paradox is that the campus community encompasses, and is in a sense defined by, the academic mission of the University. So while we know from our summary of ‘best practices’ that fostering a sense of community is vital, and that the quality of campus life directly affects the effectiveness of the undergraduate experience, we cannot so easily separate ‘student life’ from ‘academic life.’ Indeed, students tell us that the character of academic life at Hopkins, the infamous ‘throat culture’ and excessive specialization, creates a dysfunctional community outside the classroom.

Strengthening our sense of community, then, may depend as much on what happens in the calculus class as whatever changes we may make in residential and student life, and however much we may spend. At the same time, plenty of evidence suggests that improving residential and student life can go a long way toward breaking an endemic culture of competitiveness and complaint that has become a self-perpetuating expectation if not a self-fulfilling prophecy.

**The needs for better integration of the elements of the undergraduate experience and for a healthier sense of balance find expression in a number of Commission recommendations.** One of the consequences of Hopkins decentralization is that responsibility for various aspects of the undergraduate experience is fragmented. Departmental autonomy on major requirements and advising arrangements, the segregation of the structures that address student life issues from those responsible for academic matters, and the resulting lack of integration of the academic and extra-curricular dimension of the undergraduate experience reflect some of the dysfunctional aspects of a tradition of decentralization that has otherwise served Hopkins well. Several recommendations thus propose ways “to see the student whole.” Moreover, Hopkins is a place where faculty and students come to work hard, but coming with a sense of purpose is not mutually exclusive with coming with a sense of play. Survey data show that some self-selection is at work as a large percentage of students come to Hopkins prepared to study especially hard and anticipate a less fulfilling social life. As one of our members observed, this is one area in which it is unfortunate that Hopkins lives up to expectations! Departmentally mandated extensive course requirements and liberal policies permitting significant course overloads intensify the stress on students, many of whom already operate under the pressure of the reality of competition for admission to graduate and professional school
or competition for limited job opportunities in a tight labor market. Several recommendations thus propose remedies to create a more balanced and supportive environment.

**A third need around which many of the recommendations cohere is the need for undergraduate education at Hopkins to be more personal.** As one of the smallest of the American research universities, Johns Hopkins should offer an undergraduate program characterized, if not any longer by the “hand-tooling” that faculty tout as the standard for a Hopkins graduate education, at least by the opportunity for substantial, close interaction with faculty. Growth in the size of the student body over the past dozen years may well have made it more difficult to achieve this objective. Nonetheless, the absence of core requirements and courses specially designed for first-year students and the anonymity of large science and other introductory classes all contribute to an environment that is individualized, yet not personalized.

**One of the most disturbing findings by the Commission is the extent to which many students perceive that no one cares.** Given that the faculty and administrative members of CUE each agreed to serve out of a strong commitment to undergraduate education and that the President and Provost who launched the Commission, and the Deans who blessed the initiative, did so out of equally strong beliefs in the importance of undergraduate education and a determination to make it better, this is particularly troubling. Almost uniformly, other administrators not centrally involved in this exercise volunteered help. Some were even disappointed not to be included as Commission members. So, where is the disconnect? How is it that this level of interest and concern has not resulted in wider recognition that some, and indeed many, do in fact care? Certainly, there is a need to reconcile this gap between the perception of not caring and the reality that many do indeed feel passionately about the satisfaction and success of undergraduates.

**Finally, the need to be more intentional about undergraduate education is a fifth need and focus of many of the recommendations.** The decisions to appoint a Commission on Undergraduate Education and to focus the reaccreditation self-study on undergraduate education are two first steps. There is merit in continuing University-wide discussions about undergraduate education, but, in keeping with our administrative tradition of decentralization, explicit focus must also take place in each school and in each department. Part of being more deliberate is also to identify individuals with the unequivocal charge to attend to undergraduate education. If the undergraduate experience is to be enhanced, there will need to be clearly assigned responsibility and accountability.

We turn now to the Commission’s recommendations, recommendations that speak to these important needs.

**CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS**

As noted in the previous chapter, Hopkins offers many exceptional, perhaps unparalleled opportunities. But there are also significant areas where we can and must do better, and there are structural and cultural changes that must be made. The recommendations that follow are the Commission’s suggestions for those things that most need doing. They cover the four areas of inquiry described in the previous chapter: the academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life.

A number of these recommendations are equally relevant for all five divisions that offer undergraduate degrees, while others may be applicable to only one or two divisions. The precise application of these recommendations will have to take into account each school’s mission, culture, and resources. Some corrective actions are already in progress, and the Commission is pleased to note these efforts.
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

RECOMMENDATION 1

Assign specific responsibility for assuring the quality of undergraduate education to a senior-level administrator in each school’s dean’s office and regularly bring together those individuals to facilitate discussion of undergraduate concerns across the University.

At present much of the vision of how the undergraduate experience should be organized is de-centralized. At Homewood, for example, departments are free to set requirements that are not directly related to the major. The faculty determines, without administrative consultation, whether a course will fulfill a particular distribution requirement. More central oversight can also ensure that problems with class size are identified and addressed. These problems are localized within the curriculum but severe in some cases when they occur. (We are doubtful that efforts to target an increase in the number of students to a particular course of study will sufficiently address this problem.) The senior-level administrator designated with the responsibility for ensuring the quality of the undergraduate program would oversee and coordinate the review of undergraduate programs called for below; work closely, collectively and individually, with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies called for in the next recommendation to continue the conversation and sustain the effort to enhance undergraduate education; and work closely with student affairs staff to better integrate student life with the academic experience. Some of the early foci of the senior administrator, working closely with faculty and with the directors of undergraduate study called for in the next recommendation, will be to create a “program review template” to guide the work of departments as they implement recommendation 3; to strengthen the quality, participation level, and effective use of the course evaluation system; and to review current grading practices and/or policies.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Appoint a faculty Director of Undergraduate Studies in each department or degree program that offers an undergraduate major.

Responsibility for the academic quality of the undergraduate major rests with departmental faculty who have multiple responsibilities; there needs to be an individual for whom the development and health of the program is a major priority. This person should be more than a coordinator; he/she should be charged with the formal responsibility for leading the development of a coherent major, ensuring adequate course offerings, monitoring class size, organizing the departmental advising system, and perhaps arranging programs for majors that offer intellectual stimulation, guidance regarding advanced study, or practical information about career opportunities. Such programs would also help to develop a sense of community among departmental majors. Where workload dictates, faculty service as a Director of Undergraduate Studies should be recognized by appropriate adjustments in course load and should be considered a significant form of departmental and school service. The creative engagement of graduate students should also be considered as an ancillary source of help in departmental efforts to strengthen services and programs for departmental majors. Directors across the departments should be brought together regularly to discuss common issues, including strengthening the course evaluation system, and to consider the interfaces among the various departmental programs so that the academic needs of undergraduate students are being met across the entire curriculum.

RECOMMENDATION 3

Conduct broad reviews of the quality of undergraduate degree programs on a regular cycle, in addition to, or as part of, existing reviews of academic departments.
To enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience, each program offering an undergraduate degree should undergo a broad review on a regular cycle (but no less frequently than every eight to ten years). An initial review might take the form of a departmental self-study, but, over time, all or most departments should also undergo reviews that include outside experts. Programs would be asked to address explicitly a series of questions derived from national professional standards and Hopkins faculty pedagogical expertise. These reviews are not intended to replace current departmental review processes, such as those conducted by the Homewood Academic Council, because those are essentially “program audits” and do not focus on the quality of the undergraduate programs.

These reviews, whether they are incorporated into existing review processes or are conducted separately, would examine such matters as the philosophy underlying the major requirements; teaching expectations; the range of introductory, small group, and senior capstone experiences; the use of instructional technology; international opportunities for students; diversity in the curriculum; course evaluation systems; grading practices and/or policies; and data on the modal experience of students. It is assumed that the appropriate senior-level administrator for undergraduate education in each division (see recommendation 1), working with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies, would create a “program review template,” oversee the administration of a review process, and work with departments on appropriate follow-up.

As a part of the regular departmental review there would also be yearly routine examination of certain aspects of the undergraduate program, for example, course evaluation review. Each year, every department and program should evaluate feedback provided by undergraduates in the class. Departments should use a school set criterion (e.g., Merlin), and if they desire, an additional form for personalized questions for their course. However, any supplemental questions should not be used in lieu of uniform criteria. Moreover, data collected should be submitted to the Dean's Office in addition to the department. If "poor" (again some basic standards will need to be determined) marks are persistent for more than two or three years in a course, an independent external review of the course should be undertaken by a committee comprised of representatives from the school.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**

**Assure that juniors and seniors have access, within their majors, to small classes and to appropriate small group experiences, including “capstone” courses.**

In some departments, advanced majors have access to too few courses in which enrollment is small enough to facilitate high-quality interactions between the faculty and students. This is a problem for two reasons. First, we believe that a Hopkins education as we envision it must give students a good chance for real interaction with research faculty. And second, it is important that students develop close relationships with faculty so that faculty evaluations of students and letters of recommendation can be of a high quality. As a rough guideline, we propose that every student be able to take at least two courses in her or his major in which enrollment is not more than 20. Within the broad parameters of this guideline, it may be wise to leave individual departments with substantial latitude as to what sort of a "capstone" experience they provide for their undergraduates, so long as the capstone has a personal touch. To be true to our mission and our obligation to our undergraduates, these courses should be taught by distinguished faculty. To assure sufficient small group experiences, some departments are likely to need additional faculty resources.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

**Expand the opportunities available to first-year students for intellectually engaging academic experiences in a small group format.**
On many campuses, priority attention has been given to the quality of the first-year experience as a means of setting the tone for the entire undergraduate program. Some of these successful experiments are reviewed in the text accompanying the Student Life recommendations, but they generally have in common the fact that students are challenged to be active learners. Unfortunately, the curriculum of many first-year Hopkins students reflects the need to make early progress on pre-medical or engineering requirements, and there is precious little opportunity to experience seminar style learning. While we believe that small group experiences are especially critical for juniors and seniors, and thus should receive priority for resource allocation, serious and creative attention should be given to developing ways to make it possible for first-year students to have a more personal academic experience. We believe that such opportunities reinforce healthy attitudes about academic exploration and that, were a critical mass of freshmen to have such experiences, it would improve the campus intellectual climate. The proposed departmental undergraduate program reviews should encompass attention to this issue with respect to departmental majors, but many freshmen are unsure of their choice of majors, and they, too, should have access to small group experiences, some of which may serve the purpose of exposing freshmen to diverse disciplinary perspectives.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

**Provide various faculty incentives for good teaching, and ensure deliberate and appropriate recognition of teaching excellence in faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure.**

Faculty investment of time and energy in good teaching should be recognized and rewarded in various ways, the most important of which, of course, is recognition in the appointment and promotion process, and where there is none, in the merit raise determination. The Academic Councils of the schools bear responsibility for considering the role of teaching in appointments and promotion, and their efforts to effectuate such recognition are to be encouraged. Various other ways must be found to attach greater value to and to show greater respect for the work of faculty who are devoted to teaching, including those non-tenure track faculty, instructors, and adjuncts who carry part of the teaching mission in some programs. While there now exist some of the customary teaching awards common on many campuses, the divisions should be certain that appropriate recognition is accorded those who attain teaching excellence through *rewards* as well as *awards*. In some critical programs there is clearly a problem with classes, particularly large lecture classes that are not being taught well; this affects the academic experiences of hundreds of students. To refresh the curriculum, released time or summer grants could be given to develop new courses or to enhance existing courses, through technological or other innovations. The quality of these key courses with high demand should be a priority and the subject of special efforts to secure superior teaching.

Additionally, the schools should consider more active recognition of “teaching as scholarship” as called for by Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in his 1990 book *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Surely, the writing of the definitive textbook in a field or the development of widely used electronic teaching modules constitutes important research, influences the education of students, contributes to the development of the academic disciplines, and adds to the stature of Hopkins faculty.

The idea of recognizing teaching excellence is a hardy perennial; indeed, the Committee on the 21st Century endorsed a similar recommendation almost ten years ago. It is time to take steps to embrace this value as a central part of the Hopkins academic culture and to ensure that it is honored. The Commission believes that there are alumni and others who might be attracted to fund these opportunities to recognize teaching excellence.
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RECOMMENDATION 7

Increase support for faculty and graduate students in teaching effectiveness - including pedagogical consultation, assistance with enhancing teaching and learning through instructional technologies, and strengthening the course evaluation system - and improve the campus physical infrastructure to enable such.

For new faculty, Teaching Assistants, and some tenured faculty, knowledge about, and experience with, effective instructional methods and strategies may not be readily available. All Hopkins faculty who teach undergraduates should have access to offices of instructional support that offer pedagogical consultation and a range of tools for understanding how instructional technologies can enhance a variety of learning environments. Currently, such support is available through the Center for Educational Resources in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and in a similar entity in the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. Special efforts to enhance the teaching skills of graduate students should also be made. Beyond a very basic introduction and review of University policies, any additional guidance and mentoring of graduate students is left to the discretion of the department. Conducting some programs on a division-wide basis would offer economies of scale. And, no doubt, attention to teaching methods would benefit undergraduates through enhanced instruction, but also graduate students themselves as they develop their skills for the professoriate.

Furthermore, during the February and March 2003 public comment period, a number of community members noted that the campus infrastructure for teaching, i.e., campus classroom facilities, needed attention. Not only was Hodson Hall held out as exemplary because of its technical assets, but also because of its HVAC systems, lighting, furniture, and other basic amenities. Each campus that holds classes for undergraduates should provide a plan for assuring that its classroom facilities meet a contemporary minimum set of requirements designed to optimize the teaching-learning experience for both faculty and students.

RECOMMENDATION 8

Support actively efforts to ensure that all members of the University community are educated about what constitutes academic integrity and understand their obligations to act with honor in each and every academic matter.

Surveys provided sobering commentary on the view of many students at Homewood who feel their undergraduate experiences are compromised by dishonest acts of their classmates. The caricature is that of a cutthroat culture where anything goes in order to get the grade and where academic competitiveness supports, if not encourages, an environment where cheating is all too common and where there are alleged instances of students deliberately undermining the success of other students. In conversations, graduate teaching assistants stated their active concern about this problem and their discouragement that some faculty fail to deal decisively with academic misbehavior. Some TA’s expressed concern that students may not be well enough informed on the basic principles of citation and may need instruction in what constitutes unacceptable practice.

Similar discussions about academic integrity are taking place on campuses across the nation. Like many peer institutions, some Hopkins divisions have developed programs to confront the issue, and these should be pursued vigorously. All Hopkins schools should have plans involving education about academic ethics, clearly stated penalties for violations, and support for those TA’s and faculty members who report situations of alleged misconduct.
None of the other aspirations that the Commission has for the undergraduate experience matter if the basic elements of an academic community are not in place, and surely academic integrity is chief among them.

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

**Encourage efforts to broaden the mix of academic interests in the student body in order both to enrich the intellectual discourse and to match student enrollments more closely to academic resources.**

One of the joys of being at a University is knowing students and faculty who, together, have wide-ranging interests. Such diversity of academic interests and talents makes for a stimulating environment, fosters lively conversation, and causes members of the community to expand the scope of their own horizons. Across the University, we need to bring together elements of our academic diversity, as with facilitating more contact among Nursing, Homewood, SPSBE, and Peabody students. But, also, within each School’s student body, it is important to ensure diversity of academic or disciplinary interests. A student body has a significant impact on itself, so that this diversity is a critical element in the quality of the undergraduate experience. Recruitment efforts at Homewood already show some positive results in leavening the academic mix with larger numbers of students who want to major in one of the humanities disciplines.

**RECOMMENDATION 10**

**Ensure that the undergraduate experience has a significant international dimension by offering students attractive opportunities for foreign study and internships, coursework with an international character, and campus activities and programs that take advantage of the University’s rich international resources.**

Johns Hopkins is a thoroughly international institution, and yet too few of our undergraduates experience this element of a diverse education. Adequate support should be provided for students who wish to study abroad, in terms of advising and information resources, but there should also be active development of Hopkins programs for international study, perhaps taking advantage of Hopkins international facilities and the significant international research activities of many Hopkins faculty. For example, a formal summer internship program could be developed through which pre-medical students are teamed with those faculty in the School of Public Health who conduct numerous summer research projects abroad. Programs should take advantage of unique Hopkins resources. Similarly, the creation of a position in the Alumni office to organize networking and internships should also afford international opportunities for students, especially in light of the large number of our alumni who live abroad and who are eager to remain engaged with their alma mater (see recommendation 16).

**RECOMMENDATION 11**

**Thoroughly study the current weekly course schedule and class scheduling practices to determine whether adjustments might be made to enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience.**

As noted earlier, perhaps no proposed recommendation of the Commission generated more discussion than that to change the weekly course schedule for Homewood to a more standard format of Monday-Wednesday-Friday/Tuesday-Thursday instead of the current schedule which, loosely, operates on a MTW/ThF format. The recommendation was proposed in the Commission’s Interim Report because the Commission thought there would be significant benefits to spreading out three meeting courses over five days and two meeting courses over three days. A key benefit of such a change would be the facilitation
of cross-divisional registration and inter-divisional collaboration in program development. Currently, the ability of Homewood students to take classes at the Bloomberg School of Public Health and at the Peabody Institute and of Peabody students to take courses at Homewood (where their presence would enrich student experience) is seriously constrained by the incompatibility of class schedules. In addition, this change was seen as having the potential to enhance students’ ability to prepare for class, complete readings and assignments, and evenly distribute their academic course loads, thus providing time to absorb learning. Moreover, the revision offered the possibility of improved classroom utilization since the current scheduling convention results in less than effective classroom deployment.

The Commission saw the unique Hopkins schedule as contributing also to high stress levels, a sense of being harried, and difficulties in time management for students. A pattern of concentrating classes over only three days of the week may well be contributing to the feeling of isolation for many students. Normal social interactions become quite lopsided when students shift from high levels of campus engagement while taking back-to-back-to-back classes without a break to more solitary pursuits, frequently in the isolation of their off campus apartments. But resident advisors also noted another concern: a frequent pattern of students who live in residence halls concentrating their classes in three days and regularly leaving Baltimore on weekends, thus exacerbating the difficulty of developing a sense of community. Furthermore, it is quite possible that the student perceptions of faculty not being accessible are related to the fact that many students have relatively few interactions, for instance, from Wednesday afternoon to Monday morning.

During the various community conversations held to solicit reaction to the Interim Report, we heard endorsement of almost all these observations about the effects of the current course scheduling practices. Some faculty even cited this recommendation as the most important in the Commission’s report in terms of its impact on the quality of undergraduate education. But, the Commission also received from Arts and Sciences constituents many e-mails, letters, and comments at community meetings that argued in support of the current course schedule because it supports the scholarly activity and research productivity of the faculty. It was evident that many see the Hopkins system as being part of the institutional culture and a definite advantage in recruiting faculty for whom the considerable flexibility is a welcome advantage in conducting research trips including utilizing instrumentation at other institutions, attending professional meetings, or simply having blocks of concentrated time for research and scholarship. Some faculty also argued that the current system has pedagogical advantages in allowing for sustained attention to topics over consecutive days and in encouraging self-paced, individual learning.

Concern was expressed that a M-W-F format would result in more graduate student teaching or cancelled classes on Friday when faculty might need to be traveling. The current system was seen as allowing scholars and researchers to meet their teaching obligations while fulfilling their need to be especially visible professionally and active in their disciplines, given that the small size of many Hopkins departments means extra pressure on each individual faculty member to contribute to the academic stature of the department.

And, while we had positive comments from students about proposed changes, we heard also a number of cautions. A common observation was that the current system makes possible entire days free of classes and facilitates their ability to take advantage of research opportunities in East Baltimore or in Washington, D.C. There were also students who, candidly, expressed concern that Friday classes would compromise the four day weekends that they had come to enjoy and make Hopkins an even more intense environment.

It remains the vast majority of the Commission’s strong conviction that a change in the course scheduling practices would enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience, and that, in the absence of such change, it will be very difficult to make the Hopkins culture more supportive of undergraduate students.
However, the Commission has taken the input received on this issue seriously and thinks that the issue warrants further serious study toward the end of determining whether important and legitimate needs in undergraduate education might be met by adjustments in the course schedule without undue compromise to faculty scholarship, research and other professional activity, or to student research opportunities. The Commission invites additional reflection and imaginative thinking about how best to accomplish these ends. It challenges the leadership of the schools to ensure that this matter receives the attention that it warrants as one of those long-accepted practices at Hopkins that is not conducive to high quality undergraduate education and probably influences culture more than we know.

**RECOMMENDATION 12**

*Give final examinations only during the final examination period.*

There is one aspect of the academic calendar that the Commission thinks should be addressed immediately. Regardless of the particular configuration of the class week, the Commission thinks it is vitally important that, within the semester calendar, the reading and scheduled examination periods be respected. Students report that not infrequently individual faculty infringe on the published reading period by scheduling their examinations on an *ad hoc* basis. We learned of many incidences of scheduling final examinations also during the final week of class, thus compromising the length of the semester. In the interest of fairness, and out of respect for students, this practice should be curtailed, and only in the most extreme circumstances, and with a dean’s approval, should examinations be given at other than the formally scheduled time. The Registrar’s Office should establish and publish an examination schedule in sufficient time for students and faculty to make their end-of-the-semester plans accordingly.

**RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ADVISING AND CAREER SUPPORT SERVICES**

**RECOMMENDATION 13**

*Strengthen faculty engagement in advising by making expectations clear, by providing mentoring and orientation, and by more explicitly including effective service as an advisor as one of the considerations for salary and promotion decisions.*

This objective might be implemented in several ways: by including a discussion of advising responsibilities in hiring discussions with prospective new faculty; by creating an academic advising orientation for new faculty and a “reorientation and update” program for experienced faculty; by providing to new faculty senior faculty mentors known to be strong advisors; and by developing a mechanism to evaluate faculty mentoring and including that information among considerations for salary increases and promotions.

**RECOMMENDATION 14**

*Improve communication and leverage activities among the career support services offices, departmental advising coordinators, academic and preprofessional advising staff, alumni offices’ staff, and other related service providers.*

Advising should be seen as a seamless system. The current situation reflects too high a degree of decentralization so that the whole is not only not greater than, but also perhaps not equal to, the sum of its parts. Service providers in one area should be familiar with complementary resources in other areas and should be able to facilitate access to those resources with a minimum of hassle. For example, it might be helpful to have faculty advisors educate career support services professionals about academic careers and
to have career advisors update faculty about the non-academic labor market, contemporary strategies for exploring employment opportunities, and non-academic careers related to the major. In particular, attention should be paid to making sure that faculty, career professionals, and students are well-informed about services and programs by increasing the use of the Internet, the involvement of student leaders, and the use of student publications. Students should also be educated about their responsibilities as an advisee. The new departmental Directors of Undergraduate Studies (see recommendation 2) might best provide the interface between and among those who advise students about careers.

Cooperation and collaboration (for example, with jointly sponsored career and graduate fairs) can also be improved among career support services offices in the several schools.

**RECOMMENDATION 15**

**Explore the centralization of some advising/career support resources, such as study abroad, internships, and fellowships.**

Advising now takes place in several locations across the University, and information resources are thus similarly dispersed. For example, to find information about international opportunities such as summer programs, semesters abroad, and internships, students often have to visit several offices. Fellowship information may be obtained in departments, depending on the field, or in the central Homewood academic advising center. While it makes sense to take advantage of expertise wherever it is found, some effort should be made to provide “one stop shopping,” as appropriate, in either a single physical or virtual location.

**RECOMMENDATION 16**

**Create a position within the Johns Hopkins Alumni Office that, in concert with the various school career support service offices, would develop networking and internship opportunities for undergraduates.**

Hopkins alumni represent a wonderful resource for current students, and current students represent splendid ambassadors for the University. At present, interaction is primarily *ad hoc*. One of the benefits of a Hopkins education should be access to the impressive network of Hopkins alumni around the globe. More concerted efforts need to be made to link students with alumni and to capitalize on the rich experience and perspective that they offer. Many institutions enlist alumni in providing career advice and in developing internships. Within each school’s career support services office, a staff member should be designated to act as liaison to the Johns Hopkins Alumni Office in order to develop networking opportunities with alumni for undergraduates.

**RECOMMENDATION 17**

**Assure undergraduate access to professional career planning and development services, including employment support for the growing number of undergraduates who choose not to go directly to graduate/professional school and desire employment after earning their baccalaureate degrees.**

The increasing trend among Homewood undergraduates to delay application to graduate school for two to three years after graduation and concomitant desire to explore career/employment alternatives with advice from career support services staff should be recognized with an appropriate level of support.

Professionals skilled in career development should be available in sufficient numbers to counsel students. They should be creative and innovative in their approach to providing career planning and placement
services to students throughout their entire undergraduate program, from freshman year to senior year. Large numbers of Hopkins undergraduates come with definite ideas of their career goals; not all such students maintain their interests or find it feasible to pursue their original aspirations. Career development is a several decades-long process, and, during their four years at Hopkins, undergraduates should be helped to acquire the skill sets that will help them grow professionally throughout their careers.

**RECOMMENDATION 18**

Assure adequate physical and technical facilities (including a state-of-the-art website and electronic student portfolios) for career support services offices in each school.

Technology offers creative possibilities to enhance career support services, but at present, these possibilities are not sufficiently developed. Some schools have begun to explore the creation of electronic student portfolios, and such efforts should be encouraged. Similarly, career support services offices need adequate facilities if they are to host recruiters.

**RECOMMENDATION 19**

Assure that each school tracks its graduates' post-baccalaureate activities, whether advanced study or employment.

Information about the plans of our graduates is important, but, across the University, we have surprisingly little systematic data about what undergraduates do with their Hopkins education. A central, University-wide repository for tracking data about employment and graduate school attendance should be developed and maintained. The development of a new student information system offers the potential for planning for systematic collection and analysis of these data.

**RECOMMENDATION 20**

Include an evaluation of academic advising and career support in all undergraduate satisfaction surveys.

Because adequate academic and career advising should be an integral part of the Hopkins undergraduate experience, data on student satisfaction with these services should be regularly collected and monitored.

**RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DIVERSITY**

**RECOMMENDATION 21**

In the area of student recruitment, significantly increase the diversity of its undergraduate student body so that, within five years, Johns Hopkins is in the top decile of its peer group in the enrollment of underrepresented ethnic minority students. Toward that end:

- Prepare a detailed plan for enrolling African-American, Latina/o, and Native-American students, complete with action steps, funding requirements, and an aggressive timetable.
- Endorse the proposal of the Homewood Admissions’ Office to establish “The Baltimore Scholars Program” to provide full scholarships (tuition and fees) to graduates of Baltimore City Public Schools who are admitted to an undergraduate program, beginning with the entering class of 2004.
• Develop linkages with other Hopkins ethnic minority outreach programs, including successful diversity initiatives by the Center for Talented Youth, and consider forging partnerships with community colleges.

The first empirical study of the impact of diversity on the quality of the educational experience and success in the workplace after graduation (The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions by William Bowen and Derek Bok) demonstrated that students of all races benefited from living and learning in a diverse educational environment. Race-sensitive admissions policies matter not just for underrepresented ethnic minority students but for majority students as well. Civic participation, job satisfaction and employment performance, satisfaction with life and personal growth – all were powerfully influenced by an academic life experienced in the context of a diverse student body. As Glenn Loury writes in the foreword to the book, “since individuals use race to conceptualize themselves, we must be conscious of race as we try to create rules for a just society…there is a need to confront opinion with fact so we can better see the distinction between the ‘morality of color-blindness’ and the ‘morality of racial justice.’”

We recognize that unequal educational opportunities at the primary and secondary education levels affect the “pipeline” of ethnic minority students who are appropriately prepared to study at Johns Hopkins and other elite universities. More can and must be done.

RECOMMENDATION 22

Take steps to increase significantly the retention and graduation rates of all undergraduates so that, within five years, these rates at Johns Hopkins compare favorably with those of peer institutions. To accomplish this:

• Prepare a detailed plan to improve both retention and graduation rates of all students, complete with action steps, funding requirements, and an aggressive timetable.
• Improve the retention and graduation rates of subgroups of students who are lagging behind their peers. A systematic study should be undertaken to identify the factors that cause students not to persist and to provide a basis for designing appropriate programmatic support and interventions to achieve this goal.

Students who want to succeed must be helped to do so. The pressure felt by undergraduates at Hopkins is well-known. For ethnic minority students, the stressful environment may seem especially troublesome viewed through the experience of an ethnic minority. Many report feeling particularly isolated in the Hopkins environment. An infrastructure must be developed that “programs” students for success, tracks progress, and intervenes to catch those who stumble, regardless of their race or ethnicity. Given the rigors of the admissions process, we should regard it as a failure of the system if there are differential rates of persistence to graduation between ethnic minority and majority students.

RECOMMENDATION 23

Increase significantly the number of underrepresented ethnic minority faculty over the next five years by preparing a detailed plan complete with action steps and an aggressive timetable.

In order to offer an excellent undergraduate – and graduate – experience at Hopkins, we need a diverse faculty, and equal attention should be paid to the hiring of junior and senior faculty who are outstanding scholars as well as members of an ethnic minority. Without greater representation of ethnic minorities, we hinder our own efforts to provide the highest quality education possible. It is important also to protect
underrepresented junior faculty from serving on so many departmental, divisional, and University committees that they are distracted from teaching and research obligations.

**RECOMMENDATION 24**

Assess, within the schools, whether the content of the curriculum taken as a whole provides undergraduates with sufficient opportunities for exposure to diverse disciplines, fields, languages, cultures, and ideas, and where needed, expand the offerings to do so.

A curriculum should not be static. A quality education should address the realities of a changing world and provide a rich variety of coursework that stimulates ideas and expands intellectual horizons, that prepares students to understand perspectives different from their own, and that gives them both the tools to examine their own biases and the knowledge to navigate the world around them. If we are serious about preparing Hopkins students to fill positions of leadership in a world where definitions of majority and minority are not fixed, they must be challenged during their undergraduate years to learn beyond their comfort zone and to broaden their appreciation for the full breadth and depth of human endeavor. This recommendation could well be implemented as part of the periodic undergraduate program review of each major (see recommendation 3) and coordinated by the senior administrator in each school responsible for undergraduate education (see recommendation 1). Individual faculty, of course, retain responsibility for the intellectual content of their courses and departments for the design of majors that encompass critical disciplinary findings and methods. But, it is worth periodic reflection to assess whether the sum total of our academic efforts offers our graduates the very best preparation.

**RECOMMENDATION 25**

Assure an array of offerings that reflect the diversity of our campus, city, and nation, including developing a special speaker’s series to bring the University community together for at least two major events each year that would focus on issues of diversity.

A systematic, University-wide study of current offerings should be made to assess the extent to which this objective is fulfilled by existing programs. To the extent that additional, conscious efforts are needed to focus the collective attention of the community on diversity issues, senior officers should provide leadership for these programs.

**RECOMMENDATION 26**

Increase efforts to recruit underrepresented ethnic minority staff, especially in those areas that provide student services, and prepare a detailed plan for hiring underrepresented administrative staff, complete with action steps and an aggressive timetable.

In order to employ the most talented staff, we must ensure that recruitment efforts yield persons from all ethnic groups. We need the talents and expertise of ethnic minorities. Additionally we need the diversity of perspective that maximizes creative thought and effective problem-solving. However, it is not enough simply to hire underrepresented staff; they must be mentored and fully empowered to contribute to the excellence of the institution. Programs for mentoring and staff development should be expanded to emphasize the professional development of current underrepresented ethnic minority staff for advancement and leadership so that, at the very top, the diversity of the University’s staff reflects the full range of human resources.
RECOMMENDATION 27

Create a coherent, comprehensive residential program, supported by appropriate housing and dining services, that provides Hopkins undergraduates who live in University housing with a variety of living/learning options that support and enhance their academic experience while strengthening the sense of campus community.

More can be done to ensure that the residential life at Hopkins contributes in significant ways to the educational, personal, and social development of undergraduate students, and to the collective life that they enjoy. This means moving beyond concern with physical facilities (though they, too, factor importantly in the quality of the experience) to consideration of the quality of the interactions that take place within them. Many of our peers, such as Yale, Princeton, and the University of Chicago, have some version of a residential college, usually with a live-in faculty member, a house or residence master, along with a residence head (generally a graduate student). At Duke, for instance, first-year students can apply to one of 11 FOCUS (First-year Opportunity for Comprehensive, Unified Study) residential learning communities. Some universities, such as Penn and Cornell, have recently made very significant investments in the construction or renovation of residence halls and in major program initiatives to enrich residential life, including the engagement of faculty as associates of residence halls. Washington University has enjoyed success and found that small investments can pay big dividends. They began with just six residential houses, staffed by senior faculty, who seemed more eager to participate than junior faculty. Residential colleges, however, do not necessarily require live-in faculty or graduate students. We may well want to consider models where faculty members have responsibility for programming and sometimes for advising, but live elsewhere.

Many of our peers also offer the option of designated theme houses which seem limited only by scholarly imagination, and range from academic interests (Eco-House, Women’s Studies) to languages (Chinese Language House), ethnic groups (African-Caribbean House), to community service and outreach, to future entrepreneurs and fitness buffs, to co-ops of one sort or another, including an intriguing Trip Hammer House where all students must help cook, clean, and repair and maintain the property. We think Hopkins should consider experimenting with offering as one housing option theme housing on a small scale, perhaps using a system where groups can identify a common broad interest, apply and then be evaluated regularly, as Wesleyan does each semester with its extensive program housing, to ensure that the academic and community objectives are being met.

To judge the demand for various kinds of housing, we included the options of residential colleges and thematic housing on a questionnaire distributed during the spring to Homewood students. The responses showed active interest in considering living in a residential college but less interest in thematic housing. Feedback after the CUE Interim Report also showed concern that somehow themed housing would exacerbate the divisions that students now feel. Certainly, in developing future housing options, Hopkins should allow room for different kinds of experiments in residential housing while putting a premium on strengthening the sense of community and the broad educational and social benefits that come from exposure to the rich diversity of one’s classmates. A balance should be sought between residence halls that cater to intellectually defined themes, language and ethnic interests, and social and community service. Mindful of the unequal distribution of ethnic groups, care should be taken to avoid clustering which might lend itself to a diminished experience for all.
RECOMMENDATION 28

Begin immediately to develop new residences at Homewood which would, over a period of no more than 10 years, guarantee four years of housing to all Arts and Sciences and Engineering undergraduates who wish to remain in University housing. Explore the feasibility of accommodating Nursing, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, and Peabody students in Homewood residential options.

The shortage of housing has a profound impact on student life and institutional affection. Housing arrangements involve matters of convenience, personal security, student engagement, and the development of a sense of community. The absence of University-sponsored housing for third and fourth-year students sends a signal that they are not a priority.

The actual design of the housing facilities is important in fostering a sense of community, and it may be that the character of the housing is as important as its perceived quality. The consensus seemed to be that having at least the option of four year housing would go a long way toward keeping juniors and seniors connected to campus. We learned that students (or at least their parents) seem willing to pay a 20% premium for the benefits of University housing, such as furnished rooms, high-speed Internet access, security, and proximity. We also learned that such housing could be self-supporting and so pay for itself while benefiting the campus.

Fully half of the students who commented on housing in our CSEQ survey supported four year housing, many passionately, believing that it would contribute significantly to the development of a sense of campus community. According to another survey, with few exceptions, almost all of our 30 peer institutions guarantee housing for juniors and seniors, even institutions that are much larger or are in extremely expensive housing markets.

To gauge just how many Hopkins students would consider University housing for their junior and senior years, and what sort of housing they would be looking for, a questionnaire was distributed in the 2003 spring semester. The results support student interest in University housing, with 90% percent indicating the likelihood of choosing University facilities. We want also to explore the possibility of accommodating Nursing, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, and Peabody students in Homewood residential options, something that we think would be mutually beneficial and would promote a greater sense of University-wide community. In addition, the increased opportunities for interaction among music, nursing, engineering and liberal arts students in their residences would enhance the educational experience for all.

RECOMMENDATION 29

Explore the possibility of a “freshman campus” on the west side of Charles Street.

Students tell us, and student affairs administrators confirm, that the first-year students most satisfied with their residential experience are those who live in the Alumni Memorial Residences, Hopkins’ most traditionally configured residence halls. Students consider the old AMR’s to be effective at building community, whatever their other drawbacks. A common eating environment, non-suite style living, and common bathroom facilities seem to actually encourage a sense of belonging. While this experience may be quickly outgrown as interest in privacy and comfort become more important, the fact is that first-year students find that communal living fosters strong bonds with classmates and effective exposure to diverse individuals, something that the Marines learned long ago. The Commission believes that all first-year students should be able to enjoy the same educational benefits of residential life and that an investment in making this possible would pay big dividends in student satisfaction and alumni loyalty as well.
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The feasibility of housing all freshmen in the vicinity of the AMR’s should therefore be explored. Such a plan, bold as it is, would create a sense of esprit and facilitate programming that integrates the academic and social experiences of students, including engaging faculty in creative ways. By providing alternative housing for the freshmen now housed in McCoy and Wolman, more space would be made available to sophomores and juniors. A reformed residential system would thus provide a progression from a traditional residence hall experience for first-year students, to a semi-structured residential setting for sophomores where infrastructure and staff would be provided, to more independent living in University-owned and operated residential facilities such as Homewood and the new Charles Village development under consideration. See also recommendation 34.

RECOMMENDATION 30

Develop campus facilities to support the need for informal, social interaction as well as for group study.

There is a real demand on all our campuses for places to simply relax, chat, and take a break between classes. This need affects faculty as well as students and certainly the degree of interaction between them at Homewood, Peabody, and Nursing. SPSBE students are acutely aware of the need for spaces to engage with their classmates and even fulfill the more mundane need to grab a bite before their evening classes. The new Recreation Center has been universally hailed as a vital addition to the Homewood campus, and the Mattin Center similarly has provided welcome support for selected student groups and a superb home for the arts. But, these facilities do not fulfill the more general need on campus to create a larger campus community. While on many other campuses, student unions (also called campus centers) have provided a social hub, it is not clear presently whether a new student union would address the root of the problem and improve the campus culture at Hopkins. What is clear is that students do need space to come together, that such space is badly lacking at Hopkins, and that the current Homewood “union” (Levering Hall) does not meet expressed needs.

In the short term, creative use of space seems to be the key. Transforming barren spaces into active and welcoming ones takes more imagination than money, and a start in this direction is being made in Levering, with the addition of electronic games, small concerts, more comfortable furniture, and better food. Late hours seem essential, since student clocks are set rather later than faculty and staff clocks. We should also seek to take advantage of the talents of Peabody students who could contribute, for example, to the offerings of a coffee house or jazz club. The need for group space is not solely for social programs. Just as there can be more programming in the residence halls, there could be informal conversations with faculty and staff in informal spaces. Students also need facilities where they can work collaboratively on class projects and participate in study groups. Our physical facilities can help to mitigate the effects of competition among student by supporting such collaborative learning efforts.

RECOMMENDATION 31

Provide interdivisional programming and intramural sports opportunities (including field space) that create a greater sense of community for Homewood, Peabody, Nursing, and SPSBE students.

While students applaud the role they have been given in planning campus events, they would like to see programming designed with a broader audience in mind, and more administrative responsibility for University-wide programming. Campus events, like the curriculum, seem often to balkanize rather than galvanize the Hopkins community. Peabody and Nursing students feel especially disenfranchised in this respect. They would like to meet their counterparts at Homewood, and would like to see events that make a real effort to be inclusive. Peabody has ‘rush’ tickets available to Homewood students, but this is not widely known. Cross-campus programming built around Peabody events, including a series of informal
performances by Peabody students at other Hopkins campuses, is also worth considering. We should consider the institution (or re-institution) of various activities, such as fall formals, all night gigs at the Museum of Visionary Arts, and celebrations of the last day of classes.

There is a strong sense that Hopkins needs more traditions, even if, like most traditions, they need to be invented. This is the ‘celebrative community’ the Carnegie Foundation report discusses, events that provide students with a sense of history and belonging. In their survey responses, many students deeply resented what they considered the loss of the few traditions Hopkins has, such as Spring Fair and commencement on the main quad. Fortunately, Spring Fair was returned to the quads this year, and plans have been developed to conduct commencement at Homewood Field with certain nice touches.

More frequent shuttles that run later hours are also needed. We have not always taken advantage of our best assets. With a first-class athletic facility, we should develop a first-class intramural sports program, which offers a welcome break from studies and also fosters camaraderie, by floor or building or theme house. As new buildings increasingly crowd Homewood, fields for intramural and recreational sports are badly needed. Peabody and Nursing students should be included in these programs since their campuses lack green space. Again, we are perhaps limited more by imagination than funding.

RECOMMENDATION 32

Increase participation and leadership of academic administrators in student life, making their presence known on their campuses.

- Academic administrators should engage regularly with students in both formal and informal situations.
- Deans of each school should meet formally with their student councils every month.
- The President and Provost of the University should meet each semester with Student Council leadership.

True or not, the strong perception among students, supported by their numerous comments on surveys, is that the administration is indifferent or even hostile to undergraduates and not inclined to meaningful interaction. Other campuses put a high priority on Town Hall meetings, presidential office hours for students, presidential pep talks to the athletic teams, dinners with the Deans, and so on, but here it appears that informal interaction with senior administrators is the exception rather than the rule. Students seem hungry for more interaction with and communication from senior leaders. It is important that students know they have strong advocates within the top ranks of the administration. Based on their initiative in launching this Commission, these advocates are, we believe, very much there.

RECOMMENDATION 33

Improve food quality and service at Homewood so that it can effectively function as an essential element in community building.

Student complaints about the food at Homewood were dismal. Again and again students compared Hopkins dining very unfavorably to what they find at other schools. Students not only feel poorly fed, but angry about what they regard as excessive prices. SPSBE students have special needs in the evening and on weekends, when dining operations appear to operate on the assumption that eating is an activity reserved for Monday-Friday. The responsible administrators are aware of what peer institutions are doing, and they are experimenting with a number of ideas, such as Megabytes, Jay Store, and other ‘grab and go’ options. Reinstating the meal equivalency in Levering has quieted some of the storm, but we
must provide what students really want at a price they can afford. Other top schools have successful board plans and contractors offering quality and value that satisfies students and administrators.

Better food is essential, but dining should be about conversation and camaraderie, not just eating. We need to create a number of evenings at which dinner is used to foster a sense of community. And, we should take advantage of opportunities to involve faculty in making meals a time for stimulating exchange and interaction.

RECOMMENDATION 34

Support partnerships to enhance the Charles Village neighborhood and to develop additional amenities that could improve the quality of life for Charles Village residents as well as Hopkins faculty, students and staff.

During the public comment period in February and March, CUE received a number of questions and supportive comments about current efforts to enhance the Charles Village community – for both the citizens of Baltimore and faculty, students and staff of Johns Hopkins. Constituents suggested that expanding housing and parking options, and strengthening pedestrian-friendly retail operations in the neighborhood to the immediate east of the Homewood campus, where many Hopkins students live, would not only help to develop the sense of community that seems to be lacking at Hopkins, but also would help to sustain it over the long term. A thriving, energetic “college town” that meets the needs of the citizens who live in Charles Village as well as those of the Hopkins community would be attractive not only to current undergraduates, but also to prospective students, graduate students, faculty/staff, and alumni. In addition, students from other Johns Hopkins campuses, such as Peabody and East Baltimore, would find it an increasingly attractive place to live.

Supporting current and future initiatives to enhance Charles Village would facilitate a number of other CUE recommendations: providing guaranteed student housing, expanding theme housing options, improving food quality and services, and creating a greater sense of community among the five undergraduate divisions. Furthermore, a stronger sense of neighborhood may enable expanded opportunities for community service, just as the process of partnering with Charles Village leaders and others can strengthen civic engagement for undergraduates.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

The Commission has presented a large number of recommendations, thirty-four to be exact. Certain of the Commission’s recommendations are likely to have more resonance in some divisions than in others. Not all the recommendations are of equal weight, complexity, or cost. In general, the Commission sees several ways in which its recommendations can be supported. Some proposals are matters of policy changes, restructuring, communication and coordination. The implementation of some might appropriately be done by administrative action; some would require consideration by relevant faculty bodies; and others still the active participation of students. A number of the Commission’s recommendations could be implemented at little or no expense, while others would require the identification of significant new resources, presumably through the present University fund-raising campaign that recognizes undergraduate needs among the priorities.

While preliminary estimates have been made regarding a few proposals, e.g., numbers of additional courses that should be offered to provide sufficient small group experiences at Homewood, no systematic cost projections yet have been developed. An important part of the next phase of the follow-up to the Commission’s work will be to understand more fully the financial implications of moving forward within
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these recommendations, as they are particularized to specific divisional contexts. This exercise is best carried out by those administrators and faculty members closest to the context, especially in light of Hopkins’ decentralized financial models.

Whatever the estimates, we expect that the costs of enhancing quality are not trivial. But, the Commission thinks that more substantial costs will be incurred by not addressing the improvement of the undergraduate experience. As noted in Chapter 2, in recent years, many of our peer institutions have focused significant effort and resources to enhance their undergraduate programs. As a result, these universities have increased the quality of their programs and their attractiveness to prospective students.

It should be relatively easy to realize some immediate small successes by moving quickly to address the “low hanging fruit” among the Commission’s recommendations. However, were the net results of the Commission’s efforts to be only the “easy pickings,” we would not have succeeded in bringing about substantial enhancement to the undergraduate experience at Hopkins.

The Commission has thus considered carefully the matter of establishing priorities for all its recommendations. The fact that the circumstances differ in each of the five schools that offer undergraduate programs makes the ordering of priorities particularly difficult. Some issues are simply not problems in each of our schools. Notwithstanding this, the Commission feels strongly that certain of its recommendations are vital to the enhancement of the undergraduate experience and that, without action on these key proposals, it will be very difficult to improve the environment in substantial ways. The Commission thus commends for special attention three of its recommendations that are most important and most challenging: the provision of small group or “capstone” experiences for upperclassmen, guaranteed University housing for Homewood students, and a significant increase in the diversity of the undergraduate student body. We urge administrative leaders to embrace these priorities and devote extra efforts to advancing these objectives, including the identification of resources. We also recommend that the Deans of each of the schools, working closely with faculty, staff, and students, further refine the priorities for their division and develop appropriate implementation plans.

Having cautioned against preoccupation with “low hanging fruit,” however, the Commission notes with satisfaction the fact that action is already underway in several areas to address needs identified by the Commission and/or to implement Commission recommendations. Admissions offices report progress on diversifying the applicant pool in terms of academic interest and minority candidates. A conversation has been begun with directors of career advising and alumni affairs offices about developing an internship program that would draw on alumni connections. The Homewood Academic Council is seriously examining the weight of teaching in the appointments, promotions, and tenure process. The teacher course evaluation process is being reviewed at Homewood. The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences has appointed a Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education whose charge it will be to oversee enhancements to the undergraduate experience. The Deans of each of the schools with undergraduate programs have agreed to meet periodically to discuss issues that affect the undergraduate experience across their divisions. A major planning effort is underway to consider ways to maximize the residential experience for undergraduate students, including developments in Charles Village that show promise of improving the quality of life for all its residents. Improvements to the quality of the dining ambiance and the food are being implemented. And the list could go on.

The next steps of the process of particularizing the Commission’s Final Report to each of the five undergraduate divisions will be tied effectively to the University’s institutional self-study that is part of the reaccreditation process Johns Hopkins will undergo in the coming year. The Commission report is in essence the cornerstone of the focused examination on undergraduate education, and, in the next phase of work, school working groups will carry out the charge to refine priorities, formulate implementation plans, and develop outcome measures. They will also be asked to pay specific attention to linking these
initiatives and other extant programs and services to the demonstration of compliance with the specific standards required by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Those readers attentive to the state of higher education will recognize that not all of the Commission’s proposals are distinctive, nor are many of them particularly novel. But, in the context of Johns Hopkins, and taken together, these recommendations have the potential to change significantly the culture for undergraduates and the quality of their experience. We think there are other things that also could be done. On university campuses, there is no shortage of good ideas. Had time permitted, the Commission would have liked, for example, to explore further creative ways that graduate students could better contribute to the undergraduate program and to leverage the well-developed international aspects of the University in the interest of the undergraduate experience. Before we can undertake initiatives to capitalize further on our institutional comparative advantages, however, we have more fundamental needs to address.

In the end, we recognized that a single commission cannot hope to address every legitimate concern, nor can it hope to fix every problem or take advantage of every opportunity in the short term. Accordingly, a number of the Commission’s recommendations speak to the establishment of a structure that will institutionalize an ongoing commitment to enhancing the undergraduate experience. The fact that the Commission included members from the several divisions has provided a diversity of experience and perspective that has enriched the Commission’s discussion. Commission members have learned from one another, and we think this kind of cross-fertilization should be continued.

The Commission does not see itself as having exclusive ownership of this agenda, nor its recommendations as being, in and of themselves, sufficient to bring about all the quality improvements we are ultimately seeking. Our recommendations are designed to challenge the administration and faculty of the five schools that confer undergraduate degrees to renew and revitalize their undergraduate programs. The recommendations seek to balance the traditions of departmental responsibility with more oversight. We do not want to transform Hopkins into another type of university but rather to ensure excellence in the undergraduate program.

If the undergraduate experience is to be enhanced, it will take the collective efforts of many individuals, most notably faculty members who propel this University forward on so many fronts. The Commission will be satisfied if its report is seen as a foundation on which to build both the commitment and the structures that will maintain ongoing efforts to offer an undergraduate program of real excellence, both inside the classroom and outside.

The Commission sees its report as the beginning of a conversation, one that the University has needed to have, and one that should continue. The very fact that Johns Hopkins has, in earnest, joined this discussion has created a certain momentum on campus, one that seems likely to propel us closer to full realization of the simple aim of Johns Hopkins’ first President, Daniel Coit Gilman: “to make scholars, strong, bright, useful, and true” and to the challenge of preparing “for the service of society, a class of students who will be wise, thoughtful, progressive guides in whatever department of work or thought they may be engaged.”
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PART III: SCHOOL SELF-STUDY REPORTS

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
The Whiting School of Engineering
The School of Nursing
The Peabody Institute
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education
CHAPTER 1: THE KRIEGER SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES SELF-STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Offering comprehensive undergraduate education as well as graduate training, the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is the direct descendant of the original Johns Hopkins University. Today it is the core institution of the Johns Hopkins complex of schools, centers, and institutes. A century and a quarter after the University was established, the Krieger School still follows the guiding principles of Hopkins’ visionary first president, Daniel Coit Gilman, whose educational precepts keep the Krieger School not just up to date but actually at the forefront of knowledge.

The plan that Gilman devised and began to carry out in 1876 established Johns Hopkins as the nation’s first research university - that is, an institution in which every faculty member was actively engaged in original investigations. Today, each of the School's approximately 275 faculty members is expected to spend as much time on research as on teaching. As a result, inquiry and the creation of new knowledge are the engine and fuel that drive both instruction and learning in the School for its approximately 2800 undergraduates.

Though innovative, Gilman's approach also fully valued the traditional disciplines. In patterning the new institution after the European model to which he had been exposed as a student, Gilman preserved the elements of a classical education. Following that ideal, in its 23 departments, the School gives balanced attention to the disciplines that fall into the general categories of the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences.

The research university concept mandates that the substance of the diverse disciplines always be under scrutiny and question, and that the boundaries delimiting academic fields be porous and under constant outward pressure. The result is a community charged with intellectual energy. Academic rigor and independent thought are the School's hallmarks. Notwithstanding its small size, the School is on a par with outstanding U.S. universities that are many times its size and far richer in resources. Unfortunately, while Hopkins’ undergraduate programs are among the most distinguished academically, not all aspects of the undergraduate experience reflect the highest possible quality. As part of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) reaccreditation process and the University-wide examination of undergraduate education, the Krieger School has identified a number of areas for enhancement. Simply put, we want to do superbly what President Gilman advocated when he set forth the challenge to “prepare for the service of society a class of students who will be wise, thoughtful, progressive guides in whatever department of work or thought they may be engaged.”

STANDARD 1: MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

The Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is, historically and at present, the intellectual heart of the Johns Hopkins University. The Krieger School is a leading research and educational institution with an abiding commitment to excellence in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. In the broadest sense, our mission is discovery: the creation of new knowledge through research and scholarship, and education of students, graduate and undergraduate, through immersion in this process. The School’s
research mission is fundamental to its educational objectives and infuses its undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral programs with unique learning opportunities.

More than a century ago, Johns Hopkins created the first research university in the United States with the opening of the School of Arts and Sciences. Then, as now, the union of research and teaching at all levels provides a distinctive learning environment and the synergy that enables the School to compete with institutions possessing significantly greater resources. Large enough to provide a broad education, yet small enough for focused individual work, the School builds upon the strength and diversity of faculty and student interests, achieving its success through rigorous selection of faculty and students, and the carefully and creatively focused use of its resources. Throughout its history, the School has successfully pursued a strategy of selective excellence. In the coming decades, the Krieger School must continue to identify and pursue those scholarly and scientific areas in which we are positioned for international leadership, and we must continue to foster an international emphasis in our programs, students, intellectual agenda, and impact. Scholarly and scientific expertise need respect neither national boundaries nor traditional disciplinary ones.

The Krieger School’s unique character is based on this commitment: to choose carefully what is worth pursuing and then to do so without compromise. In its most basic form, our mission is to preserve and nourish that character and thereby to instill in our students the highest standards of intellectual achievement and an enduring commitment to self-initiated learning and discovery.

The statement of mission and vision for undergraduate education proposed by the Commission on Undergraduate Education is very much in keeping with the objectives of the Krieger School. Fundamentally, we expect students to become engaged global citizens; to exhibit critical thinking skills; and to be prepared for and drawn to a lifetime of learning. We think we provide superb preparation for advanced study and professional training and that our graduates are supported in these aspirations at a high level.

With respect to more specific elements of the CUE statement, effective writing and communication is certainly a shared goal. It is addressed by the curricular requirement in writing, the emphasis given to writing across the curriculum, and the proposal for departmental consideration of opportunities that would especially cultivate oral presentation skills. Each year the undergraduate neuroscience honor society sponsors a research symposium which is open to students from all disciplines. This opportunity for students to present their research findings is but one example of creative approaches to this challenge. Our distribution requirements ensure educational breadth across the broad disciplines of learning. As will be noted further, experience with the process of knowledge creation and understanding of the research enterprise is perhaps one of the most distinctive features of the Hopkins undergraduate experience.

While there is no one formula for cultivating the appreciation for diversity that is endorsed in the undergraduate mission statement, Hopkins offers many curricular opportunities to explore diverse cultures in a variety of disciplines and inter-disciplinary programs and also a significant number of events outside the classroom that celebrate diversity. These include an annual CultureFest, an international affairs symposium, a diversity leadership awards ceremony, and numerous presentations by cultural groups. Planning is beginning for the major campus-wide event proposed by CUE. Cultural sensitivity also is emphasized by the signals sent by administrators, as, for example, in an annual letter from the Chaplain to faculty calling attention to the religious holidays celebrated by many faiths.

Finally, Hopkins provides numerous opportunities to develop the habits of community service and civic engagement, both in Baltimore and elsewhere through internships or our semester in Washington. From the time they arrive on campus and have a Day of Service as part of the formal orientation week, students are actively encouraged “to give back” and the statistics on student volunteerism bear this out.
STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS

Undergraduate Arts and Sciences and Engineering students are admitted to the Johns Hopkins University through a selective and individualized process that includes both a binding Early Decision and regular admission plan. The criteria include academic strengths as well as the potential to contribute to University life and to take full advantage of the educational opportunities offered here. Academic strength is judged by the high school record of achievement in a rigorous program of study, by standardized test scores, and by evidence of intellectual curiosity and engagement as reflected in essays and teacher evaluations. Personal qualities are important as well, and here the achievements outside the classroom, as evidenced by the student’s self-reported activities and essays, factor heavily. Each application is read twice and rated by both subjective and objective measures according to a scale developed to reflect qualities along four dimensions. The senior admissions team conducts a final review of the freshman class. As in any selective process, there are strong cases to be made on behalf of many more applicants who are qualified to do the work than can be accommodated in the spaces available. A premium is placed on students who show evidence of high motivation and a willingness to take charge of their educations.

Over the past ten years, the growth in the strength of the Arts and Sciences and Engineering admissions applicant pool is striking. Applications for this year’s entering class totaled 10,022, up 30 percent over the 7695 applicants in 1994. More competitive financial aid packages contributed to an improved yield rate of 35 percent (up from 28 percent ten years ago). The University’s admit rate, therefore, declined from 44 percent to 30 percent, a very positive development in terms of the selectivity of the freshman class. The specific data for Krieger School freshman are similarly impressive: 7964 applications; an admit rate of 24 percent; and a yield rate of 37 percent. While the admit rate compares reasonably well to the COFHE cohort of universities, the yield rate still lags the strongest of our peer group. A major admissions challenge is to have Hopkins become the first choice for many more students. We expect that the attention to the undergraduate experience and increased scholarship endowments will, over the next five year period, be reflected in a higher rate of matriculation among students who are admitted.

The Class of 2007 numbers 1050 (Arts and Sciences and Engineering combined) and is the most diverse group of students ever to enroll at Johns Hopkins. There is great geographic diversity with 47 states and 22 countries represented among the four percent of the entering class that has foreign citizenship and an additional four percent of international students who are permanent residents. Increasing the numbers of international students in the applicant pool has been a priority, and significant gains are being made. Almost half of the class comes from the mid-Atlantic region, while 17 percent is from the West Coast, and roughly 10 percent each from New England, the South, and the Midwest.

The best news is a record percentage of underrepresented minority students and of women. In the past several years, a priority concern has been identifying the reasons for, and eliminating the causes of, diminishing interest among women at each phase of the admissions process. Over half of the 678 students enrolling in the Krieger School are women, and nearly one in five is a member of an underrepresented minority group, with nine percent being African-American, eight percent Hispanic, and one percent Native American. About 20 percent are Asian American. These percentages represent significant improvement over several prior years when our underrepresented minority numbers plummeted. The School has made improvement in this area a high priority and has invested additional resources in staff and funding for minority recruitment programs; the results are showing. It is even more important, however, to ensure that the students who come here are successful, and we have underway analyses of the retention rates and the

---

1 COFHE is the Council for Financing Higher Education, a consortium of highly selective American colleges and universities.
experience of minority students so that we will more fully understand whether the support being provided is adequate and effective.

The class of 2007 also reflects a higher level of diversity of intellectual interests, as called for by CUE, with about a quarter having a primary interest in one of the humanities, another 29 percent in the social sciences, and about 42 percent in the natural sciences. Even greater intellectual diversity is desired to utilize more effectively faculty resources and to enhance the intellectual atmosphere. Achieving a better balance among academic interests is a complex problem, since some of our strongest applicants are in the areas in which we want to control enrollment in order to more equitably spread the teaching load and to ensure the quality of the programs that have given us a very high profile among prospective students. A particular challenge for us is constraining the number of students with medical school aspirations in our entering class. In many ways, they are the core of our recruitment strength, but too much of a good thing puts undue pressure on the service teaching of many departments and has a negative effect on other students who feel less valued than our science majors.

The academic preparation of Krieger freshmen is outstanding with a mean unweighted GPA of 3.64 and a median GPA of 3.7. Combined SAT scores average 1361, with a median of 1375. Although many fewer high schools now report rank, 76 percent of Krieger freshmen were in the top 10 percent of their high school class. The rigor of students’ high school programs is impressive. Over two thirds of the enrolling first-year students took five or more Advanced Placement classes.

The strengthened admissions position in the Krieger School is attributable to substantive improvements in the quality of the undergraduate experience; to a more effective recruitment strategy, including enhanced publications, communications, and “customer service”; and to more competitive financial aid programs. Hopkins had been lagging its peers in the attractiveness of its need-based grant programs, but a major gift has made possible lowered loan expectations and increased flexibility in assessing need and in packaging need-based grant awards. Further, the University has been able to create two highly competitive need-based awards, the Bloomberg Scholarships and Trustee Scholarships. These provide especially attractive packages for approximately 140 students in each class. Need-based programs are supplemented by several important merit-based scholarships including approximately 20 Hodson Trust Scholarships valued at $21,500 per year. Another major gift has allowed the creation of the unique Woodrow Wilson Undergraduate Fellowship Program that now supports almost 100 students who are particularly motivated to pursue independent research. The fellowship provides up to $10,000 to entering students in support of research expenses, including travel, equipment, and the use of archives or laboratories.

Despite a much strengthened admissions posture, challenges in student recruitment remain. Investments in the human, physical, and technological infrastructure necessary to support a first-rate admissions and financial aid operation are essential to meeting these challenges. Planning is underway for a Visitor’s Center, and should the project proceed, it would provide new quarters for the Admissions Office and allow decompression of the Financial Aid Office in the vacated space. The development of the full capacity of the SCT Matrix integrated student information system is key to having the data management and communications capability on which sophisticated recruitment and financial services programs depend. Equally important is attracting and retaining the highest quality professional and support staff. This will require reviewing the position grade levels of all the staff and improving professional development opportunities as well as working conditions. The Office of Undergraduate Admissions has had less experienced staff (both in the selective admissions field and at Hopkins itself) and more turnover than is healthy for a competitive program that puts a premium on personal attention in the admissions process and gives admissions officers a substantive decision-making role. The staff in Student Financial Services is stable with significant education and experience as aid administrators. Working conditions are very cramped, however, and position grading issues also need to be resolved.
A strong admissions program also requires the support of other key constituencies, and progress has been made on addressing these needs. Faculty involvement has been strengthened with the establishment of a Faculty Committee on Admissions. More faculty contact with admitted students has been facilitated through new communications with prospective students and additional yield events. This will be extremely important in supporting admissions efforts to recruit more students in the humanities. Alumni involvement also is important as a way to enhance outreach efforts to prospective students and to strengthen alumni ties to the University. The effort to involve more alumni has been a collaboration between the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and the Alumni Association, and it has now been institutionalized by the creation of an associate director position, co-funded by the alumni and admissions offices. A new handbook for alumni volunteers also has been produced, and more training programs have been developed to improve the effectiveness of alumni as they interview students, represent Hopkins at admissions fairs, and host various recruitment events. The Office of Student Financial Services also is strong in its outreach, with on-going efforts to educate guidance counselors and other community and constituent groups as to the availability of assistance.

Other primary challenges to a strong admissions position are financial. The competitiveness of our financial aid packages cannot be maintained without major increases in scholarship endowment. Compared to our peers, Hopkins is very tuition dependent for its financial aid budget. About 24 cents of every tuition dollar is devoted to undergraduate need-based student financial aid. To keep this discount rate from growing, we are forced to make difficult choices. We do not have the luxury enjoyed by better endowed peer institutions that can state unequivocal commitment to the joint principles of need-blind admission and meeting the full need of all students. While Johns Hopkins generally has operated according to those policies for about 95 percent of the class, it has always been necessary to protect the core budget by the qualification “to the extent the budget will allow.” There is discomfort with this approach philosophically and practically. In practical terms, this means students who file late, or who demonstrate needs greater than the budget can support, may be denied assistance for at least two, if not for all four, years.

With respect to more formal aspects of Standard 8, all admissions and financial aid policies and procedures are stated clearly in admissions and student financial services publications and are available on the web. The policy on transfer credit appears in the academic manual, the academic catalog, and on the website for the Office of Academic Advising. The admissions website includes a question and answer section related to transfer credits. The web also provides interactive tools to support the financial aid process, such as a calculator for families to determine their need and assess their eligibility for financial assistance. Through online access, students can check for required forms, file their applications, verify the status of their applications, and sign for loans.

The Admissions Office engages in a variety of assessment activities to ascertain the effectiveness of its recruitment programs and student selection. Aid and admissions administrators also carefully monitor national trends and peer data from COFHE members. Obviously, the growth in quantity and quality of applicants is a key measure of program effectiveness as is increased yield of desirable students. A study of the correlation between admissions criteria and academic performance also was undertaken two years ago, and the results confirmed that the admissions rating criteria are predictive of academic success.

**STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

A full array of student services supports undergraduate students in the Krieger and Whiting Schools in realizing their academic and personal goals. The experienced and well-trained professionals who staff these service areas adhere to an educationally sound philosophy of student development and see their role as contributing to the overall goal of helping to prepare students to be informed and engaged global citizens. Over the past few years, as part of the effort to enhance the quality of student life, changes have been made
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in the organizational structure for the delivery and oversight of these services. A major objective has been to effect stronger coordination among the offices. A Dean for Student Life is responsible for those areas of student affairs that include student development and programming; student involvement; residential life; judicial affairs; orientation; athletics; student volunteerism; and student mental and physical health and wellness. A Dean of Academic and Enrollment Services is responsible for academic, career, and preprofessional advising; registration and records; admissions and financial aid; and international student services. Both these individuals report to a Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education who oversees these areas and ensures that they support the educational missions of both the Krieger and the Whiting Schools. It is a primary goal of the schools to better integrate life inside and outside the classroom.

The services provided to students are fully described in the undergraduate catalog, a freshman academic handbook, an undergraduate academic manual, a student handbook called The Compendium, numerous individual brochures, and websites that have been recently upgraded to provide fuller descriptions and additional interactive links. Parents also have been given complete descriptions of policies governing students and of the programs and services offered as well as advice on how they can support their sons’ and daughters’ educational development in a newly created parent handbook called Advising Hopkins Students.

Since the range of student support and the various services are described fully elsewhere, the following comments summarize only highlights and evaluate strengths and weaknesses of key areas. Last spring, in an initiative parallel to the Commission on Undergraduate Education, a Homewood Student Affairs Task Force was convened to develop a broad vision and long-range plan for student life and academic and enrollment services offices that would support the overall thrust of CUE recommendations. The Task Force reaffirmed a statement of mission and expressed a commitment to help every student have a successful experience that includes physical, emotional, and spiritual well-being, as well as the opportunity to build skills in problem-solving, hone critical thinking and communication skills, develop leadership potential, grow in appreciation for the importance of civility, and engage in public service. The Task Force also outlined a plan for regular assessment and reporting on activities and accomplishments in support of this mission. The plan calls for continuous improvement through benchmarking student services against accepted best practices. A template has been developed for an annual report to document outcomes, the effectiveness of structure and processes, the health of the organization, and goals that would advance the program in the coming year. Already in place is an assessment initiative through which the directors of each of the student life areas conduct a self-assessment of their own efforts against specified standards in each professional area.

A general observation about student support services is in order. Like many other things at Johns Hopkins, the approach to campus activities has been very decentralized. Programming is largely student driven and implemented; such student entrepreneurship is very much in keeping with the Hopkins culture. Moreover, student ownership of social life has resulted in leadership development and the creation of stimulating events that serve particular organizations and interests very well. While activities abound, there are, however, fewer school traditions and events that unite the student body. These require staff support and infrastructure to relieve students of the burden of execution as well as planning complicated programs. We are enhancing staff support in programming major attractions and campus-wide celebrations. A similar issue exists with new student orientation. Unique among universities, the orientation of new students and their parents is planned and operated largely by students. While this approach has many merits, not the least of which is that the program is judged to respond well to the concerns of those it serves, it is not clear that the delegation is effective in all respects. Some modifications may be in order.

Among the most important of the student support services is advising. Five different Hopkins offices provide formal advising services, and many more offer counsel on a variety of issues. Over the past several years, major attention and resources have been committed to enhance these individual services and to develop greater coordination among the advising services so that the system is more seamless. The newly
created Council of Homewood Advisors works to ensure that wherever a student enters the system, he or she is channeled appropriately. The Council also is a vehicle for comprehensive attention to and discussion of advising issues. For example, a Sophomore Task Force has been established to review the sophomore experience and to design programs to alleviate the academic and social aspects of the infamous “sophomore slump.”

The Office of Academic Advising has as its primary charge promoting intellectual exploration and providing counsel and encouragement to students so that they can find courses, majors, and other educational experiences that suit their curiosity, interests, and talents. Freshmen are given special attention by academic advisors in this office which also coordinates the faculty advising system. After the first year, students see a faculty advisor every semester. Study abroad advising is provided here also, as are workshops, tutors, and study consultants. The office, under the leadership of an Assistant Dean, has developed enhanced processes for identifying, developing, and presenting outstanding undergraduate students for major fellowship programs. This year these efforts were rewarded with a Rhodes Scholar, two Marshall Scholars, and a Mitchell Scholar. Academic Advising is dedicated to raising the level of satisfaction with advising. Toward that end, it has developed an instrument to assess student satisfaction with the advising system and with advisors. It also has supported educational offerings by creating a pilot Freshman Study Group Program designed to develop a supportive learning community of students taking a cluster of three related courses. Each study group is supported by a study consultant. Because Academic Advising also has formal responsibility for monitoring the academic status of students and ensuring that degree requirements are met by all degree candidates, a number of important records functions devolve upon the office. It has been resourceful in developing clear communications about academic policies and procedures, both in print and online, and in creating degree audit instruments so that students can fully understand degree requirements and assess their progress.

Preprofessional Advising serves the needs of significant numbers of Hopkins students who are headed for professional school programs in health, law, or business. An additional staff member has been added to the staff to support the demand for advising. The Office is reviewing its programs to determine the most effective interface with academic and career advising services and how best to provide advice through a combination of publications, technology (e.g., websites and software programs), general information programs, and individual advising sessions in order to give the highest level of service and support. The Office also oversees several programs that allow students to gain experience and exposure to the professions.

The Career Center offers students guidance through all facets of the career development process, including self-awareness, career exploration, career decision-making, and career choice. The Center offers the traditional range of programs and individual counseling and is developing additional career programming for freshman and sophomore students. Another major effort is to improve marketing and on campus programming with employers, especially in support of job placement interests of engineering students. Technology has made possible many additional tools to support career planning and job placement, and the Career Center is aggressive in identifying and implementing appropriate software and web-based programs. One important new tool is FOCUS, a career and educational planning system that students may access on the web. Students are encouraged to think about the stages of career exploration throughout their years at Hopkins, and, toward that end, a four year planning guide is available online. Students express high levels of interest in internships, and the Career Center actively supports experiential learning and career exploration through such opportunities. Networking is facilitated through an alumni partnership known as HopkinsNet.

The needs of international students (and faculty) are supported by an Office of International Student and Scholar Services that, like its analogs at other universities, is struggling to respond to the challenges of new
tracking and monitoring regulations and using SEVIS, while offering the best guidance to individuals and departments whose programs are affected by the changed climate for international exchange.

Many of the Student Development Programs (Student Involvement, Greek Life, Multicultural Student Affairs, and Homewood Arts Programs) are administered through offices reporting to one of the Associate Deans for Student Life. Programs are thus reinforcing, and student leaders of groups are able to do “one stop shopping” as they schedule rooms, get budget information, and consult staff about leadership development programs. The Office of Student Involvement is particularly challenged to support a growing and diverse number of student groups and organizations (at least 250 at last count). The strategy of enlisting additional faculty and staff as advisors to individual groups had the added benefit of fostering greater student-faculty interaction. The lack of adequate meeting and programming space presents an ongoing problem for which the Charles Commons amenity space may provide some relief.

The staffing for Multicultural Student Affairs and the effectiveness of current programs is now being evaluated to determine how best to support multicultural student groups. Currently, the leadership for that office is provided by an Associate Dean, who, although fully committed to the program, has other demands on his time. It is interesting that while many undergraduate students perceive that there is disproportionate support for individual cultural and ethnic groups, members of those groups do not share this perception.

About 26 percent of male undergraduates belong to ten fraternal organizations, and 21 percent of women students belong to one of the four sororities supported by an Office of Greek Life. Greek organizations do not dominate the social life at Hopkins, nor do they seem to be the source of status distinctions that compromise student interaction. In fact, given the inability to offer housing to upperclassmen, the Greek organizations probably provide a valuable social “glue.” Hopkins has not, however, had a coherent approach to Greek life and its relationship to other extracurricular and residential programs. A Greek Task Force has been appointed to address the value and health of the Greek system and such issues as 1) whether sophomores who live in recognized Greek houses should continue to be given an exemption from the two year housing requirement; 2) what kinds of facilities should support Greek organizations; and 3) how to manage the difficult community relations that off campus Greek housing creates for the Baltimore neighborhoods near the campus.

The opening of the Mattin Center in the spring 2001 has given Hopkins a wonderful facility to support Homewood Arts Programs. A black box theater, art studios, music practice rooms, a dance studio, a Digital Media Center, darkrooms, and multipurpose rooms for music rehearsals, etc., have enhanced both extracurricular and academic programs in the arts. The Center is heavily used by a range of student groups. With growing interest in student arts organizations and growing interest in formal instruction through a series of Arts Workshop courses, however, there are competing demands for the use of the space. In the absence of departments of studio or performing arts, alternative mechanisms need to be developed for proper faculty oversight of arts courses; these are now under review.

One of the strongest aspects of campus life for undergraduates is the breadth and depth of volunteer service encompassing such programs as tutoring and mentoring, Habitat for Humanity, Performing Arts Outreach, and health education. The Center for Social Concern and Volunteer Services oversees more than 50 such student-run service groups, several of which have sustained decades-long involvement with local schools and community organizations. The Center also serves as a home to two very large, student-initiated education organizations: Teach Baltimore and the Center for Summer Learning. It is estimated that about 70 percent of undergraduates participate in at least one volunteer activity during their Hopkins tenure. Perhaps the largest challenge in the area of community service is to decide which of the many concerns Hopkins undergraduates can best address and then to match the serious community needs with available resources. There is the further challenge of integrating the learning that occurs in many of these volunteer activities into educational programs.
Students on the Homewood campus have access to an exceptionally well-trained and experienced group of health professionals to support their physical and emotional needs. The Student Health and Wellness Center offers both medical treatment and health education and is staffed to provide flexible and responsive service. There is no charge for services. An on-call system offers 24-hour coverage, although students would like more weekend walk-in hours. A new part-time nutritionist helps students who are struggling with eating disorders. By welcoming input through a Student Advisory Committee and feedback from students in the form of exit surveys, the Center has established a reputation of being a genuinely helpful service. The biggest challenge faced by the Center is the limitation of its facilities, which are too small and too outmoded to meet student demand. New residence halls in the freshman quadrangle may provide the opportunity to address this important need.

The Counseling Center also has strong leadership and highly talented staff members who provide 24-hour coverage to meet the growing demand for student mental health services. Staff capacity to offer timely individual counseling as well as group programs and outreach is stretched. Center professionals also serve as consultants to administrators and faculty members with concerns about individual students. The Center collaborates effectively with other departments, forming teams to address difficult cases (e.g., representatives of the Dean of Students’ Office, the student health service, and residential life when dealing with a student with a serious eating disorder). Indicative of the professional quality of the program, the Center recently received full accreditation from the American Psychological Association for its internship program. Hopkins can thereby refresh the staff by attracting the best counseling interns from across the country. A member of the Center’s staff also helps train and oversee a group of students who, through “A Place to Talk” in the residence halls, listen to other students and help them with the strains of college life.

Residential Life constitutes a critical area of student life programs that is the focus of special attention in response to the Commission on Undergraduate Education’s recommendations. While acknowledging the importance of the residential experience as a primary vehicle for student education and personal development, Hopkins has been constrained by the lack of residential facilities adequate to house all students who wish to live on campus. There is no doubt that this lack hurts the ability to develop and sustain a strong sense of community. Over the past year, a plan has been developed to improve residential life by focusing on two initiatives: the completion of a freshman quadrangle on the Homewood campus and the creation of an upper-class housing precinct across Charles Street. Both initiatives respond to CUE recommendations. In particular, significant time and effort has gone into planning for the Charles Village Project. When complete in summer 2006, the Charles Commons will not only increase the housing stock for upperclassmen by approximately 615 beds, but also will provide additional amenity space to serve the needs of many of the upperclassmen living in the surrounding neighborhoods. The planning effort for the freshman housing initiative is just beginning, but it is hoped that all freshmen may be able to share a common experience in a freshman quadrangle possibly as early as the fall 2007. This would permit major programming enhancements and would foster a sense of class unity and loyalty. In addition to the strengthened sense of community and school spirit, more students would be able to reap the educational rewards of this particular part of college life.

The residential staff operates according to a strong training and development model and includes both full-time professionals and upper-class students. One of the greatest challenges in residential life is balancing the programming needs with the obligations to operate a fiscally responsible set of housing and dining auxiliary services, the latter now under a separate management structure. While a spirit of goodwill has characterized the interactions between the relevant offices, extra effort and coordination is necessary to ensure that the programmatic vision drives the decision-making. Administrative attention needs to be directed to making the planning process for facilities additions or improvements less cumbersome.

The lack of a traditional student union means that many social programming functions are decentralized. As new facilities for residential life come online, a more comprehensive approach to extra-curricular
programming will be developed to create a “virtual” student union, even if a single center in the classic sense is not possible. In particular, space in the Charles Commons will be available to meet social needs that cannot now be accommodated with available campus facilities. The Dean of Student Life is considering redefining a staff position so that there can be better integration and coordination of campus activities across the range of facilities that support student groups and functions.

Johns Hopkins students who are eager to develop their religious or spiritual life have the support of an active Campus Ministries program. Religious activities find a home in the Bunting-Meyerhoff Interfaith Center which accommodates both formal worship and informal gatherings. Under the guidance of a Chaplain and a volunteer clergy representing more than 20 faith traditions, a broad range of services and programming are offered to facilitate spiritual development and to promote religious tolerance and social awareness.

Disciplinary matters occupy the attention of student life administrators at Hopkins, as elsewhere. One of the Associate Deans of Student Life handles Judicial Affairs and ensures that students are acquainted with the provisions of the Undergraduate Student Conduct Code as well as the procedures by which matters will be adjudicated by the Student Conduct Board, the Dean of Student Life, the Interfraternity Council, the Student Activities Commission, or the Undergraduate Academic Ethics Board, according to the authority of these entities as outlined in the section on standards and policies in The Compendium. The various aspects of the system seem to work well with the most challenging issues involving complaints about student behavior off campus.

Athletics and Recreation programs at Johns Hopkins are a salutary adjunct to the undergraduate experience. Intramural activities attract a significant following (1146 participants were registered last year), and 27 club sports engaged more than 1300 students in everything from cricket to Ultimate Frisbee to Wing Chun Kung Fu. There are, for example, 89 intramural basketball teams, 52 indoor soccer teams, and 48 volleyball teams. Outdoor programming has evolved over the past years, and a staff member has recently been hired to support experiential education courses that encourage ethical leadership, teamwork, and character development. As an NCAA Division III institution, with only lacrosse a Division I provision, we consider the intercollegiate athletic program to be well-run with a full appreciation of the balance between a demanding academic environment and a rigorous competition schedule. The men’s lacrosse team has won 42 national championships, and during the 2002-03 academic year, among the 26 men’s and women’s intercollegiate athletic teams, there were six conference championships in football, men’s and women’s soccer, women’s basketball, men’s fencing, and baseball. Nine programs appeared in the relevant NCAA tournaments, and the Hopkins’ lacrosse team played in the national championship game.

A recent faculty review of the admission of students who wish to play competitive sports has confirmed the faculty’s satisfaction that the notion of “student athlete” is far from an oxymoron at Hopkins. All admissions decisions are vested in the admissions office, and the input of coaches and the athletic director is channeled properly. Moreover, the academic performance of student athletes is strong, as evidenced by Hopkins placing 14th in the NACDA Director’s Cup. Graduation rates are slightly higher for student athletes, and their grade point averages are above a 3.0, only slightly lower (roughly a tenth of a point) than all other students. A major recent challenge in athletics was external: the NCAA proposal to bar the Division III schools currently operating under an exemption from continuing to provide athletic scholarships in a single Division I sport. This would have forced a decision by Johns Hopkins and other colleges in a similar situation to move their entire sports programs to a Division I status or to attempt to be competitive in the absence of scholarships. Fortunately, the current system has been retained. It is important to seek endowment support for lacrosse scholarships now funded through the financial aid budget; this will help relieve the strain to meet the financial need of students.
A second challenge relates to the adequacy of facilities. The White Athletic Center has provided facilities for varsity athletes and a swimming pool for recreational use. The addition of the Ralph S. O’Connor Recreation Center in January 2002 has made an enormous difference by providing students and faculty with basketball, volleyball, squash, and racquetball courts, a rock-climbing wall, a weight room, and fitness training and an aerobics facility. It is open 112 hours per week during the fall and spring semesters and serves an average of 1600 people daily. More than 30 group fitness classes are offered each week. Even with this important addition, the facilities are not adequate for the size of the current student body and for the number of varsity sports that are played. While a long-term plan for facilities expansion and improvement exists, funding has not been identified.

**STANDARD 10: FACULTY**

The tradition of faculty governance is very firmly established at Johns Hopkins University and is truly part of the fabric of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences. The approval of academic programs and academic policies is the responsibility of the faculty as are the very critical decisions about who can be invested with the status of a Hopkins faculty member. A twelve member Academic Council, elected from the Schools of Arts and Sciences and Engineering, serves as the primary mechanism for faculty governance and for ensuring ownership of academic decisions, including faculty appointments, promotion, and tenure. Working through several committees, including a Curriculum Committee, the faculty voice is definitive in matters relating to curricular requirements and school-wide academic policies. Within the departments, the faculty bears the primary responsibility for the content and rigor of academic majors, the development of individual courses, and the academic advising of students who have declared majors.

The faculty also are the foundation of the Krieger School in the sense that their research and scholarly excellence are indispensable to every aspect of the School’s mission. For many years, the School has been able to maintain a level of achievement and visibility disproportionate to its small size by pursuing strategies of selective excellence in all disciplines. To maintain this leadership position, every faculty appointment must contribute fundamentally and essentially to the intellectual growth and academic prosperity of the School. This means that all faculty, in addition to maintaining research excellence, are expected to contribute directly to building and guiding the intellectual community of the School and to enriching the educational experience of our students.

The most important mechanism for ensuring that all faculty contribute at the highest level to the intellectual community involves rigorous procedures for appointment, promotion and tenure. The School is in the process of a thorough re-examination of this process, including the rank at which tenure is granted, the criteria for promotion, and the procedures that govern the review of candidates. Oversight of this process is the primary obligation of the Academic Council, according to published policies to ensure that all candidates for appointment show evidence of distinction in research and scholarship (or, in the case of junior faculty, show promise to attain it) and a commitment to teaching excellence. The Krieger School has historically not granted tenure below the rank of Professor under most circumstances, and the process of promotion to this rank thus can take as long as ten years from the initial appointment as Assistant Professor. This extended time frame makes Johns Hopkins virtually unique among American universities. While this system may have some advantages both for the School and for the faculty member, who need not be hurried in building the research record on which his or her promotion ultimately will be judged, the system also makes it difficult to attract and retain excellent faculty at the Associate Professor level and potentially has a negative impact on faculty diversity. For these reasons, the Committee reviewing the current process has recommended that tenure be awarded to Associate Professors; these and other proposals related to enhancing the review process are being vetted by appropriate faculty bodies.
It should be noted that the Academic Council reviews and approves the appointment of anyone who teaches in the Krieger School, including those who hold part-time, adjunct, and lecturer appointments. A recent study of academic titles and the criteria that pertain thereto has been completed by the Academic Council which has codified the scheme. While regular rank faculty do the bulk of the teaching at Johns Hopkins University, the Dean’s Office has begun a review of instruction done by faculty not affiliated with academic departments, as in the case of the Language Teaching Center and the Arts Center, with the objective of ensuring proper academic oversight of such activities.

Once appointed, every faculty member must report annually on her or his scholarship/research, teaching, and service activities during the preceding year. Written guidelines specify the areas to be addressed, and each faculty member’s contribution is discussed by the Dean and appropriate Department Chair before salary determinations are made. Teaching quality is discussed as part of this review, although the mechanisms for obtaining evaluation of teaching are not as strong, nor employed as systematically, as is desired, despite the fact that all faculty are asked to participate. An examination of the student course evaluation process is underway, with a better instrument and more effective procedures anticipated during the spring. As part of a broader conversation about the weight of teaching in the tenure and promotion process, the Academic Council also is currently discussing how best to measure teaching effectiveness and the role that student evaluation and departmental assessment should play. Consistent with the CUE recommendation, more must be done to recognize and celebrate teaching excellence, and the Dean’s Office is currently considering ways to promote greater attention to the importance of this activity.

Equally important in the development of faculty is the institutional support provided for the advancement of junior faculty in the Krieger School. The Dean has strengthened the review process for junior faculty so that Department Chairs must now annually review every untenured junior faculty member and communicate the results of that review in writing, citing areas of opportunity for professional growth.

In addition to the regular rank faculty, graduate students contribute in significant ways to the School’s educational mission. We are fortunate to attract superb graduate students. Their involvement in the teaching program has mutual benefit. As a research university, Hopkins views providing experience in the art of teaching as an essential aspect of the educational program for its graduate students. At present, much of the responsibility for training Teaching Assistants rests with individual departments, with the result that the quality of mentorship in this important area varies among the departments. The School is now examining how best to provide some central services that would enhance the training graduate students receive. This past fall a new edition of a teaching manual for graduate students was produced, and a revamped TA orientation program was conducted. An expanded charge is being entertained for the Center for Educational Resources in order that additional programs to address the needs of graduate students might be developed and more support for pedagogy provided to faculty. The “Buzzword Bistro” series has proved a popular means of introducing both faculty and Teaching Assistants to innovative teaching tools and strategies as well as assessment of student learning. A program of Dean’s Teaching Fellowships provides to a select group of advanced graduate students a valuable pedagogical experience, while enhancing the quality of the curriculum and increasing the number of small classes offered to undergraduates. Thanks to a generous donor, graduate students also are eligible to apply to a fund for small grants to assist their professional development through conference attendance and support for research trips.

The Krieger School’s 2001 strategic plan called for modest and targeted growth (about 10 to 15 percent) in the faculty over the coming decade. Due to a combination of new endowed chairs, more effective management of faculty turnover, and some opportunistic hiring in support of diversity, the faculty has experienced much of the increase that was imagined over the next several years. While this is good news for our teaching and research programs, supporting a larger faculty has added to budget stress. The full-time tenure and tenure track faculty of the Krieger School now number 273. Of these, 76 percent hold tenure, virtually all at the rank of Professor. All of the School’s faculty holding regular appointments teach,
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with the teaching commitment balanced between graduate and undergraduate instruction. The Krieger
School also has a limited number of research faculty whose primary engagement is with specific research
programs, funded by external sources that direct the allocation of their time. While these faculty contribute
in important ways to individual instruction in the laboratory, they are not formally involved in the
undergraduate teaching program.

Whether measured by citations per faculty member, scholarly recognition as reflected in professional prizes
and fellowships, or research dollars (which have grown by 45 percent over the past five years, to a total of
over 40 million dollars), the scholarly and research productivity of the Hopkins’ faculty is extraordinary and
stands as one of the distinguishing features of this University and, in particular, its School of Arts and
Sciences. Faculty are attracted to Hopkins because the University values (and expects) that its faculty will
advance the frontiers of knowledge. Students are similarly attracted to Hopkins with the expectation that
they will study with those scholars and researchers who are actively engaged in the process of knowledge
creation and that they will have the opportunity themselves to be active participants in that process. And, as
will be discussed, students have multiple opportunities to do so. Within the Krieger School, the potential
conflict of “teaching versus research” is resolved by openly embracing the notion that a large part of
teaching takes place through research. Compared to students at peer institutions, a particularly large portion
of the Hopkins student body (about two thirds) participates in substantial research experiences.

Because of the small size of many Hopkins departments, the scholarly reputation of the University depends
on every faculty member achieving world-class distinction. Small size also means that the stresses of
service commitments on faculty are perhaps larger than at other institutions where there is a larger pool of
faculty available to engage in the myriad responsibilities that attend to faculty, e.g., committee service both
within the department and the school, assistance with student and faculty recruitment, involvement in
alumni and community programs, etc. Although most faculty share the institutional commitment to a
renewed emphasis on undergraduate education, many express understandable concern about how to manage
the trade-offs involved with the finite resource of their time. The School is challenged to consider how
economies of scale might be achieved in an environment of small departments and to determine whether
any reallocations are possible, including whether there are activities now being done by faculty that might
be better handled in another manner.

While there is much to celebrate about the Krieger faculty, taken as a whole, faculty excellence is under
pressure in three related areas. First, notwithstanding the overall growth and a number of recent
outstanding additions to the faculty, marginal salaries in some areas, especially in the natural and social
sciences, continue to threaten our ability to attract and retain the finest scholars, scientists, and educators.
In the long run there is no higher priority for the School than the recruitment and retention of our most
distinguished scholars. Beginning in January 2001, the Dean initiated a process to improve the
competitiveness of faculty salaries by allocating additional resources for merit increases in all departments.
Budget constraints have now hampered our plan to continue systematic increases across the board.
Nonetheless, the School has been able to be proactive with a number of crucial faculty with the result that
retention has improved. The School’s strategy is to resist the temptation to raise salaries to a competitive
level only when an external offer must be matched to attract or retain an individual; such a practice is
destabilizing, demoralizing, and often more expensive than a comprehensive approach.

An identified priority of the current fund-raising campaign is to secure additional endowed chairs that offer
an important competitive edge in attracting outstanding faculty members, especially if the endowments
come with research budgets to support graduate students or post-doctoral fellows. It is equally important
for the School to recognize and reward excellence within the standing faculty on a regular and routine basis.
This recognition may be through endowed chairs as well as formal awards for research and teaching
excellence, matching funds, enhanced sabbatical time or funds, post-doctoral support, or other means. The
creation of Krieger-Eisenhower Chairs recognizes the totality of faculty contributions, lifting up the model
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of faculty who combine superb scholarship with teaching excellence and university citizenship of the highest order. It is significant that the most recent group appointed to these most prestigious chairs are current faculty members rather than externally recruited individuals.

A second pressure stems from the struggle to maintain critical mass and vitality of our research enterprise, and, here again, small size presents challenges. In many if not most academic disciplines, there is a trend toward ever increasing specialization. To pursue a strategy of selective excellence in this environment, departments in the Krieger School have responded largely by narrowing their focus to a few carefully chosen areas in which they have excelled. Relative to the size of peer institutions and to growth in enrollments, we have lost ground in faculty size; we fear that many departments have hit the limit of smallness as a virtue. In many fields, proper training at the graduate level demands a certain level of breadth, including a standard graduate core curriculum, and attracting high quality graduate students often requires diversity in the available research opportunities. At the same time, these departments are particularly stressed by large and increasing teaching commitments, both to service courses and to undergraduate majors. For these reasons, emphasis has been placed on faculty growth targeted carefully to new opportunities for excellence. Interdepartmental connections are being promoted in the social sciences. The core natural sciences and mathematics, which have not kept pace with growth in the disciplines or at peer institutions, must be expanded to provide the basis for new research as well as the interdisciplinary programs on which selective excellence depends. The strategy for the humanities is to maintain excellence and build on strength by making appointments that will have high impact across departments. To maintain the School’s commitment to the liberal arts, it is important that the humanities retain its size proportional to the other areas.

Third, highly productive faculty require outstanding research facilities, modern laboratories, excellent libraries, and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows of the highest caliber. Improvement is needed in each of these areas if the Krieger School is to continue to succeed in its research and teaching missions as we have in the past. Investments in faculty must be matched by investments in research and teaching resources. The state of the infrastructure is a central issue: crucial goals include the transformation of Gilman Hall (the home of the humanities departments) into a state-of-the-art facility to nurture scholarship across the humanities disciplines, the upgrading of science laboratories (a process given an enormous boost with the opening of a new chemistry building), improvements in the teaching environment by renovating classrooms to allow wider use of instructional technologies, and the creation of new office space for faculty and graduate students, many of whom lack appropriate venues to meet with their students. Planning also is underway for a possible library expansion that would make collections more accessible, facilitate the use of library resources in our teaching programs, and provide better study space for students, including space that could be dedicated to the effective practice of group study.

While the intellectual quality of the Krieger faculty is a source of pride even in the face of these challenges, another vital challenge and serious concern involves the diversity of the faculty. Especially with respect to African-Americans, minorities are vastly underrepresented. Despite several recent key appointments, the School’s track record on attracting and retaining Black scholars and researchers, compared to our peers, has been poor. Hispanics are similarly underrepresented, and while a number of senior faculty women have been appointed in the past few years, these gains have been balanced by several key losses.

With the active leadership of the Dean, the support of University officers, and the shared commitment of the faculty itself, the School is determined to enhance faculty diversity in significant measure. The challenge is particularly difficult given the overall strategy of selective excellence on which the institution’s academic excellence is premised. Because the resource base does not permit full coverage of disciplines, specific subfields of disciplines have been targeted as areas in which to achieve distinction. In the absence of flexibility in fields, it is harder to take advantage of targets of opportunity. One strategic initiative that has implications for faculty diversity is the creation of a Center for Africana Studies. In addition to the
exciting educational opportunities it presents for students, it is hoped that the program will serve also to attract Black scholars to Johns Hopkins.

Other steps have been taken to increase diversity and ensure equity, including a revamping of the faculty search procedures so that, before interviews begin, the Dean reviews all the short lists of faculty candidates to ensure diversity of the applicant pool. Recommendations made by a faculty committee on the status of women also have been implemented. A regular review of faculty salary equity is conducted to ensure that there are no differences attributable to factors other than measures of status and merit. The School hopes to take advantage of “Presidential Professorships” that have been created at the University-level to allow opportunistic hiring when positions are not currently available. The School also will continue to be actively engaged with the University’s Diversity Leadership Council.

**STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS**

The School of Arts and Sciences offers 38 majors and a wide variety of courses within them. The common theme is academic rigor and the encouragement of independent research and creative thinking. Students find that they have many academic options from which to choose. They also find that, because a very favorable student-faculty ratio (9:1) has been maintained, most upper-level courses are small. In fact, 57 percent of undergraduate classes have fewer than 20 students. And, it is not unusual for students in the humanities and social sciences to have seminars with fewer than ten students. In addition to close contact with faculty, students also have access to many state-of-the-art research facilities and abundant opportunities to participate in the process of discovery that is an institutional hallmark.

All of the major disciplines of learning in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences are represented by the course offerings at Hopkins, and because many Hopkins departments are among the most outstanding nationally, students have extraordinary opportunities to study with faculty at the forefront of their fields. The catalog describes in full each of the departments and its course offerings as well as the degree requirements for each program, but it is worth highlighting the breadth of the educational programs and some of the most distinctive. In the humanities, courses are offered in the traditional areas of English and American literature, history, philosophy, and modern foreign languages, but also in classical Latin and Greek, history of art, creative writing, comparative literature, Near Eastern studies, film and media studies, and the history of science and technology. An area major is a possibility for students who have developed interdisciplinary interests. An East Asian Studies major offers students a balance of coursework in language (at least six semesters of Chinese or Japanese) and area studies, including history, comparative literature, and political thought. A major in Africana Studies has recently been introduced to tap current offerings in a number of humanities and social science departments and to cultivate additional faculty interest.

Art history students benefit from outstanding museum collections at the Baltimore Museum of Art and the Walters Art Museum as well as the many extraordinary resources of Washington, D.C. A new Humanities Seminar has been developed through the Washington Center and allows students the opportunity to spend a semester studying and interning in cultural institutions in our nation’s capital. The Writing Seminars Program at Hopkins is world renown, and many students laud the superior teaching and close association formed with writers and poets who serve as the faculty for this program. Among other notable opportunities in the humanities is a program that allows undergraduate students to participate in an archeological dig in Egypt with a faculty member who recently curated a major exhibit at the Smithsonian Institution. A small but impressive archaeological museum is located in Gilman Hall and allows students to view various antiquities collected in the Near East. It contains an excellent study collection of Egyptian artifacts and Palestinian pottery.
Many students interested in the humanities find additional opportunities by taking courses at the Peabody Conservatory. The Krieger School is working on establishing closer ties between the two schools so that more students can benefit from the access to a world-class conservatory faculty. Arts and Science students may take a minor in music, and each year a number of students also graduate with double degrees. The outstanding educational breadth of Hopkins’ programs is supplemented by a cross-registration agreement among the area colleges and universities that allows Hopkins undergraduates to take one course per semester at other Baltimore institutions such as Loyola University, Goucher College, Towson University, Morgan State University, the University of Maryland at Baltimore County, and the Maryland Institute College of Art. The Academic Cooperation Program has been especially supportive of the interests of students who wish to supplement their programs with courses in the fine arts, including art, dance, and theater.

The Krieger School offers a broad array of social science programs, including anthropology, economics, political science, and sociology. One of the largest majors is International Studies, a multidisciplinary program emphasizing political science, history, economics, and foreign language that was one of the first such programs in the country. Students also have the opportunity to take advantage of the proximity to Washington, D.C. by participating in the Atchison Public Service Fellowship, a new residential program based at Hopkins’ Washington Center. There they study institutions of government and engage in firsthand observations through internship programs. Students also benefit from the University’s Institute of Policy Studies (IPS) whose faculty offer an introduction to urban policy that includes both a seminar and an internship. Courses in several departments (political science, sociology, anthropology, economics, and geography and environmental engineering) support students with an interest in urban studies and take advantage of Hopkins’ location in Baltimore, a city with all the cultural opportunities and challenges that characterize today’s urban areas. Opportunities abound to integrate academic work with involvement in community service through a very active Center for Social Concern.

A large number of undergraduate students are attracted to Johns Hopkins because of the strength of its science and quantitative studies programs, and indeed, there is much to offer at the undergraduate level with coursework in biology, biophysics, chemistry, cognitive science, earth and planetary science, mathematics, physics and astronomy, and psychological and brain sciences, as well as the opportunity for complementary coursework in the engineering departments of the Whiting School. Undergraduates receive strong encouragement to undertake research under the direction of faculty members. It is not unusual for students to be co-authors on scientific papers or to participate in poster sessions at professional meetings. Physics majors, for example, have the opportunity to work in state-of-the-art facilities and to participate in research projects at the forefront of condensed matter physics, high energy physics, and astronomy, including a digital sky survey which is mapping the universe. The fact that the NASA Space Telescope Science Institute is located on campus offers other additional benefits to students with focused interests. Majors in Earth and Planetary Science have notable opportunities to become engaged in fieldwork.

One of the most popular majors is neuroscience, a rigorous preparation for advanced study in a doctoral program or medical school. Students have the option of a four year B.A. program or a five year combined B.A./M.S. program that also includes a yearlong intensive laboratory experience. The program offers both a broad overview of the field as well as more advanced training and research opportunities in one of three areas of concentration: cellular and molecular neuroscience, systems neuroscience, and cognitive neuroscience. All undergraduate neuroscience majors (approximately 150 at present) are required to complete two semesters of independent research. Many of them fulfill this in laboratories at the School of Medicine that has for nearly 20 years housed one of the top-ranked graduate neuroscience departments in the country. Thus, this program facilitates interactions between the undergraduates at Homewood and the world-class faculty at the School of Medicine. For students interested in studying the interactions between behavior and biology, a specialized natural sciences area major combining coursework in fundamental areas of biology and neuroscience with psychology, anthropology, and sociology is offered through the David S.
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Olton Behavioral Biology Program. Another of Hopkins’ distinctive programs is Public Health Studies. In light of the opportunities that are created by having as one of Hopkins’ academic divisions the largest and arguably most distinguished School of Public Health in the country, it is not surprising that it is the third largest major.

In addition to programs in modern foreign languages (French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, and German) and classical Greek, Latin, and modern and biblical Hebrew offered through Arts and Sciences departments, a Language Teaching Center provides instruction in Chinese and Japanese and less commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Hindi, Kiswahili, Korean, and Persian. A cooperative program with Goucher College also facilitates a full range of courses in Russian language and literature.

Study abroad is actively encouraged, and students may opt for Hopkins administered programs or one of many other approved programs organized by other universities. Some programs are offered at Hopkins’ international centers, including a villa in Florence, Italy and a center in Nanjing, China which houses a summer language program and a graduate level program in Chinese and American Studies. As a member of the Berlin Consortium, Hopkins also is able to offer students the opportunity to study for a semester or a year at the Free University of Berlin. During a typical year, over a hundred students engage in foreign study in dozens of countries around the world. Administratively there are few barriers to study abroad, but the large number of science and engineering majors means that, compared to peer universities, a smaller percentage of Hopkins students ordinarily participate. There is less flexibility in course selection for science majors, and the sequential nature of much of the coursework makes it difficult for science students who want to complete programs in time for medical or graduate school application to have the freedom to spend a semester away from the campus. The development of innovative international programs that would accommodate the needs of these particular students is being pursued.

In addition to regular semester courses, students at the Homewood campus can participate in an optional three week Intersession term in January during which a variety of credit and noncredit courses and activities are offered. No extra tuition is charged for these short courses. Students are encouraged to use this time to explore new interests and to enjoy the opportunity to concentrate on one subject. Departments have been encouraged to offer Intersession courses with their full-time faculty, but generally this period is viewed as a very valuable opportunity for concentrated periods in the laboratory or for research-related travel, and it is difficult to entice regular faculty to participate. Moreover, it probably is a better utilization of faculty resources to have full-time faculty teaching during the regular academic semesters when more students can take advantage of the resource. A number of programs have been developed that include foreign travel for students, and while these are quite popular, students and administrators are concerned that the extra cost associated with these programs makes them inaccessible for some students. Despite the success of many specific courses, students are, overall, not satisfied with the range of Intersession course offerings. After some internal assessment, we have decided to orient the program more toward coursework that is innovative and to encourage wider use of adjunct faculty and graduate students to develop courses that would supplement the regular curricular offerings. In light of the shortness of the Intersession period and the limited student contact hours, the amount of course credit that can be earned during Intersession is under review.

Students in the Krieger School are eligible to receive credit for work done elsewhere according to policies outlined in the Undergraduate Academic Manual. The general guidelines are that students may transfer up to 12 credits from courses taken at other institutions, whether before or after matriculation, excluding credit earned through Advanced Placement examinations, International Baccalaureate courses, and other foreign certificate courses, and those taken through approved study abroad programs.

All new academic programs must be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee, a committee of four faculty and four student members that operates under the aegis of the Academic Council. In addition
to required review of new majors and minors, the Committee looks periodically at the effectiveness of other
curricular requirements. For example, the Committee has just heard a report on the writing program and
has looked recently at several issues related to the designation of individual courses for purposes of the
distribution requirement. The Curriculum Committee also monitors the success of initiatives designed to
enrich the curriculum, such as the proposal to develop additional freshman courses, especially seminars.
The development of an online Spanish language course, the first such course in the Krieger School, has
raised the issue of the appropriate use of non-traditional delivery modes, and the Committee intends to
pursue consideration of the circumstances in which online courses may be offered.

Approximately every five years, each academic department is reviewed by the Academic Council. The
review includes consideration of both undergraduate and graduate programs, as well as the scholarly
standing and morale of the department. While this mechanism has been a useful form of assessment, and
one that has helped departments to establish an agenda of improvement that can be monitored by the Dean’s
Office, it has not focused with specificity on the full array of issues that relate to the quality of the
undergraduate program. Thus, beginning in the spring 2004, the Krieger School has plans to initiate a
review of undergraduate major programs, consistent with the recommendation of the Commission on
Undergraduate Education. The template that is being developed will ask the departments, under the
leadership of their Directors of Undergraduate Studies, to consider a series of questions that addresses not
only program goals, but also appropriate measures of success in terms of learning outcomes. Datasets are
being developed to provide departments with information about major requirements and notable programs
at other universities as supplemental contextual materials. Since their official designation in the fall 2003,
Directors of Undergraduate Studies (many of whom were previously departmental coordinators) have been
at work following up on a series of recommendations to strengthen support for undergraduate majors made
during the past academic year. We see many signs of initiative in the form of new course offerings and
better rationalized course sequences, the development of study abroad programs, planning for laboratory
enhancements, and programming that facilitates faculty-student interaction.

The intertwining of research and teaching at the undergraduate level is one of the distinctive features of a
Hopkins education, and no discussion of a Hopkins education would be complete without a discussion of
research opportunities for students, just as no discussion of the Hopkins faculty would be complete without
acknowledgment of their primary engagement in discovery. Because of our small size, students are
encouraged to participate actively in scientific and scholarly research through partnerships with faculty and
graduate students in specific projects and by interacting with scholars in small classes where the critical
thinking associated with the research process can be most effectively conveyed. Intellectual partnerships
with students and engaged faculty mentors are essential to the success of this “hand-tooled” model of
undergraduate education. Students should leave Hopkins having been exposed to the methods and virtues
of disciplined inquiry and with an abiding commitment to self-initiated learning and discovery.

Students have multiple opportunities for independent study and research, whether for credit or experience.
The Woodrow Wilson Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program mentioned earlier in the discussion of
financial aid, pairs students with a senior faculty mentor. Students pursue their research throughout their
tenure at Hopkins, either in a series of projects in one or disparate fields, or they choose to focus on a single
long-term project in one field. The list of the projects undertaken by currently enrolled Woodrow Wilson
Fellows is particularly impressive. Another related opportunity to complete original research is supported
through Provost’s Undergraduate Research Awards. Each year, approximately 50 students are awarded up
to $2,500 for projects to be completed over the course of a summer or a semester. The projects are
presented in a year-end poster session with presentations that are remarkable in their scope and
sophistication. Undergraduate neuroscience students also have initiated a research symposium where
students in various disciplines make formal presentations at a daylong symposium dedicated to their
original work. Most of these research experiences are the result of student-initiated contacts with faculty
whose research is of interest. Students frequently describe being struck by the receptivity of faculty to their
involvement in their laboratories. The School of Medicine and the School of Public Health are incalculable assets to Hopkins undergraduates in the quality and quantity of research experience and mentorship that they afford.

While there are these signs of vigor and many indications of excellence in undergraduate affairs, sizable growth in the undergraduate student body at Homewood in the last fifteen years, along with minimal growth in the size of the faculty, has unfortunately placed the School at risk of losing an essential dimension of “hand-tooled education.” In several disciplines, especially in the natural and social sciences, class size has been increasing, service teaching is crowding out upper-level seminars, and an increasing number of majors makes it ever more difficult for departments to manage. Laboratory courses in particular have suffered and raise issues of diminished intellectual value and possibly safety considerations. All of this necessarily implies fewer faculty-student interactions of the sort that makes Hopkins distinctive. The problem is exacerbated further by the changing composition of the undergraduate student body. For a variety of reasons, including growth in the number of engineering students, the burden has been increasingly borne by the natural and social sciences. At the same time, the humanities, despite its exceptional quality, have many fewer students and majors. Whereas growth in the size of the faculty will surely help to ease this burden, particularly in the natural and social sciences, so too must the School attract more high quality students interested in the humanities and eschew further growth in enrollments among over-represented majors. The Admissions Office is undertaking vigorous recruitment programs aimed at attracting humanists.

Turning from program to infrastructure, the Krieger School’s academic programs are supported by appropriate library and other learning resources, facilities, state-of-the-art equipment, and professional staff. With over 2.5 million volumes, the Sheridan Libraries are among the top research libraries in the country, and the other components of the Hopkins library system (the Welch Medical Library, the Mason Library, the Friedheim Music Library and several special collections) provide outstanding additional resources for further exploration of focused interests. All components have not only extensive traditional collections of monographs and periodicals, but also expansive collections of electronic resources. Because of the heavy research orientation of the faculty, not only are the scholarly library resources well-developed, but so, too, are the resources for scientific experimentation. Students thus have access to the same equipment as researchers, such as scanning electron microscopes and the new nuclear magnetic resonance instrumentation. In addition, departments such as Physics and Astronomy and Biology offer undergraduate students specially designed advanced laboratory courses focused on state-of-the-art research equipment that is often shared with departmental research faculty.

The Krieger School provides substantial technological support for its undergraduate programs, although there is no shortage of interest in, or of need for, additional resources. Generally, the School provides a number of department specific computer facilities, a major Computer Laboratory, as well as several smaller computing clusters distributed throughout the School. In addition to the fully wired Hodson Hall classrooms, several classrooms have computer stations at each seat. Further, wireless access is available in the major public facilities and outdoor areas and in most of the larger classrooms. Programs have been developed to allow students to purchase hardware and software at competitive prices, and site licenses are available to reduce further the cost of key software.

The effective use of information technology requires not only the proper equipment, but also, equally important, adequate levels of staff support from those with appropriate expertise. A faculty member has been recently appointed Director of Information Technology for the Krieger School to ensure that faculty and students’ needs for technology resources are met. A 24-hour help desk is available to students, faculty, and staff who have computer or software problems and need consultation. This resource is backed up by the expertise of HITS (Hopkins Information Technology Services.) A strategic decision to move individuals with disciplinary specialties from a central Homewood Academic Computing organization into the
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academic departments has had very positive consequences for the integration of technology into courses and also for the administrative efficiency of the departments. Over the past five years, the number of IT Discipline Specialists has been increased, such that all the departments and programs in the Krieger School now have coverage from one of 16 specialists who play a key role in supporting the teaching, research/scholarship, and service missions of specific departments at the program and at the end user level. Many of our science departments with the most up-to-date computing facilities, for example Physics and Biophysics, have developed creative curricula utilizing this sophisticated technology.

The Center for Educational Resources (CER) assists faculty who wish to extend their instructional impact by connecting digital technologies and innovative teaching strategies. Partnerships in art history and biology, for example, have resulted in exciting educational resources for students, including a digital slide library that helps students prepare for exams and conduct critical analyses of art works, and an interactive “voting” system that allows instructors to gauge student understanding of material. Through the Technology Fellowship program grants, additional digital course resources have been spawned.

A Digital Media Center (“where art and technology merge”) provides important support for students who want to explore creative new ways of making art with emerging technologies. The Center is essentially a multi-media studio that nurtures students’ creativity and allows them to work on both academic and non-academic projects, under the guidance of professional staff, including digital music and digital video specialists.

The School is supported by additional infrastructure administered by the University’s central information technology organization that is responsible for maintaining the University’s networks, including the wireless network. Each of the schools is represented on a variety of planning committees and information technology councils to ensure that school needs are being met by central initiatives, including the important and expensive effort to create an integrated student information system (ISIS) and an even more daunting undertaking, dubbed HopkinsOne, to provide an integrated administrative information system across the University and Health System.

While many of our facilities for advanced work are among the most sophisticated, there is reason to be much less satisfied with our general classrooms. Hodson Hall, a new classroom building, came online within the past two years and offers the kind of learning environment that we would like to provide more widely. It features high tech, multimedia “smart” classrooms; too few of our more traditional facilities are able to offer as comfortably appointed and technologically equipped surroundings. In fact, a source of faculty concern is the state of our teaching plant. A needs assessment has been conducted and a plan for upgrading teaching facilities has been developed, but funding must be identified before the necessary renovations can be begun. Depending on the economic outlook and the outcome of state budget discussions, we may be able to move forward this spring with the first phase of general classroom renovation. Among the anticipated benefits from a change in the weekly class schedule are some additional flexibility and better utilization of classroom space.

**STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION**

Hopkins undergraduate students enjoy a great deal of freedom in shaping their educational programs. They are expected to exercise responsibility for academic choices and to take ownership of their education. This flexibility has been a hallmark of the educational philosophy at Johns Hopkins throughout its history. But, students do not operate without framework; nor do they operate without support. In recognition of the value of a liberal education, faculty and University officials have set forth guidelines and requirements to help students distribute their learning across major fields. As noted in the Undergraduate Academic Manual, this process of formulating a coherent, yet wide-ranging course of study that both recognizes the
student’s gifts and encourages new interests is a process of gradual shaping and careful consultation. Faculty advisors, professional staff in the various advising offices, graduate teaching assistants, and undergraduates all contribute to the process.

First-year students are encouraged to explore widely and to make a “commitment to wander.” In fact the introduction to the Freshman Academic Handbook is entitled “An invitation to explore,” and the rationale for and benefits of not limiting educational choices are conveyed in written materials and in regular contacts with advisors. All first-year students are designated as “pre-majors,” and not until late in the second semester are students asked to declare a major. Since it is sometimes well-intentioned family members who add to the pressure to restrict choices to those “practical” subjects, the rationale for educational breadth also is conveyed to parents through the Parents’ Handbook. Because Johns Hopkins attracts, and, in fact, is a particularly good fit for students with focused interests, we do find that because of plans for advanced study, many students often become somewhat instrumental in their approach to their education and make choices based on an unnecessarily narrow view of what careers require. The antidote to this problem is not, our faculty believes, equally prescriptive direction via specific core courses assumed to be of value to all students. Rather, it is affirmation that getting an education is about making choices, and that coming to understand one’s intellectual interests and how to stimulate and satisfy them requires some latitude to decide. The worksheets in the Freshman Academic Handbook and the interest inventory in the FOCUS program that is made available to students online offer tools for thinking through those choices in preparation for meeting with advisors. So, too, do the MERLIN system of online peer evaluation for undergraduate courses and the ACE Guide.

To graduate from Johns Hopkins University, students must satisfy the requirements of a major; fulfill a University writing requirement; fulfill the University distribution requirement of earning at least 30 semester credits in courses coded for areas outside the area that includes the major department (excluding courses that are prerequisites for required courses for the major); and complete additional courses needed to meet the minimum degree requirement of 120 credits. For purposes of satisfying distribution requirements, the disciplines generally are divided into clusters of academic areas: humanities, natural sciences, social and behavioral sciences, quantitative and mathematical sciences, and engineering. Individual courses are each given an area designation to assist students in selecting courses that provide intellectual breadth. Further specifications apply as follows: Math and Science majors must complete at least 18-21 credits of the required 30 credits in courses that are designated humanities or social science; Humanities and Social Science Majors must take at least 12 credits of the required 30 credits in courses designated natural science, quantitative, or engineering. These requirements are clearly described in several official publications. The main point is that the distribution requirements are simple, and they strike a balance between encouraging exploration and curbing intellectual freedom.

The Krieger School is strongly committed to fostering the development of sound writing skills, and undergraduate candidates for the B.A. are thus required to take at least four courses that are writing intensive. There are several options to satisfy this requirement. First-year students are encouraged to take a course in Expository Writing (taught through the English Department by trained instructors) that is designed to prepare students for the wide variety of writing challenges they will face during their college experience. A second option is to take any one of a number of courses designated by a “W.” Among these are courses that emphasize writing in the major; these courses are taught by faculty or trained instructors who have expertise in writing and in the content area. A third alternative is to take “Introduction to Fiction and Poetry,” a writing and reading course designed to introduce prospective majors to the Writing Seminars, but open also to non-majors. While the writing courses generally have been appraised favorably, a newly appointed Director of the Writing Program has been bringing creative ideas and additional rigor to the program.
There is no school-wide foreign language requirement, but the study of a foreign language is encouraged as part of the process of preparing to be an informed global citizen sensitive to the cultural differences that enrich the human experience. Many majors require the study of a foreign language and encourage students to take advantage of study abroad programs; these factors contribute to healthy foreign language enrollments.

No one educational experience is designed to address the goal of information literacy. In fact, the understanding and skills necessary to find, evaluate, and apply information is arguably part of every course and every major at Johns Hopkins in that no academic paper, no essay examination, and no laboratory report could be written in the absence of knowing how to frame an argument and how to marshal evidence. This process is fundamental to demonstrating critical thinking skills. Among the most important partners in students’ efforts to master primary sources of information in the library and, increasingly, through electronic sources, are the staff of the Sheridan Libraries at Johns Hopkins. They provide excellent support through an array of orientation programs for new students and discipline-specific workshops offered by 14 Resource Services Librarians who make it their business to be conversant with all the major sources of information for someone wanting to be literate in a particular field. The role of the libraries in promoting information literacy among students, faculty, and staff is important enough to warrant citing some of the following examples of their activities, which included over 100 such sessions involving more than 2500 participants during the last academic year:

- Discipline-specific instruction in information and library use, primarily in conjunction with the subject liaison librarian model. This instruction takes the form of individual and small group research consultations; course-related, classroom-based library instruction; orientations to the library’s services, collections, and principal resources in a particular discipline; and development of online and print curricular materials to assist students and faculty in navigating and evaluating information sources and content.

- Course-related instruction in the use of Special Collections, which include various types of materials that may be unfamiliar to students of the 21st century. A Hopkins class is often the first time students are introduced to medieval codices, early printed books, Papal bulls, historical manuscripts, Renaissance maps, or nineteenth century sheet music. Library instruction classes unlock the potential of primary source materials for students in undergraduate survey classes as well as graduate and undergraduate seminars. Sessions teach students both how to locate these non-traditional materials as well as how to interpret them. Librarians work with faculty members to plan the class to address the pedagogical goals they set and to draft in-class exercises or follow-up assignments to reinforce the lesson. Types of lessons include introduction to printing history and transmission of texts; analysis of the physical presentation of the information and how this affects its reception; and how to locate and interpret the texts.

- Instruction in dataset manipulation and geographic information systems (GIS) for students from a variety of disciplines.

- Course-related instruction in library and information use for expository writing, technical writing and writing and research methods courses.

- Librarian-taught credit courses for targeted populations covering information sources and their use.

These activities take place by way of responding to a set of articulated learning objectives (depending on audience and place in the curriculum):

- Understanding of the basics of information organization in the JHU libraries;
• Framing a research question, identifying an information need, formulating a search strategy;

• Exploring different types of information resources, e.g., primary vs. secondary sources in a given discipline; characteristics of scholarly vs. popular vs. trade publications, understanding the production of information in one’s discipline (the information cycle);

• Understanding concepts of information searching and retrieval that may be applied to different information resources and among different disciplines; and

• Development of strategies for critically evaluating information sources and content; understanding how to incorporate evaluation methods into the information retrieval process.

The library evaluates its effectiveness in meeting these general educational goals through a number of assessment strategies, including monitoring the number of faculty who request sessions or return for sessions to support new courses; “as we go” assessment - using class exercises that explore and provide immediate hands-on experimentation and practice; post-session exchanges between students and library staff; and assessing faculty commitment to library instruction through faculty participation in individual library instruction session planning and debriefings with faculty after key assignments or papers are graded.

STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

In support of the Commission on Undergraduate Education, a great deal of data was gathered to evaluate the quality of the undergraduate experience. Some of the data sources had been available on campus in previous years, but had not been subject to rigorous analysis, nor had the results always received the attention that was warranted. For the Krieger School especially, the CUE process served to affirm the value of serious institutional research to assess our programs and to inform decision-making about enhancements.

Data from the Admitted Student Questionnaire make clear that among students’ main motivations for attending Johns Hopkins are the high academic reputation and graduate school acceptance rates. The track record of Hopkins graduates in successful application to professional school is impressive, with more than 90 percent of those who apply to medical school and 95 percent of those who apply to law school gaining admission, according to the Preprofessional Advising Office which carefully evaluates the results of professional school admissions each year. The success rate at placement in medical school, at twice the national average, is even more impressive when one considers that essentially 100 percent of Hopkins applicants to M.D./Ph.D. programs are accepted. COFHE surveys also document the fact that eighty percent of Hopkins alumni go on to earn graduate degrees within 10 years of graduation, perhaps the highest percentage of any university in the nation. For those students who want first to work, the Career Center reports that, within six months of graduation, 90 percent of new graduates looking for jobs are employed. And, equally important is the qualitative assessment of Hopkins graduates shared by professional school admissions officers and employers who continue to recruit Hopkins graduates because they are confident in their ability to succeed.

This year, data were obtained from the Association of American Medical Colleges, and an assessment was conducted of Hopkins’ students GPAs and their performance on the Medical College Admissions Test compared to aggregate data from a peer cohort. The study demonstrated that Hopkins students perform well, and this, we believe, is additional evidence that the required pre-med courses are in fact meeting their goals.
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At the School level, we have not systematically assessed the admissions success of those students applying to doctoral programs in each of the disciplines, but the consistent feedback from departments who do follow the progress of their majors is that their best students do very well in competitive graduate programs. As noted earlier, we certainly know that our top graduates are competitive for the most prestigious fellowships. We intend to encourage more departments to survey systematically their graduating students about their experience in the graduate school application process and, just as important, to ask the alumni of their programs how well-prepared they were for graduate study in specific fields. This is important in providing the departments with more systematic feedback about outcomes.

More careful attention is being paid to retention data and to understanding the causes of attrition. The freshman to sophomore persistence rate is very high (approximately 96 percent in the past few years), and overall graduation rates are substantially higher than the national averages. Compared to our peers, however, the four year and five year graduation rates (about 80 and 86 percent, respectively,) are somewhat lower. We are seeking to understand better the causes of this. An exit interview instrument has been drafted for use with all students withdrawing from the Krieger School to help determine the reasons for their departure. Although a differential is not uncommon, we are particularly concerned about the retention gap between African-American students and other students.

Among the most compelling outcomes data reviewed as part of the CUE study were the results of surveys of student satisfaction. Both an Enrolled Student Survey and a Senior Survey showed that the vast majority of Hopkins students were satisfied with their overall Hopkins education, but many fewer were highly satisfied than most administrators had been aware. The CUE Final Report addresses many of the areas of dissatisfaction with recommendations for improvement, and there is no need to detail the strengths and weaknesses cited therein. Before the CUE proposals even were fashioned, however, a working group of deans from the Krieger and Whiting Schools and Homewood Student Affairs was convened to assess the survey results and implement immediate action in several areas. This task force met over a period of nine months to identify “quick fixes” for the issues causing the most serious morale problems (e.g., the food), while the Commission was completing its work. Not only did the group take actions that had substantive effect, but also the process itself solidified the constituency for undergraduate education.

In addition to satisfaction data, the COFHE Senior Survey provides very helpful outcomes information about the extent to which students are involved in certain activities, e.g., there is documentation that Hopkins students indeed are engaged in the process of discovery through a variety of research experiences. Perhaps the most intriguing data are those self-reported gains in various aspects of undergraduate education, although it is not entirely clear how good a measure self-assessment is for educational gains. Overall, Hopkins students report comparable gains in most areas, but there are a few aspects where the gains lag those reported by students at peer institutions, and we plan to seek fuller understanding of these differences, some of which may be discipline-specific when we re-administer the survey this spring.

The response rate to the College Student Experiences Questionnaire was sufficient to allow a breakdown according to several of the largest majors, and these analyses were shared with several departments. COFHE is offering an alternative Enrolled Student Survey this spring, and Hopkins is planning to participate. The goal would be to have a response rate sufficient to allow us to provide additional feedback to departments. Because two thirds of the Hopkins undergraduate student body are either science majors or engineers, it is important to disaggregate the data about aspects of the academic experience.

As compelling as any quantitative data were the substantive comments written by many earnest students. This was such a rich qualitative source of students’ assessment of their Hopkins experience that copies of the several hundred comments were provided for review by appropriate administrators. Recognition of the value of this resource has prompted consideration of conducting in-person exit interviews of a sample of members of each graduating class to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Hopkins undergraduate
experience. We plan to develop a set of structured questions (different from the exit survey of students who withdraw) that could be addressed to seniors in 45-minute interviews by approximately 20 – 25 faculty and administrators, each interviewing about 10 students. Subsequently, each interviewer would summarize the main themes and issues, and all interviewers would then gather to discuss the findings and to identify issues that should be given priority attention. Over time, this process would not only yield valuable guidance, but it also would send a strong signal to our students about the extent to which we are interested in student assessment of the Hopkins experience.

In addition to the above sources, numerous special studies have been conducted during the past few semesters as part of our effort to be more analytical about academic programs and policies as well as student learning outcomes. In the fall semester 2002, the Office of Academic Advising completed a curriculum review of distribution requirements and requirements for each of the majors at Hopkins and comparable data on general education and major requirements for a select group of peer institutions. An underlying concern is whether some of the Hopkins programs have such extensive major and related requirements that students lack sufficient flexibility beyond the major.

A number of other specific issues also have been examined. For example, a study of the grades earned in various kinds of independent study and research courses has just been completed, and the general policies governing how credit for independent exercises should be determined are scheduled for review this spring. The Office of Academic Advising also has begun collecting course syllabi. We find significant variation in their organization and effectiveness. As a matter that has traditionally (and appropriately, we believe) been the prerogative of individual faculty members, we are considering approaching this issue through the departments and their Directors of Undergraduate Studies who may want to organize a discussion of best practices in this regard. This would include a discussion of the specification of learning goals and how these may differ among the disciplines. On a related note, a syllabus insert on academic integrity has been prepared, and we will urge that it, or an appropriate variation on it, be systematically incorporated. More broadly, we are now preparing to report to the faculty on the implementation of a set of recommendations that strengthen support for academic ethics. All of these data will be factored into the reviews of undergraduate majors when they are begun this spring.

A significant amount of comparative data also has been gathered from our peer institutions to provide a context in which to evaluate our programs and policies. By way of another example, our effort to attract more humanities majors involves reviewing the distribution of students among the disciplines at peer universities and also looking into College Board data to understand the level of humanities interest among high school students.

One of the overarching objectives for the coming spring is to formulate a serious research agenda that will include a plan for survey research and special studies with an indication of which of these will be done each semester, annually, or periodically. The plan also will address the expected follow-up to the more routine reports on teaching loads, grade distributions, and course enrollments. To support these efforts, administrators and faculty now have additional resources that were not previously available, at least not at a sufficient level of sophistication to allow full utilization of institutional research for decision-making. A University Office of Institutional Research has been established to provide leadership in data-reporting and analysis and in institutional assessment and student learning outcomes. A major focus of early efforts is to build the kinds of databases that will facilitate serious institutional analysis. Further, to support enrollment and academic services, a Coordinator of Enrollment Research has been appointed for the undergraduate program. We intend to work toward creating a culture of institutional research that will allow us to be systematic in our approach to ongoing assessment.
CHAPTER 2: THE WHITING SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING  
SELF-STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

This Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Accreditation site visit comes at a critical point for the Whiting School of Engineering (WSE). In spring 2003, Dr. Ilene Busch-Vishniac stepped down after a successful five years as Dean and was replaced on an interim basis by the former Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The University plans to appoint a new Dean for the WSE by July 2004. This review, therefore, serves as an opportunity for some of the School’s strengths and weaknesses to be identified for the incoming Dean. Used effectively, this self-study and accreditation process can reduce the learning period for the new Dean and offer him or her a sense of direction for the pedagogical mission of the school as reviewed by a team of highly-regarded professionals in the field of higher education. The WSE is anxious to engage in this process as it attempts to break into the next level of elite engineering schools.

Ranked as the thirteenth best undergraduate engineering school in the 2004 U.S. News & World Report survey, the Whiting School is proud of the reputation it has garnered, especially considering the School’s relatively small faculty and student body size. With 117 tenured and tenure-track faculty members serving approximately 1,370 full-time and part-time undergraduates, WSE professors face the challenge of providing a first-rate undergraduate experience while also maintaining some of the most productive research agendas in the country. It is this presumed struggle for faculty members’ time between research and undergraduate education that spurred the Boyer Commission report in 1995 and the Johns Hopkins President’s Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE) in 2002. With the second largest undergraduate body in the University, it is not surprising that the WSE was well-represented on the Commission - with several faculty members, students and administrators serving as members - and that the School has embraced CUE’s findings. The WSE has ensured its students and faculty members that it will not postpone the implementation of CUE’s recommendations until a new Dean is named. If a CUE-advocated change will improve learning or college life for WSE undergraduates, then it needs to be adopted as soon as it is feasible to do so.

Full-time undergraduate education in the Whiting School is conducted by our 117 tenured and tenure-track faculty members and by approximately 50 lecturers and adjunct faculty members affiliated with the following 13 majors (with ABET accreditation denoted by an asterisk): Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Biomedical Engineering*, Civil Engineering*, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering*, Computer Engineering*, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering*, Engineering Mechanics*, Environmental Engineering, General Engineering, Geography, Materials Science and Engineering*, and Mechanical Engineering*. The five largest majors, composing 77% of the student body, are as follows: (1) Biomedical Engineering, 505 students; (2) Computer Science, 163 students; (3) Mechanical Engineering, 119 students, (4) Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, 108 students; and (5) Electrical Engineering, 103 students. Our percentages of female (25%) and underrepresented ethnic minority (7%) students appear to be typical of a highly selective engineering school. The Whiting School also has a very small program in part-time undergraduate engineering education. Approximately 70 students are spread among three degree programs in Electrical Engineering, Engineering Science and Mechanical Engineering.
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STANDARD 1: MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Whiting School of Engineering has benefited greatly from its mission and vision statements as well as its overarching goal and objectives. These principles serve as the cornerstone of the WSE Strategic Plan (Phase II), which has guided the School since its introduction in 2001 by former Dean Ilene Busch-Vishniac.

DETAILS OF THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The mission, overarching goal and objectives were all ratified by the Whiting School Strategic Planning Committee and announced to the community formally through Phase II of the Strategic Plan. They address both full-time and part-time programs in the Whiting School. To ensure that these statements were publicized and widely known, Dean Busch-Vishniac presented the Strategic Plan to External Departmental Committees as well as the Whiting School’s National Advisory Council at the same time that she distributed hard copies to all faculty members, presented the plan at a WSE Faculty Retreat, and published the plan on the Internet. The mission explains whom the School serves and what it intends to accomplish by focusing on research and education—the two core functions of the Whiting School.

The overarching goal of placing each department’s graduate ranking among the top 15 in the country in its discipline with at least two departments ranked in the top five is the Whiting School’s clearest effort to position itself in an external context. While the School refuses to allow external rankings such as those by U.S. News & World Report to affect policy decisions greatly, we have become increasingly aware of the influence that these metrics have on our ability to recruit the top undergraduates, graduate students and faculty.

The Whiting School’s overarching goal and the thirteen objectives stated in Phase II of the Strategic Plan are unquestionably outcomes-based and capable of being evaluated. The Office of the Dean recently conducted a thorough “Assessment of Progress in the Strategic Plan” to measure the advancement already made toward its goal and objectives and how much farther the School must go to meet them. Upon completion of the review, we found the following:

The Whiting School has not yet met its overarching goal. In the 2004 U.S. News & World Report undergraduate rankings in engineering, the Whiting School placed one program in the top five in both (Biomedical Engineering, first) and another program is near that range (Environmental Engineering, eighth). But, while all eight eligible programs are ranked within the top 25 in their discipline, only the two mentioned above earned spots in the top 15.

The Whiting School has made significant progress in nearly all of the 13 objectives. Key findings are as follows: (1) The Whiting School has already met Objective 1 - adding 15-30 full-time faculty members within 10 years - by increasing the ranks by 19 since 1999-2000; (2) the Whiting School has acquired space in or made plans to build six buildings in a very short amount of time [Objective 2]; and (3) the Whiting School has greatly increased its services to undergraduate engineering students through an expanded Engineering Advising Office capable of providing not only advising, but also opportunities for international study [Objective 4].

The assessment was equally successful in identifying areas where the School has yet to make significant progress, most notably, our objective of reviewing the undergraduate engineering curricula to incorporate advances in pedagogy and course content [Objective 4]. Here, the influence and momentum of the Commission of Undergraduate Education (CUE) should be useful. By assigning responsibility for assuring the quality of undergraduate education to a senior-level administrator in the Whiting School and
appointing a Director of Undergraduate Studies in each department, the School now has formal channels through which to conduct reviews of departmental curricula. To learn of pedagogical advances, the Whiting School will increase its support for faculty and graduate teaching assistants by making the services provided by the Center for Education Resources (CER) available upon request to all Whiting School instructors.

While our continuous self-assessment is extremely valuable, outside assessment can more readily place a school into the external landscape. At the request of President Brody, the WSE underwent a formal external review in spring 2003 shortly before Dean Busch-Vishniac stepped down from office in order to assist the incoming Dean in surveying the School’s strengths and weaknesses and in setting strategic directions for the School. The review also serves as a guide for the Whiting School in its attempt to reach the next level of status as dictated by our peers. To achieve the next level, the external review suggests that the WSE embark on a strategy of focused selective excellence. The Interim Dean is currently working with the WSE leadership, under the guidance of the Provost, to determine what preliminary steps can be taken during his interim tenure to prepare for possible changes to be implemented by a new Dean.

**DEPARTMENTAL MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

The Strategic Planning Committee decided that the School mission, goal and objectives could be broad functional statements applied to all disciplines within the School (e.g., increasing focus on undergraduate admissions and advising) because the individual Whiting School undergraduate programs are expected to provide focused student learning outcome statements for the engineering accreditation process. In 1999, the Whiting School’s eight undergraduate engineering programs underwent a review by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), using the new ABET criteria (EC 2000). These criteria revolutionized the way engineering schools viewed their offerings by requiring that all programs develop student learning-focused “program educational objectives” and “outcomes” very similar to the goals and objectives requirements for MSCHE accreditation. Six of our nine departments offer ABET-accredited programs, and therefore maintain active statements that are equivalent to the MSCHÉ’S departmental mission, goals, and objectives. Of the remaining three departments, one–Applied Mathematics and Statistics - has now developed focused student-oriented goals and objectives. The other two departments - Computer Science and Geography and Environmental Engineering–will seek accreditation during the next school-wide review (in fall 2005) and will develop goals and objectives during the 2003-04 academic year.

The Part-Time Programs in Engineering and Applied Science (PTE) include three undergraduate majors (in Electrical Engineering, Engineering Science and Mechanical Engineering) with a total enrollment of approximately 70 students. This is a two part undergraduate degree, with students first completing a 70-credit engineering foundation program comprised of core mathematics, science, liberal arts and engineering science at any accredited educational institution. In the second part of the program, students take a minimum of 60 credit hours in courses that lead to mastery in the area of the major.

Goals are set for the PTE undergraduate program as a whole. The two year program has experienced diminishing enrollments and is currently under scrutiny. We seek tighter integration between the part-time and full-time undergraduate programs in order for all WSE offerings to be of similar quality. In the field of engineering, the hallmark of a high-quality program is ABET accreditation. None of the part-time majors currently hold this distinction. Two issues which may preclude this from occurring are: (1) the fact that the majority of PTE instructors are adjunct faculty members, and (2) insufficient lab requirements vis-à-vis ABET standards.
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MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES ASSESSMENT

Most of the Whiting School’s undergraduate education programs are reviewed by three different boards at different intervals. At each of these steps, the programmatic or departmental mission, goals and objectives are assessed. These three boards and their cycle lengths are: (a) the Homewood Academic Council, every four years; (b) ABET, every six years; and (c) MSCHE, every ten years. A brief description of each process follows.

The Homewood Academic Council reviews provide an opportunity for each department to assess its mission, goals and objectives for both undergraduate and graduate programs. The Academic Council examines both education and research. ABET requires each program to have assessed its mission, goals and objectives with input from a range of stakeholders. In addition, ABET reviews require departments to place their mission, goals and objectives in alignment with those of the Whiting School. As recommended by CUE, we will now require all undergraduate programs not accredited by ABET to undergo a self-study every six years on the WSE/ABET timetable. These reviews will include departmental mission, goals and objectives. Lastly, the MSCHE accreditation cycle provides the opportunity for us to re-examine the mission, goals and objectives for the School in the context of a broader University review.

A NEW MISSION AND VISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT JOHNS HOPKINS

The Whiting School welcomes the new mission and vision statement for undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins which resulted from the CUE process. It is very much in alignment with our existing approach to educational programs. Critical thinking skills and creativity are at the heart of engineering design. In addition, we take great pride in our preparation of WSE graduates to pursue either advanced degrees or employment as practicing engineers. With regard to the eight specific dimensions, the Whiting School already strives to meet five of them through our ABET accreditation efforts.

The three dimensions that we do not pursue directly are addressed in other ways. For example, the mission statement suggests that our students be familiar with the subject content and approaches to understanding the world carried out by humanists, natural scientists and engineers, and social scientists (dimension 2). Naturally, we require our students to be well-versed in engineering and the natural sciences subject matter, but we also require that they undergo a brief but coherent review of one or more areas in the humanities or the social sciences. Whether they should pursue studies in both of these fields can be considered in future curriculum reviews. While the Whiting School does not specifically require familiarity with the origins and diversity of U.S. and foreign cultures to foster civility and an appreciation for diversity (dimension 3), our students do enroll in humanities and social sciences courses, as mentioned above, and we are making significant progress in expanding our study abroad program for engineers. Lastly, even though the Whiting School does not expressly provide opportunities for all students to develop the habits of community service and civic engagement (dimension 8), two of our programs select senior design projects to serve the needs of the local community and/or the disabled community, and many of our students tutor middle school and high school students through programs sponsored by Homewood Student Affairs and the Hopkins Organization for Minorities in Engineering and Science. Overall, adopting the new mission and vision of undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins will have a strong, positive effect on the Whiting School; it will reinforce our pre-existing emphases and encourage us to consider increasing our curricular and intellectual diversity.
STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS

The Whiting School has experienced vigorous growth and improvement in undergraduate admissions. Since fall 1998, the Whiting School freshman class has increased in size by 14% (F’98–326; F’03–372), without compromising quality, as the mean SAT score for the WSE incoming freshmen has improved from 1368 to 1410 over the same period. The Whiting School recognizes, though, that size and mean SAT score are not the only measures of an incoming class. We are dedicated to increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of our student body, as well as its intellectual diversity as measured by the number of students who show interest in each major. In recent years, for example, nearly half of the incoming class has been composed of Biomedical Engineering majors, risking the health of all programs in the School. Through increased communication and collaboration with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, we are making significant progress towards our goals.

WSE INVOLVEMENT IN ADMISSIONS

The Homewood Office of Undergraduate Admissions manages the Whiting School’s admissions efforts, and the Homewood Office of Student Financial Services administers our undergraduate financial aid. To avoid any potential disconnect between the Whiting School and the process of admissions, Phase II of Strategic Plan called for the WSE’s increased involvement in undergraduate admissions. The Whiting School now participates in the newly formed Faculty Committee on Admissions and in the Enrollment Management Team. The former seeks to solicit faculty and School input to guide admissions decisions on topics ranging from marketing ventures to lists of desired admitted student characteristics, while the latter both sets admissions policy and provides the schools with frequent updates on admissions throughout the recruitment and enrollment seasons.

One of the Whiting School’s most critical admissions initiatives was implemented with the assistance of these two committees. As the CUE Final Report proposes, the Whiting School seeks to match student enrollments more closely with academic resources. As mentioned above, faculty members in the Biomedical Engineering program had been teaching and advising nearly half of the undergraduate students in the Whiting School of Engineering. While the School strongly supports its flagship program, its success was jeopardizing the intellectual diversity of the engineering community. Two measures were taken. First, the School sought to place a limit on the number of students accepted to the Biomedical Engineering program by requiring prospective students to apply specifically to BME, rather than generally to the Homewood campus. Second, after noticing that students were taking advantage of the no-obstacle-to-transfer policy at Hopkins, we sought to crack down on the practice of students applying with a stated major other than BME, and then transferring into the BME program. Starting with the fall 2003 incoming class, only students admitted to BME may enroll in that major. This is the first time in Hopkins history that a restriction was placed on transfer into a Homewood program. The new policy was successful in dropping the incoming BME class from 160 (fall 2002) to 136 (fall 2003), reversing a very strong upward trend in freshman enrollees.

What softened the effect of the change in admission to the BME program was the introduction of three “bioengineering” options in the Whiting School. The Departments of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering (the biomolecular option), Materials Science and Engineering (the biomaterials option), and Mechanical Engineering (the biomechanics option) all enrolled students who may have otherwise selected BME as their major. The presence of these programs has helped to spread enrollments more evenly. We now turn our attention to declining enrollments in Computer Science (69 freshmen in fall 2000, 24 in fall 2003) and Civil Engineering (16 in fall 2000, 4 in fall 2003). Preliminary analysis suggests that the former is part of a nationwide response to current economic conditions. The latter might be a part of a
trend shared by other similar COFHE\textsuperscript{2} engineering schools (e.g., Duke, Columbia, Rice, Penn), but more information needs to be gathered before this can be verified.

\textbf{POLICY INFORMATION}

The Whiting School relies upon the Office of Undergraduate Admissions to make admissions policies and criteria available to prospective students. Admissions also distributes a two page sheet with expected learning outcomes for students in every WSE major. In addition, every major has a specific advising manual that outlines all major requirements. These manuals are published on the Internet for use by current as well as prospective students. Information regarding placement and diagnostic testing is available in the Arts and Sciences and Engineering catalog as well as on the WSE Academic Affairs website. The Office of Student Financial Services provides scholarship and loan information. The Undergraduate Academic Manual (both in-print and online) contains policies regarding transfer credit. In the Whiting School, the Office of Academic Affairs determines whether a transfer course will be accepted for Hopkins credit, while the student’s department decides whether a transfer course meets a specific program requirement.

\textbf{ADMISSIONS PLANNING EFFORTS}

The Whiting School is interested in whether there are any admissions variables that may be particularly strong predictors of the academic success of its engineering students (e.g., SAT, HS GPA, etc.). When most analyses of this sort are conducted at Johns Hopkins, data for engineering students are not disaggregated from those for arts and sciences students. In the past, the Whiting School has attempted to conduct its own analyses. Some of these attempts are statistics-based and others are more anecdotal - performed by professional academic advisors who have extensive contact with engineering students. While the statistical analyses seem to indicate that performance on math standardized tests (i.e., SAT Math, SAT II Math) are highly correlated with success in the Whiting School, these studies are crude and do not include all potential variables, making the data unreliable and inconclusive. The anecdotal data can be very helpful, but our professional advisors spend a majority of their time with students in academic difficulty, rather than those who have excelled in the classroom and laboratory. With the assistance of the Johns Hopkins Office of Institutional Research, the Whiting School expects to conduct a more formal analysis on all possible variables predictive of success during the 2003-04 academic year.

\textbf{DIVERSITY ADMISSIONS EFFORTS}

Engineering has traditionally been a white (and more recently, Asian) male endeavor. Racial and gender diversity have been difficult to establish. In recent years, the Whiting School entering undergraduate class has been approximately 25% female, slightly higher than the national norm, and 7% minority, which is lower than the national norm\textsuperscript{3}. At the graduate level, the WSE is among the highest in percentage of women in our programs, but the percentage of underrepresented ethnic minorities is below the national norm.

The norms, however, are still unacceptable to us. To make engineering a more diverse field, at Johns Hopkins we are taking and will take several measures. We will continue to support two nascent diversity-focused initiatives. First, the Baltimore Scholars Program encourages talented city high school students to apply to JHU by waiving tuition. Second, The Whiting School has created a policy of reserving a percentage of overall funding for financial aid and scholarships for transfer students. The School has found that recruiting applicants from community colleges and other postsecondary institutions can be an

\textsuperscript{2} COFHE is the Council on Financing Higher Education, a consortium of highly selective American colleges and universities.

\textsuperscript{3} Engineering Workforce Commission, \textit{Engineering and Technology Enrollments}, 2002.
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effective tool for attracting minority students as well as students from economically and socially disadvantaged backgrounds. The most critical step, however, will be in line with CUE Recommendation 21. We will work with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions to prepare a detailed plan for enrolling ethnic minority and female students. This shall include action steps, funding requirements, and an aggressive timetable.

PART-TIME ENGINEERING ADMISSIONS

PTE conducts its own recruiting at both the undergraduate and graduate level, and both student bodies are local. With decreasing enrollments in the PTE undergraduate program, admissions has become a focal point of the program planning efforts. PTE has increased its efforts to widen the pipeline from local community colleges to the part-time undergraduate program. Descriptions of all undergraduate courses (with outcomes) are available to prospective students in the PTE catalog. Admissions requirements and transfer credit policies also are published in the PTE catalog.

STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

Many of the student support services provided to engineering students are shared with arts and sciences students and formally administered through Homewood Student Affairs and Homewood Enrollment and Academic Services. Because these units organizationally are responsibilities of the Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education, they are addressed in the Krieger School’s Self-Study Report.

The Whiting School offers critical student support services to its undergraduates in the form of academic and career advising. Both faculty members and professional advisors serve these functions. WSE faculty advisors are, first and foremost, expected to provide degree requirement information and assistance in course selection. There are other academic advising tasks associated with being a faculty advisor, but these two constitute the primary expectations. If a student intends to pursue either employment or a graduate degree within his or her major field, the faculty advisor is then expected to provide guidance or referral to colleagues in these areas as well, upon request.

The Engineering Advising Office handles tasks that can be applied to all undergraduate students within the Whiting School, such as: (a) summer registration for freshmen, (b) orientation for incoming freshmen, (c) semi-annual review of academic progress (i.e., Dean’s List and academic probation), (d) graduation clearance for bachelor’s candidates, (e) guidance on major selection, and (f) evaluation of requests for exceptions to academic policies outside of the major. Though faculty and professional advisors often work very closely together on individual student cases, one of our objectives is to make the general division of responsibility clear to students. We stress the different roles of the advisors during freshmen orientation and on the Academic Affairs website. In our spring 2003 Advising Survey, we asked students whether they expected a faculty advisor or the Engineering Advising Office to perform some of the tasks listed above, and an overwhelming majority of respondents answered in a way that would indicate that we have successfully conveyed the functional differences of the two types of advisors. For example, 90% of all students expected their faculty advisor to provide degree requirement information, and 93% expected him or her to provide course selection assistance. This is consistent with our system’s intent.

ADVISING POLICIES

The Engineering Advising Office serves as the repository for WSE undergraduate academic records, and it has strict regulations regarding the maintenance and security of these documents. All records for active undergraduates, including complaint and grievance files, are stored in the WSE Office of Academic
The Whiting School of Engineering Affairs. No students are permitted to enter these files. Records of alumni and un-enrolled undergraduates are stored for two years in a locked room near the Office of Academic Affairs. In the third year, these records are shipped to the archives of the Sheridan Libraries. All documents that identify students in any way are shredded prior to discarding. The Office of Academic Affairs posts all of its academic policies on its website, and all WSE undergraduate programs have published advising manuals which lead a student from point-of-entry to graduation - all but one of these are on the Internet. Policies regarding complaints and grievances can be found in the Homewood Undergraduate Academic Manual, and information regarding the release of student information is available in the Arts and Sciences and Engineering catalog.

ADVISING ASSESSMENT

The Whiting School surveys all of its undergraduate students and alumni regarding advising through WSE Exit Surveys and Alumni Surveys. WSE departments conduct the Exit Surveys which address advising provided by the department-assigned faculty advisor. Departments are expected to analyze the data and employ the findings in a process of continuous improvement required by ABET and MSCHE. The Dean’s Office, therefore, does not receive a regular report of these results.

The Alumni Survey is distributed by the WSE Office of Academic Affairs. It addresses both faculty and professional advising and is mailed to graduates two and five years post-graduation. These data show that students are generally satisfied with both faculty advising and professional advising, though, consistent with the findings at peer institutions, the reviews are not overwhelmingly positive. In addition, satisfaction with these services appears to have increased over time. The results of the 2002-03 Alumni Survey tells us that for the Class of 1997, 62% of all respondents were either neutral or satisfied with faculty advising, leaving 38% dissatisfied. For the Class of 2000, the level of dissatisfaction dropped to 25%. Dissatisfaction ratings for the Engineering Advising Office also dropped from 32% for the Class of 1997 to 19% for the Class of 2000. Despite the methodological problems of trying to compare data for alumni who graduated two years ago with those of alumni who graduated five years ago, this is our only opportunity to examine changes over time.

Ultimately, however, these two instruments attempt to address a broad range of topics and cannot cover advising in depth. To gain a richer picture of student satisfaction with advising, and in order for effective service as a faculty advisor to be considered in salary and promotion decisions, an instrument dedicated to advising is necessary. In addition, there must be a way for individual faculty member advising performance to be evaluated. We have addressed the first issue with an Advising Survey distributed for the first time in spring 2003. As stated above, this survey solidified some assumptions about student expectations of faculty advising, but it also opened our eyes to some possible shortcomings. For example, while 70% of all students stated that they either “strongly agree” or “agree” that their advisor did “a good job of advising, overall,” the percentage of those who strongly agreed was only 26%. In other words, there is satisfaction with faculty advising among most students, but not at the level of strength that we hope to elicit. In addition, only 59% either agreed or strongly agreed with the following statement: “There is someone at Hopkins (faculty or staff) who is concerned about my progress.” This serves to confirm the need for more of a “sense of community” at Johns Hopkins, as CUE seeks to produce for undergraduates.

We are unsure as to how we can effectively include advising assessment results in salary review decisions as proposed by CUE. Our current advising survey does not ask respondents to identify faculty advisors by name. Even if it were to do so, many advisors would go unevaluated (thoroughly or entirely) unless our response rate improves dramatically from the 25% that we saw on the first distribution. This sample size may be sufficient to provide us with a sense of student satisfaction with WSE advising, but it does
not permit us to use these survey results as part of the reward system - we need robust data for all faculty members for this to occur.

One weakness we have found in the advising assessment system is our tendency to forget to “close the loop.” The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs has access to the Alumni Survey and Advising Survey results, but does not receive the Exit Survey data from the departments. In all cases, consistent with the practices at a highly decentralized university, the Associate Dean trusts that the departments are using these data to improve academic programs. A discussion, however, of these data and changes departments have made in response to findings could benefit the Engineering Advising Office as well as the other departments. We will attempt to elicit this discussion by both adding these results to the annual departmental report submitted to the Dean and by opening the lines of communication between the newly appointed senior-level administrator responsible for undergraduate education with the new Directors of Undergraduate Studies, consistent with CUE Recommendations 1, 2, and 3.

**CAREER ADVISING**

When WSE students seek jobs upon graduation, they are encouraged to request assistance from the Homewood Career Center. If they intend to pursue a position within their major field, they can additionally solicit advice from the faculty advisor. In the 2003 Advising Survey, only 62% of respondents who claimed to have requested advice from their faculty advisor reported receiving “good career advice.” In the 2002-03 Alumni Survey, 35% of those who used the Career Center claimed that the office was “not helpful,” and 36% claimed that it was only “somewhat helpful.” These results are problematic to us. We believe there is confusion among students as to whom they should ask for career advice. Students may be expecting in-depth knowledge of engineering professions from Career Services and seeking assistance in acquiring non-major related positions from the faculty advisor. If this is the case, we must better explain from whom students should seek advice, and we shall increase communication between faculty advisors and the Career Center. Faculty advisors must know the sort of assistance provided by the Career Center, and Career Center’s staff must be better informed about engineering careers. We will accomplish this by having Career Center staff meet with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies.

The Whiting School believes that internship opportunities serve a critical function in career services for its students. The WSE Office of Industrial Initiatives has a new website dedicated to internships with approximately 300 vetted offerings specifically for engineering students. Awareness of the site is increasing, but it is not yet pervasive in the School - the spring 2003 Advising Survey indicated that only half of our students “know where to go for help in finding an internship.” We will continue to increase awareness of this site through promotional publications, workshops and direct communication with students. We also suspect that our students are unsure as to whether they should seek internship assistance from the Homewood Office of Academic Advising (which serves both engineering and arts and sciences students) or from the Whiting School. As a result, the two parties will meet to discuss possible centralization of services and ways to publicize the type of assistance available.

**ADVISING TRAINING**

As CUE Recommendation 13 implies, we cannot expect faculty members to advise our students effectively without any training. In the Whiting School, each program’s advising manual provides program-specific requirements. We expect individual departments to train faculty members on University-wide requirements and policies. We cannot be certain, however, that new faculty members in all departments are receiving the same information. As a central location for engineering advising, the Engineering Advising Office will create an Advising Handbook for WSE Faculty Members. This publication will address topics such as the function of a faculty member’s signature, the implications of
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assigning an “incomplete” grade, and other policies that should be normalized across all WSE departments.

PART-TIME ENGINEERING STUDENT SERVICES

Whenever possible, we attempt to provide student services to PTE undergraduates in a convenient location. The Dorsey Center site now houses PTE undergraduate enrollment and registration services and computer laboratories. In some cases, it is neither more efficient nor more effective for PTE to offer its own services, and students are directed to use Homewood campus facilities such as the Career Center, the Sheridan Libraries, and the Office of Student Financial Services. Academic advising for PTE undergraduates is primarily the function of the program chair and the vice chair. Students are encouraged to discuss their academic programs with these faculty members.

All PTE services are evaluated in an annual fall survey to graduate and undergraduate students. While there appears to be general satisfaction with student services in PTE, the administration has not distinguished between graduate and undergraduate students in the past, and thus has not been able to directly identify areas of success or improvement for undergraduates. In the future, PTE plans to make this distinction.

STANDARD 10: FACULTY

The faculty of the Whiting School consists of tenured and tenure-track faculty members, part-time and full-time lecturers, and graduate teaching assistants. The WSE employs 117 tenured and tenure-track faculty members (all holding doctorate degrees) who teach approximately 70% of the courses in the WSE. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Whiting School have three main functions pertaining to undergraduate education: (1) advising undergraduates, (2) teaching undergraduates, and (3) overseeing undergraduate research. Faculty advising performance is assessed in the section addressing Standard 9 (Student Support Services). This section, therefore, will only address the last two functions listed - teaching undergraduates and overseeing undergraduate research - for the tenured and tenure-track faculty. Approximately 50 lecturers teach the remaining 30% of Whiting School courses. The WSE also employs roughly 110 graduate teaching assistants, who support the professors rather than lead classes. With very few exceptions, lecturers and TAs have no other responsibilities to undergraduates other than those related to instruction. In the text below, the term “instructor” is usually employed when referring to professors, lecturers and graduate teaching assistants en masse, with exceptions noted.

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING

The Whiting School uses one primary tool to assess student satisfaction with teaching by faculty members, lecturers and graduate teaching assistants - the end-of-semester student evaluation system dubbed “MERLIN.” Whiting School undergraduates are also questioned regarding satisfaction with instruction on two of the Homewood-wide surveys - the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) and the COFHE Senior Survey - and departmental Exit Surveys. Whiting School alumni are polled on instruction in the annual Alumni Survey. Combining all of the assessments, it becomes clear that students are generally satisfied with teaching in the Whiting School. We have no deep concerns regarding current WSE instruction as a whole, and all individual departments receive satisfactory ratings. Student opinion of specific instructors varies, of course. Where we can perhaps improve undergraduate education, however, is by strengthening student-faculty relations - what we view as the cornerstone of the “sense of community” that CUE seeks to elicit. Lastly, an important question is how the Whiting School can improve its assessment of student satisfaction with instruction.
In the MERLIN questionnaire, students are asked three questions regarding an instructor’s behavior in class. In all, they are asked to determine the extent to which they agree with the following statements: (1) “the professor gave clear, well-structured presentations”; (2) “the professor seemed interested that the students learn the material”; and (3) “the professor used class time effectively.” For all MERLIN questions, a scale of 1-5 is used, with the following sentiments representing each number: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. In the spring 2003 survey, no department’s average rating on any of these three questions was below 3.7, and 73% of all department mean ratings were above 4.0. This leads us to believe that, on average, students are satisfied with these critical behavioral traits for instructors.

On the WSE Alumni Survey, we inquire about student preparation in certain engineering-oriented subject areas such as “engineering design,” “laboratory/instrumentation” and “modeling,” but we ask only one direct question regarding instruction on the Alumni Survey. For that question, instruction is rated very highly. In the 2002-03 distribution, 77% of the Class of 1997 and 77% of the Class of 2000 either agreed or strongly agreed that they “received excellent instruction at JHU.” The majority of those who did not agree, in both cases, responded that they were “neutral” and thus did not disagree. While this statement includes instructors from other schools at JHU (primarily the Schools of Arts and Sciences and Medicine), our students take an overwhelming majority of their classes within the School of Engineering and are presumed to have been rating WSE instruction.

As CUE helped us to realize, the sense of community at Hopkins is greatly dependent upon strong student-faculty relations. There is more to this relationship than simply the instruction provided. On the spring 2002 CSEQ survey, WSE undergraduates were asked several questions regarding student-faculty relations. Specifically, students were asked to offer their level of agreement to the following statements: “Faculty members at Johns Hopkins are concerned about undergraduates’ academic progress,” and “Faculty members have been responsive to my needs.” Only 11% of respondents strongly agreed with the former statement, and 16% strongly agreed with the latter. It did not surprise us, therefore, that only 9% strongly agreed that that they “felt a sense of community at Hopkins.” This only reinforces the need for the JHU schools, including the WSE, to implement CUE to the fullest extent possible.

Although overall satisfaction with instruction from professors and adjunct lecturers appears to be high (as demonstrated by the MERLIN results), we suspect that satisfaction with Teaching Assistant performance is another area where we can improve. On the MERLIN questionnaire, the departmental range of scores on questions regarding Teaching Assistants was much wider. For example, when asked whether the TA was “deserving of a teaching award,” approximately half of the departmental means were in the 3.0-3.9 range, and the remaining means were split between under 3.0 and over 3.9. On the spring 2002 CSEQ distribution, 34% of respondents expressed dissatisfaction with graduate teaching assistants. This may not be a grave concern, but certainly one that we intend to address in the near future. We suspect that our reliance on foreign graduate students who may have some language deficiencies is a contributing factor.

**ASSESSING THE EVALUATION TOOL**

As the primary evaluation tool for instruction on the Homewood campus, the MERLIN system plays a critical role in undergraduate education. In fall 2002, the Dean for Enrollment and Academic Services convened a committee to examine the effectiveness of the MERLIN system. The WSE is represented on this committee by its Assistant Dean for Academic Programs. With feedback from students and faculty members, the committee quickly determined that the evaluation system, including the instrument, is likely to be flawed. Low response rates, poorly-worded questions, and an absence of belief among students that the results are used to improve courses all have very strong interaction effects with one another. In spring 2003, the committee hired a course evaluation consultant to assess every aspect of our process: our current instrument, analysis system, survey distribution process (to students), and results distribution
process (to faculty members). The consultant met with students, faculty members, Department Chairs, high-ranking administrators, and the Homewood Academic Council. The final review confirmed what the committee had suspected; the system and instrument are both flawed. The data are not collected in a uniform manner, as the online distribution process occurs after the paper survey distribution process, possibly skewing the results. The instrument has a number of survey design errors, and the results are not subjected to any systematic analysis. Results are simply posted online, and faculty members and Department Chairs have no context within which to place these numbers. Courses need to be compared with like courses based on size, level and other variables.

The consultant provided recommendations regarding all aspects of the system. The Whiting School has already begun implementing recommendations on the distribution process, but perhaps the two most important aspects of the system - the instrument itself and the way results are reported to faculty members - are currently under review. The committee has requested additional assistance from the consultant in creating a new survey and hopes to present a revised instrument to the Academic Council in spring 2004. A draft is now under review. To this point, the committee has focused mainly on the instrument and has not yet addressed the reporting mechanism. We expect this to be discussed in early spring 2004.

**UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AND FACULTY**

At Johns Hopkins, the first American research university, we expect our faculty to expand the frontiers of knowledge through both basic and applied research. Consistent with the mission of the University, the Whiting School also expects its faculty to perform ground-breaking research. This does not mean, however, that our undergraduate students suffer when faculty members are in the laboratory. At the Whiting School, we do not view research and undergraduate education as a zero sum equation; to the contrary, we contend that a symbiotic relationship exists between the two. While it is certainly true that our research informs our teaching, and vice versa, undergraduate research represents the strongest and clearest link between research and undergraduate education.

Few other engineering schools offer an equivalent level of breadth and volume (per student) of research opportunities for its undergraduates. In the spring 2003 Alumni Survey, 80% of the Class of 1997 respondents and 74% of the Class of 2000 respondents claimed to have conducted undergraduate research while at Johns Hopkins. Nearly half of both classes reported three or more semesters of undergraduate research. In the spring 2002 CSEQ survey, 88% of all students who reported having conducted undergraduate research were either “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the experience.

**FACULTY REWARD FOR TEACHING**

At the conclusion of every academic year, the Whiting School recognizes ten instructors who have demonstrated teaching excellence during the two previous semesters. Five of these awards are dedicated to graduate teaching assistants, while the other five are reserved for faculty members and lecturers. In addition, half of these come with a $1,000 gift. In most cases, it is undergraduate students who select the recipients. While we believe that teaching awards are an appropriate way to recognize outstanding achievement in the classroom and we are proud to name ten recipients each year, we also understand that: (1) there are more than ten outstanding instructors in the Whiting School; and (2) high-achieving faculty members deserve more than one time recognition - they deserve regular compensation for superior classroom performance. Spurred by CUE, which encourages the JHU schools to recognize excellence in teaching “through rewards as well as awards,” the Whiting School is seeking to make teaching a more critical part of its compensation model.

The granting of tenure represents perhaps the greatest incentive for any faculty member. As the CUE Final Report states, the Homewood Academic Council (which serves the Schools of Arts and Sciences
and Engineering) bears responsibility for determining the proper emphasis on teaching within tenure decisions. At research-based universities, teaching is usually outweighed by research in these types of decisions, and as the first American research institution, Johns Hopkins is no exception to this rule. Nevertheless, the Whiting School willingly assists the Council by providing information on individual faculty member teaching, mentoring, advising and undergraduate research that is used to evaluate candidates for promotion and by acting as advocates for faculty members who teach well and engage with undergraduates constructively. Unlike tenure and promotion decisions, salary decisions are made annually and throughout an instructor’s entire career at JHU, and thus may be more effective in rewarding/ensuring consistent classroom performance. Currently, teaching is factored into merit raise decisions in a number of different ways. First, faculty members are expected to provide information on the courses they taught during the previous calendar year. Second, WSE Department Chairs provide input to the Dean on each of their faculty members’ teaching performance. This is likely composed of student feedback via exit surveys, MERLIN system results, and other sources. Lastly, the Dean is given a summary of MERLIN results for all faculty members before the merit raises are instituted. Although this appears to be an ample amount of information for teaching to be a strong input factor, we know that the MERLIN system data, as discussed above, are not robust. It is thus with extreme caution that much of this input is used to help determine faculty raises. The Whiting School hopes to make teaching performance a standardized input on every instructor’s merit raise decision, but it cannot do so until the evaluation instrument is known to produce reliable and valid data.

INSTRUCTOR TRAINING

Incoming tenured and tenure-track faculty members are required to attend WSE New Faculty Orientation. These early fall sessions address a faculty member’s three primary responsibilities in the School of Engineering: research, teaching and advising. At these events, faculty members are engaged in a broad discussion of research policies and a more focused discussion of grants and contracts. In terms of teaching, the orientation does not explicitly dictate to faculty members how they are expected to instruct a class. Rather, they are provided with a list of resources to contact for assistance with teaching. Faculty members are encouraged to first seek guidance from members of their department.

While the Office of the Dean is confident that faculty members receive adequate assistance from colleagues familiar with deep disciplinary issues, it also wishes to increase the opportunities for WSE faculty to receive assistance in teaching from pedagogy experts. The WSE will contract with the Center for Educational Resources (CER), a technology-oriented teaching center whose mission is being enhanced to support pedagogy, to provide assistance for WSE faculty members who request such help.

WSE graduate students slated to teach undergraduates receive training in a mandatory session for incoming Engineering and Arts and Sciences TAs. This is a three hour session run by the WSE Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the KSAS Vice Dean for Faculty. Participants are provided with a teaching manual upon completion of the training session. The Graduate Representative Organization (GRO) produces the manual, thus it is a guide written by TAs for TAs. In spring 2004, the WSE and KSAS Dean’s Offices will survey attendees in the previous fall TA Training Session regarding how it, as well as the teaching manual, can be improved.

PART-TIME ENGINEERING FACULTY

Instructors for the PTE undergraduate programs consist of WSE full-time faculty, professional staff from the Applied Physics Laboratory (a division of the Johns Hopkins University) and engineers from area businesses and government organizations (such as the National Institute for Standards and Technology). Credentials of adjunct faculty members are carefully reviewed by the program chairs, the program
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committees, and by the PTE Associate Dean. Criteria for selection include education as well as professional achievement.

All PTE undergraduate courses are reviewed through an evaluation system similar to the one used by the full-time programs. Students are asked to rate the instructor on issues such as his or her “knowledge of the subject matter,” “preparation for class,” “responsiveness to student questions and concerns,” and “quality of feedback to students.” Evaluation results are reviewed by the program chairs and PTE administration. Faculty members who receive outstanding evaluations are awarded teaching distinctions at the end of the year. Very low evaluation scores are brought to the attention of the PTE Associate Dean. Lack of redress of poor teaching performance does result in termination.

STANDARDS 11: EDUCATION OFFERINGS

The focus of the undergraduate offerings in the Whiting School are the ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) accredited engineering programs and the applied science programs. In general, the Whiting School seeks to focus on the fundamental engineering science basis to modern technology without ignoring the very real need for engineers to be able to design systems subject to realistic (economic, environmental, social, legal, etc.) constraints. Mindful of the pace of technological change and the permanence of fundamental scientific and engineering principles, we seek to provide the rigorous foundation on which our graduates can build meaningful and successful careers.

CONTENT

Content for each of the WSE programs is dictated by what subject matter knowledge and skills are appropriate for graduates of these departments. With the exception of the Department of Computer Science, all of our programs have published explicit goals and objectives for their program.

Not all students enter the field in which they major. In fact, according to our Alumni Surveys, only about half of our students report entering career paths that are closely related to the major. So we at the WSE attempt to determine whether our programs and courses provide adequate time on task and information to learn and practice the knowledge, skills, and abilities relative to their experiences after leaving JHU. In the Alumni Survey we ask graduates to rank their preparation in critical subject matter areas and skills and then the importance of these areas and skills to them in their current career path (Appendix 2-A). Relative to the importance of these items, our students appear to be well-prepared in content areas and less prepared in skills. For example, students claim that their preparation level in physics, chemistry, biology, the humanities, the social sciences and core mathematics outweighs their importance in those areas. On the other hand, oral presentation, leadership/management, time management, teamwork, and technical writing are all skills rated very high on the importance scale, but lower in preparation offered by JHU.

COHERENCE

Our B.S. programs (11 of 16 total) are offered in a lock-step sequence, as engineering undergraduate programs must be because upper-level courses rely so heavily on the mathematics, physical sciences and engineering sciences. WSE undergraduates frequently build upon knowledge acquired in the previous semesters or even courses taken together in the same semester, such as thermodynamics and multivariable calculus (Calculus III) in mechanical engineering. Each program is carefully designed to be completed in four years, and the vast majority of our students complete their degrees within four years. However, this careful coordination militates against study abroad, and leaves little room for intellectual experimentation.
RIGOR

WSE undergraduate programs are considered extremely rigorous. There are at least two issues embedded in the notion of rigor: one is how hard students must work in order to receive good grades, and another is whether our grade distribution is necessarily lower than distributions at peer schools. Although anecdotal feedback always indicates that students perceive themselves to be overworked in the WSE, the number of hours spent on out-of-class academic work was lower in the WSE than for students at our peer institutions in the 2002 CSEQ, but the sample of WSE students who responded to the CSEQ also enrolled in more credits than their counterparts at peer schools (Appendix 2-C). It may be that the heavy course load leads to the perception of academic burden since so many hours are spent in class, but we are not sure how to interpret this discrepancy between what students report anecdotally and the number of hours they report studying. The spring 2002 CSEQ survey offered a comparison of the average self-reported grades in the WSE to those for engineering students at a few of our peer schools. We found that the “majority of grades” earned by WSE students was remarkably similar to that of our peers. For example, the percentage of “A” averages earned was 19% for the WSE, versus 18% for our peers. The percentage of “A- or B+” averages earned was 39% for the WSE and 38% for our peers. This does not prove that our students are not overworked, but it may put to rest the notion that we injure our students’ chances at grad school acceptance due to what has been dubbed “grade deflation” in the Whiting School.

ACTIVE LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES

The WSE offers at least two ways in which students engage in active learning and practice and improve upon skills associated with the field or area of study, as the standard requires. The first is the “capstone” design experience. All ABET-accredited programs require a capstone design experience. In the Class of 2000 Alumni Survey, only 16% of respondents from engineering majors reported feeling either “somewhat unprepared” or “unprepared” in “engineering design” upon graduation (Appendix 2-B). This is clearly one of our strengths. What we do not ensure, however, is that students from non-ABET accredited programs have similar required capstone experiences. As CUE suggests, we will now investigate how all undergraduate programs can institute a similar requirement so that all WSE undergraduates have such a fulfilling experience critical to job acquisition or graduate school.

The second active learning opportunity for WSE students is through undergraduate research. What perhaps sets the WSE apart from other engineering schools is the opportunity for undergraduates to engage in research other than the senior design project. As mentioned under Standard 10, approximately 75% of respondents to the 2002-03 Alumni Survey noted that they had engaged in undergraduate research at Hopkins. This is confirmed by the 70% of seniors who reported the same in the 2002 COFHE Senior Survey. While the alumni noted high levels of satisfaction (88%), the 2002 seniors were not quite as satisfied - only 67% reported being either “very satisfied” or satisfied” with the experience. Perhaps our biggest concern, when it comes to undergraduate research, is the lack of systematic oversight at the school or department-level. Because, by definition, the research experience in faculty laboratories is largely at the discretion of individual faculty members, it is difficult to monitor actively or to judge the quality of the experience. We are in the process of strengthening the requirements for faculty mentoring and student participation in research.

ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

The Whiting School of Engineering educational offerings are assessed in a number of ways, as displayed by the WSE Undergraduate Student Outcomes Assessment Matrix (Appendix 2-D). All undergraduate departments and thus all programs are assessed by the Academic Council every four years. These reviews focus on both the program in its entirety and drill down to the course-level. Program content is assessed for every program by Alumni Surveys every year, two and five years post-graduation. Every
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department but DoGEE assesses undergraduate programs every year through Exit Surveys. All departments have either a Visiting Committee or an External Advisory Board, and these meet every year. Lastly, all departments but Computer Science and Mechanical Engineering have an Undergraduate Program Committee.

STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION

All schools of engineering face at least one common challenge: to ensure that their graduates are prepared for engineering licensing exams requiring deep disciplinary knowledge while also providing a broad general education - all without extending the student’s time-to-degree beyond that for other programs offered by the institution. Each Whiting School of Engineering department is required to design programs that accomplish this feat (even though relatively few of our students sit for professional licensing exams) by closely examining each required course to ensure that it leads to purposeful learning. Furthermore, the WSE is committed to assessing whether its students obtain both a broad general education as well as deep disciplinary knowledge, though only the former will be addressed in this section.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

All undergraduate programs in the Whiting School meet the 30-hour general education requirement as stated in this standard. At the core of all WSE undergraduate programs is a School-wide requirement of 18 credits of humanities or social sciences coursework, and at least 6 credits of writing-intensive courses. B.S. programs in the WSE, of which there are eleven, also require at least 15 credits of mathematics and statistics and 15 credits of basic sciences, in addition to engineering requirements. B.A. programs in the WSE, of which there are five, replace some engineering courses with more humanities, social science and writing courses, including foreign language study.

The ways in which WSE undergraduates obtain the specific skills and subject matter outlined by the General Education standard are addressed in the following section.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

The WSE has no specific oral communication requirement for engineering students; however, our undergraduates spend a great deal of time in formal and informal study and design groups. The intimacy of these small groups enables students to hone their oral communication skills. In addition, most WSE undergraduates make formal design presentations that require advanced oral communication. Some departments take an active role in presentation skill development. For example, the Mechanical Engineering department videotapes practice student presentations that faculty members critique for the students. Lastly, in response to ABET requirements, the WSE developed its own Professional Communication Program in 1998 that addresses oral and written communication within a technical context. This program now offers nine different communication courses including Effective Oral Presentations.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

All WSE B.S. programs require at least two writing-intensive courses, and WSE B.A. programs require at least four writing-intensive courses. Students can fulfill these requirements in the Professional Communication Program or in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences. WSE undergraduates also receive valuable writing experience while producing lab and senior design reports.
SCIENTIFIC AND QUANTITATIVE REASONING

WSE students receive preparation in these areas through departmental requirements in mathematics, applied mathematics and statistics, and the natural sciences. All WSE undergraduate programs require students to enroll in at least 15 credits of mathematics or statistics courses, including Calculus I and Calculus II. All WSE B.S. and most B.A. programs also require students to earn at least 15 credits of natural science courses. In most cases, programs require students to enroll in both Physics and Chemistry. Beyond this base level preparation, students utilize high-level scientific and quantitative reasoning in the major.

TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITIES APPROPRIATE TO THE DISCIPLINE

WSE undergraduate programs focus on the fundamentals of engineering as well as the in-depth understanding of their disciplines. With this background, graduates can both undertake the lifelong learning necessary to maintain mastery of rapidly developing fields and engage in the creative process of engineering design. Technological capabilities addressed range from the effective use of engineering software to the ability to synthesize information from different areas to meet design problems with multiple constraints.

INFORMATION LITERACY

WSE undergraduates obtain information literacy skills through the capstone experience - collecting information on engineering standards from discipline-specific resources and applying it to their design projects. For example, a Civil Engineering student may need the maximum weight that can be supported by a steel beam of a specific thickness and length. These standards are available through resources published specifically for engineers, such as the ASCE Standards, and are available in the library.

VALUES, ETHICS AND DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

As a requirement for ABET accreditation, the WSE ensures that its engineering graduates engage in discussions of professional ethics. This topic is introduced in first-year courses within each engineering program and applied in the senior design projects with considerations of societal values and professional ethics. At this point, similar discussions do not always occur in Computer Science and Applied Mathematics and Statistics. The WSE has no School-wide requirements pertaining to values or ethnic diversity, but students are exposed to the diverse perspectives of different fields through coursework that spans the humanities, social sciences, mathematics, the natural sciences, and engineering. Moreover, WSE students also participate in orientation activities that emphasize the importance of academic integrity, and faculty are urged to devote class time to discussion of academic ethics.

ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL EDUCATION

To a great extent, these requirements are embedded in coursework and assessed in homework assignments, exams and course portfolios. Several of these requirements are also assessed in the WSE capstone experience. In addition, we assess our progress through surveys - departmental Exit Surveys, the annual WSE Alumni Survey and miscellaneous Homewood surveys (e.g., the CSEQ). Below is a discussion of recent assessment data addressing each General Education topic. Overall, our students appear to be very well-prepared in content areas (particularly in the engineering sciences) and less prepared in non-engineering (or “soft”) skills. We are concerned about the discrepancy that exists between the self-reported estimate of gains for our students and those for engineering students at peer institutions, as demonstrated by the CSEQ results. With nearly uniform underperformance on this survey regardless of the question, we are reluctant to attribute all variances solely to curricular differences.
Rather, we suspect that the intense Hopkins culture, in which students are demanding of themselves and their institution, plays a role in these outcomes as well.

**ORAL COMMUNICATION**

The data indicate that we have made improvements in this area over time. In the spring 2003 Alumni Survey, 62% of the Class of 1997 and 70% of the Class of 2000 responded that they were either “somewhat prepared” or “prepared” in “oral presentation.” The percentage of those who selected “prepared” as their answer rose from 21% (1997) to 39% (2000). However, WSE alumni rated the importance of this skill higher than their preparation level (Appendix 2-A). It is useful for us to place these results in the context of our peers as well. In the spring 2002 CSEQ results, 52% of WSE seniors claimed to have made either “quite a bit” or “very much” progress during their time at JHU in “presenting ideas and information effectively when speaking with others.” This is close to the 55% of engineering seniors at our peer institutions who responded the same way.

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATION**

The Alumni Survey data show consistent levels of preparation over time in this area - 75% of the Class of 1997 and 76% of the Class of 2000 claimed to have been “somewhat prepared” or “prepared” by their years at Hopkins in “technical writing.” Again, however, our graduates rated the importance of this skill higher than their preparation level (Appendix 2-A). In addition, on this dimension, we do not compare favorably to our peers here in the CSEQ data. Only 34% of WSE seniors responded that they had made either “quite a bit” or “very much” progress at JHU in “writing clearly and effectively,” a lower percentage than engineering seniors at our peer schools (46%). New leadership in the Krieger School’s expository writing program offers promise of enhanced programs that will benefit WSE students.

**SCIENTIFIC AND QUANTITATIVE REASONING**

In terms of scientific and quantitative subject matter (which includes reasoning), our students seem to be prepared. The percentage of respondents in the spring 2003 Alumni Survey who reported being “somewhat prepared” or “prepared” upon graduation remained constant in Physics (77% for the Classes of 1997 and 2000), and increased in the fields of Chemistry (63%, 1997; 74%, 2000), Core Math (80%, 1997; 92% 2000) and Applied Math (68%, 1997; 76%, 2000). The CSEQ looks more at the skills involved, and we underperformed our peers here. Sixty-three (63%) percent of our seniors versus 71% of peer seniors felt that they increased their understanding of the “nature of science and experimentation” either “quite a bit” or “very much.” Our numbers were similarly lower in reported gains in “analyzing quantitative problems” (WSE, 76%; 84%, peers), but both the WSE and its peers scored well on this measure.

**TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITIES APPROPRIATE TO THE DISCIPLINE**

For this, we have abundant Alumni Survey data for engineering students (Appendices 2-A and 2-B), but not as much for students in Computer Science and Applied Mathematics and Statistics. Graduates of the engineering programs reported high levels of preparation in their major field - 79% of the Class of 1997 and 91% of the Class of 2000 reported being either “somewhat prepared” or “prepared.” Engineering alumni also reported high levels of preparation in “designing experiments” and “conducting experiments.” All students reported adequate preparation in these areas relative to how important they are post-graduation. Our students need better preparation in “modeling” and “software packages” - two technological capabilities that specific engineering programs will need to target for improvement.
INFORMATION LITERACY

As with all of the other skills listed, a student’s ability is honed and assessed in coursework and the capstone design project. There is one question on the CSEQ survey, however, which directly addresses the emphasis placed on “developing information literacy skills (using computers, other information resources).” Students were asked to rate the institution on a scale of 1 (weak emphasis) to 7 (strong emphasis). The WSE earned a score of 5.2, with our peer institutions earning a score of 5.9. While the results are satisfactory, there is room, nonetheless, for improvement.

VALUES, ETHICS AND DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

We must improve our students’ preparation in “professional ethics.” WSE graduates reported an importance level much higher than their preparation level in this subject (Appendix 2-A). In addition, our scores in these areas are lower than those for our peers as well. Sixty-five (65%) percent of peer institution seniors reported significant gains in “developing your own values and ethical standards,” versus 52% of WSE seniors. When asked to rank the strength of institutional emphasis on “developing and understanding and appreciation of human diversity,” our peer schools registered a mean of 4.6 versus our 4.3 (on a 1-7 scale), a statistically significant difference, though perhaps not practically significant. Both the WSE and our peer institutions have room for improvement in this area.

In summary, the WSE appears to provide good preparation in course subject matter, but less effective preparation in skill development. In addition, we find some discrepancies between the training provided to our graduates and training received by engineering students at peer institutions. In response to these findings, the WSE will undergo a rigorous assessment to ensure that all undergraduate programs (not just the School as a whole) provide their students with sufficient exposure to diverse disciplines and fields through general education.

One of the ways that we intend to increase the understanding of diversity is by ensuring that opportunities exist for undergraduates to engage in international study. This is quite difficult for engineering students who take courses in a lock-step manner, so we face the additional challenge of identifying programs which mirror our course sequences. However, we believe that study abroad can have a profound effect on a student’s academic and personal development. It is therefore worthwhile for us to make these efforts.

STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

Undergraduate student learning assessment is approached in two different ways by the Whiting School of Engineering - what students learn in a specific course and what students learn from the academic program in its entirety. Though these outcomes are inextricably linked, as programmatic learning outcomes are largely the sum of individual course learning outcomes, we are able to analyze the approaches separately.

LEARNING ASSESSMENT FOR INDIVIDUAL COURSES

Learning objectives for courses are set by individual instructors and conveyed to students in course syllabi or other documents distributed at the beginning of the semester. Instructors measure student success in meeting these objectives using a number of traditional methods such as in-class performance, homework assignments, exams, laboratory assignments and other class projects. Ultimately, the student is awarded a grade for the course based on a collection of such methods. A student’s grade, therefore, represents the degree to which the student has met the learning outcomes set forth at the beginning of the semester. In fall 2001, for example, 79% of grades awarded in the Whiting School were between “A+” and “B-.” While we hesitate to offer any assumptions regarding the strength of the correlation between
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student learning success and the percentage of high grades awarded, we are confident that a positive correlation exists.

Since fall 2001, the Whiting School has asked students to self-evaluate individual course learning in a very broad manner through the end-of-semester course evaluation. This instrument is distributed in every traditional undergraduate class - rarely for independent study enrollment - at the conclusion of every semester. The question asks students to rate their level of agreement with the following statement, “I learned a lot in this course.” WSE classes receive extremely high scores on this question, with all departmental averages ranging between 3.9 and 4.2 (with 1=strongly disagree and 5=strongly agree) for spring 2003. While this information does not permit us to conclude that students are meeting the learning objectives outlined by the instructors, it does allow the instructor to confirm assumptions about student learning based on student performance in homework assignments and exams.

**LEARNING ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROGRAM**

As stated under Standard 1, departments are expected to create learning objectives for graduates of their undergraduate degree programs. Programmatic learning objectives for undergraduates are available to prospective and current undergraduates in the following three places: (1) undergraduate program websites, (2) the Arts and Sciences and Engineering catalog, and (3) a one page information sheet on every program distributed by the Office of Admissions. In many cases these are the same objectives devised to meet the requirements of our engineering accrediting board, ABET.

**HOW PROGRAMMATIC OBJECTIVES ARE SET**

For our ABET-accredited programs, broad educational objectives (equivalent to the MSCHE goals) and specific program outcomes (equivalent to the MSCHE objectives) are devised through a series of discussions by the faculty in ABET-targeted meetings as well as year-end faculty retreats. These programs also consult with external review committees composed of alumni, industry executives and academics in the field to evaluate the relevance of their objectives. ABET lists two levels of learning objectives which are used as a base for these discussions. The first is a general set of learning outcomes similar to the MSCHE Standard 12 General Education requirements. These are skills that alumni of any engineering program should have upon graduation from an ABET-accredited program. For example, students are expected to graduate with “the ability to communicate effectively” and “an ability to design and conduct experiments, as well as to analyze and interpret data.” The second is a set of specific engineering disciplinary requirements demonstrating that students have academic knowledge bases specific to that discipline (e.g., “a thorough grounding in chemistry and working knowledge in advanced chemistry” for chemical engineering), theoretical skills (e.g., “the ability to apply advanced mathematics through multivariate calculus and differential equations” for mechanical engineering), hands-on skills (e.g., “the ability to perform civil engineering design” for civil engineering), as well as practical knowledge (e.g., “an understanding of professional practices issues such as how the design professionals and the construction professions interact to construct a project,” again, for civil engineering).

The outcomes that ABET states serve only as a guide though; students are expected to meet them en route to obtaining knowledge bases and skills more closely related to the mission of the institution, school, and program. Information critical to these discussions, therefore, is a summary of what skills and subject areas our alumni deem important upon entry into graduate school or the workforce. In our Alumni Survey distributed two and five years post-graduation, we ask our graduates the importance of skills such as data analysis and technical writing and subject areas like physics and the social sciences.

ABET sets its objectives by conducting research to determine what skills and subject areas are critical to professional engineers in each sub-discipline. Our programs which are not accredited by ABET,
therefore, do not benefit from this research. The results of the Alumni Survey are particularly useful to these programs. This survey provides them with an opportunity to confirm their assumptions as to which skills and subject areas are useful to their graduates. These programs also have the opportunity to consult with external advisory committees regarding the relevance of their learning objectives.

**HOW PROGRAMMATIC OBJECTIVES ARE ASSESSED**

Progress in meeting programmatic learning objectives is assessed by three different constituencies: (1) the program and its faculty, (2) the students themselves, and (3) prospective employers and graduate school admissions committees. First, our undergraduate programs and the faculty associated with each program assess student progress in an incremental manner through exams and homework assignments and more holistically through engineering design capstone projects undertaken at the end of the senior year. The design project requires students to synthesize basic and advanced coursework with more applied knowledge of the discipline.

Second, students assess their own progress towards meeting learning objectives at the three following junctures, all of which are discussed in further detail below: (1) at the end of each course, (2) at the point of graduation, and (3) two and five years post-graduation. The intended purpose of the MERLIN evaluation is to assess student satisfaction with the course and the performance of the instructor. Over time, however, the Whiting School has added a few questions which assess the extent to which a course advanced the student’s progress in meeting a programmatic learning objective. These are particularly relevant to ABET-accredited programs, as they all share some common objectives, but they are undoubtedly useful to other programs as well. For example, we now ask students to state their level of agreement to the following two questions: “the course improved my engineering design skills,” and “the course improved my computing skills.” In addition, several of our programs currently distribute one page surveys along with the MERLIN evaluation that measure progress in all of the program’s objectives.

In all but one department, graduating seniors are asked whether they have met the stated programmatic learning objectives in department-distributed exit surveys. This is a critical point of information-gathering with a very narrow window of opportunity, as students are either near or at program completion - so their perspective is extremely well-informed - but they have not yet left the Homewood campus, enabling sheer proximity to boost our response rates.

Two and five years post-graduation, all Whiting School graduates are surveyed in the WSE Alumni Survey. As mentioned above, this survey is particularly useful since respondents are now aware of what skills and subject areas are required in graduate school or the workforce, permitting departments to test the relevance of their stated learning objectives. In a cyclical effect, the survey results of previous years help to shape the learning objectives of future graduates, who then confirm or disconfirm the relevance of the same objectives with their own survey results. Students also participate in a battery of surveys administered by the University’s Office of Institutional Research, from which programs can glean relevant data on whether students believe they met program-specific or perhaps more broad objectives. Current students are assessed in instruments such as the COFHE Senior Survey and the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). These surveys contain questions asking students to estimate their progress in a range of areas such as oral and written communication and critical and quantitative analysis, the results of which are very useful to our programs.

Lastly, one of the Whiting School’s core goals, though currently undocumented, is to prepare our alumni for graduate school or a professional career. In addition, we assume that there is a link - the strength of which remains undetermined - between student learning and the selectivity of the graduate program in which an alumnus enrolls or the nature of the position an alumnus accepts in the workforce. These data, provided by students but generated by graduate admissions committees and potential employers, are
The Whiting School of Engineering

collected in two ways. In nearly all departmental Exit Surveys, students are asked about their future plans for employment and/or graduate school. In the WSE Alumni Survey, we again ask our alums to list the graduate degrees they have earned, are seeking, or plan to seek, and the types of professional positions they hold and have held in the past. The information is analyzed by the programs.

FROM ASSESSMENT TO CHANGE

Faculty members and departments are entrusted with the task of ensuring that students meet the individual course and programmatic learning objectives. Faculty members conduct systematic reviews of courses and programs during annual reviews, also known as faculty retreats. In these meetings, the faculty considers data from the department’s Exit Surveys and the WSE Alumni Surveys, and discusses course portfolios. Based on these results, departments improve courses and curricula to better serve their students.

ABET also serves as an active evaluator of whether students meet individual course and program learning objectives, and an agent of programmatic change. The evaluation team is provided with evidence that students meet program objectives in the form of sample homework assignments, exams, transcripts, and survey data. In the 1999 review, ABET found that nearly all WSE programs fully met expectations. In two cases, deficiencies were addressed and corrected immediately, to ABET’s satisfaction. In Biomedical Engineering, for example, ABET found that the department had not demonstrated student ability to apply statistics at an advanced level. The Department of Biomedical Engineering immediately instituted an upper-level statistics course requirement.

Lastly, WSE programs undergo broad programmatic reviews every four years by the Homewood Academic Council and self-organized external reviews every year. The Academic Council Review examines the major directions in the field represented by the department, the department’s position in the field in terms of interests and coverage, the department’s role in both graduate and undergraduate programs of the School and the University, interactions at the teaching level with other departments in the School and in the University at large, the quality of teaching and advising in the department, and the overall reputation and quality of department and comparisons with similar departments at other institutions that are highly regarded. External reviews, encouraged by ABET, provide an opportunity for industry professionals and academics from peer institution to examine the program, its curriculum content, the laboratories and other teaching infrastructure and the ability of the faculty to provide appropriate coverage in the field. Both processes result in recommendations to the departments and to the Dean on a range of actions to be taken, from adjustments in curriculum content to the areas of critical need in the hiring of new faculty members.

CONCLUSION

In this self-study, we have attempted to address the MSCHE standards while also updating the progress on the WSE’s implementation of all relevant CUE recommendations. A snapshot, such as a self-study, captures an organization at one point in time. The WSE evolves too rapidly, however, for this to serve as the whole picture. We must include a vision of the future. In the text below, therefore, we have identified a set of challenges which we must meet in order to continue improving our undergraduate programs.

The Whiting School Strategic Plan (Phase II) outlines a clearly defined mission and overarching goal for the school and lists 13 distinct and measurable objectives. We have made respectable progress in meeting the goal and objectives. At this point, one of the broad strategic decisions that the School must make
regards the role of our part-time undergraduate engineering programs. Is this a student population that we wish to serve? If so, how can these programs be linked more tightly with the full-time programs?

Whiting School students appear satisfied with both advising provided by professional advisors in the Engineering Advising Office as well as faculty advising. The course evaluations results are overwhelmingly positive as well. In order for advising and instruction to be made part of the annual salary review process, however (as recommended by CUE), our assessment processes must be improved. We will address the question of how to improve our processes to ensure that both faculty advising and in-class performance are accurately and thoroughly assessed and thus able to be factored directly into the faculty compensation model. Once these logistical obstacles are overcome, we have an even greater task in determining the appropriate emphasis on faculty advising and teaching in the faculty compensation model. The Whiting School is a research-based institution, but teaching and advising are also core mission functions performed by the faculty.

As a highly decentralized school, the WSE must increase its information flow - particularly from the departments to the higher levels of the administration. This will serve to heighten accountability for student learning for both the departments and the School overall. Adding Directors of Undergraduate Studies in each program and requiring that programs provide annual reports will serve as a beginning point. The next step is to find the most efficient way for a great amount of data to be transmitted without causing a loss of programmatic flexibility and autonomy or greatly increasing the workload for our departments.

Our undergraduate students appear to be well-schooled in academic subject matter and engineering skills. They seem to be less proficient in more basic skills that alumni have told us are extremely important once undergraduates enter the workforce. We will address how to increase undergraduates’ skill levels without also increasing the number of courses required to graduate.

Overall, we believe we offer undergraduate students a rigorous education characterized by excellent academic programs, good teaching, and extensive opportunities for learning through research. The Whiting School has established a discipline of assessment and is on a fine trajectory of achieving the highest levels of academic quality.
## Selected Alumni Survey Results

### Class of 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Mean Level of Preparation from JHU (1 = unprepared, 5 = prepared)</th>
<th>Mean Level of Importance to Success in Current Career Path (1 = unimportant, 5 = important)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory/Instrumentation</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Mathematics (calculus sequence)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Major)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Experiments</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Overall)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programming</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Experiments</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Packages</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics (prob &amp; stats)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Writing</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Ethics</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Management</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Selected Alumni Survey Results
**Class of 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mean level of preparation from JHU (1 = unprepared, 5 = prepared)</th>
<th>mean level of importance to success in current career path (1 = unimportant, 5 = important)</th>
<th>difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Mathematics (calculus sequence)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory/Instrumentation</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Overall)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Experiments</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering (Major)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing Experiments</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Mathematics (prob &amp; stats)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Programming</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Packages</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Writing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Presentations</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Ethics</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Management</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Management</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 2-B

### Selected Alumni Survey Results

**Class of 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PREPARATION*</th>
<th>group reported</th>
<th>unprepared</th>
<th>somewhat unprepared</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>somewhat prepared</th>
<th>prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engineering (major)</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physics</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core math</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied math</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral presentation</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical writing</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing experiments</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducting experiments</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering design</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software packages</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software packages</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer programming</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer programming</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab/instrumentation</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modeling</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional ethics</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional ethics</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes those who selected “not applicable.”
Selected Alumni Survey Results
Class of 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PREPARATION*</th>
<th>group reported</th>
<th>unprepared</th>
<th>somewhat unprepared</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>somewhat prepared</th>
<th>prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>engineering (major)</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physics</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core math</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applied math</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral presentation</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technical writing</td>
<td>all students</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designing experiments</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducting experiments</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engineering design</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software packages</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software packages</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer programming</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer programming</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab/instrumentation</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modeling</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional ethics</td>
<td>eng majors only</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional ethics</td>
<td>math sci &amp; comp sci</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Excludes those who selected “not applicable.”
APPENDIX 2-C

2002 College Student Experiences Questionnaire
Selected Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WSE</th>
<th>Epers*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>respondents</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning on enrolling for advanced degree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours/week spent on out-of-class academic work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 30</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junior</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of term credit hours (spring 02)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 or fewer</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or more</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The majority of grades earned by the student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-, B+</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-, C+</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, C-, or lower</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consists of Duke, Dartmouth, MIT and U. of Chicago
### APPENDIX 2-D

**Undergraduate Student Outcomes Assessment Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>ChBE</th>
<th>CivilE</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>DoGEE</th>
<th>ECE</th>
<th>MechE</th>
<th>MS&amp;E</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Council Review</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Portfolios</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Surveys</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Advisory Board</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Jury Evaluation of Capstone</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Committees</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Licensing Exam Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School Admissions Analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Survey (e.g., CSEQ)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad Program Committee Reports</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3: THE SCHOOL OF NURSING SELF-STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The School of Nursing was formally established in 1983 as the eighth academic division of the University. An initial class of 27 baccalaureate students was admitted in the fall 1984. Currently, 570 students are enrolled in academic programs ranging from baccalaureate through post-doctoral. The School enjoys an active alumni and a rich nursing heritage dating back to the Johns Hopkins Hospital-based diploma program that began in 1889.

As the School of Nursing expanded its academic programs after 1983, its original classroom space was no longer sufficient. In December 1997, the School moved into a new education and research building on the East Baltimore campus. To accommodate the increased need for student, faculty, and research space, the School is planning an addition to its building.

The baccalaureate curriculum is undergoing a thorough evaluation by a Task Force on Curriculum Review and Revision in 2003-04 as part of the overall Evaluation Plan for the School, found in the 2002 NLNAC Self-Study Report. A report is anticipated in March 2004, and any recommendations for change will be reviewed by the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee. In response to the current severe and prolonged national nursing shortage, an evaluation of the School’s capacity to expand baccalaureate class size is underway. Consideration of classroom space and utilization, and availability of additional clinical sites, faculty, and support staff will be important factors.

The School continues to evaluate strategies to provide effective teaching and student services for a baccalaureate program that includes mostly second-degree students with an average age of 27. The current capital campaign entitled, “Who Will Care for Us?,” highlights the need to raise funds to support an addition to the School of Nursing, to increase scholarship support, to increase funding for new academic and research initiatives, and to increase the overall endowment to lessen dependency on tuition dollars.

In 2004, the School of Nursing will celebrate its first 20 years as a University division through a series of milestone events. There is much to celebrate. The School has admitted its largest and most accomplished baccalaureate class in its history. Graduates of the program have the highest pass rate on National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX) among Maryland baccalaureate programs; the School is ranked ninth among Schools of Nursing in funding from the National Institutes of Health, National Institute on Nursing Research (NINR); and graduate programs are ranked in the top five by U.S. News & World Report.

The School looks forward with optimism to its many challenges – increasing the diversity of its students and faculty, educating increased numbers of students while anticipating a severe nationwide shortage of faculty, creating opportunities for international collaboration for research and education, maintaining fiscal stability in the midst of multiple unfunded federal regulation mandates, and decreased state support – to name a few.
STANDARD 1: MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Johns Hopkins University has continuously adhered to the philosophy of Daniel Coit Gilman, the University’s first president: teaching and research are inseparable components of a university, and the objective of the University should be the creation as well as the collection and dissemination of knowledge. The University’s commitment to research and professionalism remains constant throughout its constituent parts. The University is decentralized in that it has eight schools and several independent institutes and centers, each of which has a high degree of autonomy. This characteristic also is found at the departmental- and faculty-level, such that independence is vigorously exercised throughout the organization’s layers. Each school has a full and somewhat parallel administrative structure where a large majority of the work is done.

The mission and philosophy of the School of Nursing are congruent with the mission and purposes of the governing organization. The mission of the Johns Hopkins University is many-faceted and includes the highest quality of teaching for students; the recognition that learning is a lifelong process; a creative and relevant sense of public service; and a pervading involvement in the international scope of scholarship, education and training.

The mission and philosophy of the School are to provide leadership to improve health care and advance the profession through education, research, practice and service. A thorough comparison of selected examples of congruent statements from the Johns Hopkins University mission statement and the mission and philosophy of the School of Nursing can be found in the 2003 Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE) Self-Study Report and the 2002 National League of Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) Self-Study Report.

The School of Nursing’s Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee has reviewed the institution-wide undergraduate mission statement recommended by the Commission on Undergraduate Education. The Committee believes that most of the content is included in the existing School of Nursing mission and philosophy statement. However, the institution-wide statement will be included as part of the ongoing committee discussions on Curriculum review and revision, according to the Evaluation Plan.

The School of Nursing’s mission and philosophy are published in the School’s catalog and on the School’s website. Both are updated annually by the Offices of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Affairs. Goals for the baccalaureate program are outlined in the appropriate academic manual and on the School’s website. The Faculty reviews and revises, when indicated, the mission, philosophy, and goals/objectives of the programs (program outcomes) through a systematic evaluation process as outlined in the Evaluation Plan. According to the Evaluation Plan, the mission and philosophy are evaluated every four years, under the direction of the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Baccalaureate program outcomes were formally reviewed in 2001 in the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee and are again under review during 2003-04. The most recent formal review of the School’s mission and philosophy took place in the fall 2002, when the School completed a self-study in preparation for an accreditation evaluation by the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission (NLNAC). Ongoing discussions pertaining to congruency of curriculum content with program objectives, as well as the School’s mission and philosophy, are an important activity of each curriculum committee. Data are collected regularly via course evaluations, end of program outcomes measurement, graduation and alumni Surveys, employee surveys, and focus groups used for program improvement.
STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

As noted under Standard 1, the mission of the School of Nursing is to provide leadership to improve health care and to advance the profession through education, research, practice, and service. Graduates are expected to set the highest standards for patient care, exemplify scholarship, be sensitive to changing societal needs for nursing care, be committed to health care for all individuals and populations, and provide a positive and innovative force in the evolution of the nursing profession and the changing health care system.

As stated in the School of Nursing catalog and on the School of Nursing website, the School seeks to admit students who will bring qualities of scholarship, motivation, and commitment to the student body. Admissions criteria and application procedures for the baccalaureate program are fully explained in the School of Nursing catalog and on the School’s website. The academic program, including prerequisite requirements, transfer of lower-division credit, challenge examinations, special instructions for evaluation of international coursework, and description of the program of study, is fully explained in the School of Nursing catalog. The catalog is reviewed and updated yearly and receives final approval from the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs as is outlined in the School’s Evaluation Plan.

Program outcomes for the baccalaureate program are included in the School of Nursing catalog and on the website. These outcomes include the expectation that, upon completion of the program, the graduate will be able to:

- Assess, plan, implement and evaluate nursing activities for individuals, families and communities, based on principles derived from biological, physical, psychological and social sciences, the humanities, and from financial, management and nursing theories;
- Assist individuals, families and communities, in a culturally competent manner to promote health, prevent illness, and to cope with health problems;
- Use available resources for the benefit of individuals, families and communities;
- Function as a member of a multidisciplinary healthcare team, based on knowledge of the interrelationships of roles of the professional nurse and other providers of care;
- Make professional decisions in nursing practice;
- Integrate principles of leadership in nursing practice in diverse health care settings;
- Use knowledge of the research process in applying findings to nursing practice;
- Demonstrate continued growth in the profession of nursing; and
- Demonstrate professional commitment in nursing by being accountable for our actions, by maintaining standards of practice, and by adhering to professional values.

As noted in the Evaluation Plan, the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, is responsible for reviewing courses within the curriculum every four years to ensure that courses give clear evidence of being based on School of Nursing philosophy and identified program
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outcomes. The 2003-04 Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee is currently reviewing all coursework, program outcomes, and the organizing framework.

The Baccalaureate Admissions Committee, another standing committee of the Faculty Senate, reviews all completed applications and determines eligibility for admission based on established criteria. To inform its decision-making, both the Baccalaureate Curriculum and the Admissions Committees review graduation and retention data for admitted cohorts and passage rates on the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX) for its graduates. Data for the most recent years are presented below.

### Baccalaureate Graduation and Retention Rates
(Through July, 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Undergraduate Class</th>
<th>Matriculation Date</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>% Graduated</th>
<th>Attrition</th>
<th>Still in Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1997</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1998</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 1999</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2000</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall, 2001</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accelerated Class</th>
<th>Matriculation Date</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>% Graduated</th>
<th>Attrition</th>
<th>Still in Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June, 1997</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1998</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 1999</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2001</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June, 2002</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NCLEX First Time Pass Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April - March</th>
<th>Number Tested</th>
<th>Number Passing</th>
<th>Percent Passing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>89.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2002-2003</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates first time testers between July 1, 2002 and June 30, 2003

The Director of the Baccalaureate Program and the Chair of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee review the records of those baccalaureate students failing the NCLEX examination for common predictors such as entering GPA and performance in specific nursing courses. Poor performance in three courses - Pathophysiology, Pharmacology, Principles & Application of Nursing Technologies II - has, in
the past, been correlated with NCLEX failure. Implications for student advisement are being discussed currently in the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee.

The Baccalaureate Admissions Committee plans to review the academic records of students dismissed for academic reasons or placed on academic probation to see if there are common denominators within the prerequisite coursework that may help predict poor performance. One concern is that the “age” of prerequisite courses such as Anatomy and Physiology, if greater than five years, may be a factor.

The School of Nursing is concerned about the enrollment of minority students, including men, to all academic programs. Statistics for fall 2003 baccalaureate enrollment are presented in the following two charts.

### Baccalaureate Minority Student Enrollment – Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Native American #</th>
<th>Black American #</th>
<th>Asian American #</th>
<th>Hispanic American #</th>
<th>Total Minorities #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Juniors</em></td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Seniors</em></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Accelerated</em></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Special Students</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Baccalaureate Fall Enrollment By Gender – Fall 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Juniors</em></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Seniors</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Accelerated</em></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Special</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University is committed to increasing the diversity of the undergraduate student body. The School of Nursing has undertaken the following steps towards meeting that goal:

- Hired an additional minority recruiter in the Office of Admissions and Student Services (two of 3 recruiters are African-American; one is a male African-American);
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- Revitalized the Black Student Nurses Association through the Office of Student Services; series of guest speakers has been arranged; spring event with Black alumni being planned;
- Developing an articulation agreement with Morgan State University (Baltimore, MD), a traditionally Black institution;
- Exploring the development of an articulation agreement with Spelman College, another traditionally Black institution;
- Planning a recruitment event geared towards men with the help of male alumni and faculty;
- Participating in the Baltimore Scholars Program to be initiated in fall 2004; and
- Highlighting accomplishments of minority alumni, students and faculty (including men) in School of Nursing publications, including the School of Nursing magazine.

Information about financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds is available to both prospective and current students and their families on the website, in the catalog and in the financial aid informational pamphlets mailed to applicants. Website changes are made whenever new opportunities become available. In addition, the Office of Student Financial Services is available to speak with prospective applicants and their families about the financial aid process. The Office participates in School of Nursing Recruitment Open Houses by offering a seminar on financial aid and has participated in West Coast recruitment events. This information is reviewed annually for accuracy.

The Office of Student Financial Service presents a yearly report that informs the School of Nursing leadership team of students’ average indebtedness and sources of funding. In addition, this information is shared with the School’s Development Office, potential donors, the School of Nursing’s National Advisory Council, and the Maryland State Legislature (on invitation) to underscore the increased need for scholarship monies for baccalaureate students. Of great concern is the student who borrows heavily to attend the School and must work while attending school. Too often, this combination can lead to poor academic performance, inability to complete the program “on time;” or withdrawal.

Graduation rates and NCLEX passage rates are published in the School of Nursing catalog.

STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

In keeping with the decentralized nature of Johns Hopkins University, each School offers many of its own student support services while sharing others that can be more easily centralized.

Under the direction of the Associate Dean for Student Affairs, the School of Nursing has its own Office of Admissions and Student Services, Office of the Registrar, and Office of Student Financial Services. A part-time career specialist is available on-site two days each week, and a clinical psychologist from the Homewood campus Counseling Center is on-site one day each week with availability at all other times on the main campus. International students are assisted by the Office of International Services which is located on the East Baltimore campus and which also provides services to the Schools of Medicine and Public Health. School of Nursing students receive healthcare through the Student Health and Wellness Center on the Homewood campus. The Associate Dean for Student Affairs also serves as the disability coordinator for students. A more complete description of student support services can be found in the
2002 NLNAC Self-Study Report. All student support services are provided by qualified professionals. Student support services also are described in the School of Nursing catalog.

At the present time, the School of Nursing does not offer programs at locations other than the East Baltimore campus, and there are no distance education programs. A Task Force has been convened by Dean Hill to examine the feasibility of distance education. Should such programs be developed, feasibility of delivery of student support services to this audience would be a major consideration.

Student academic advisement is provided by the faculty. Assignment of faculty advisors is made by the Admissions Office in consultation with the Director of the Baccalaureate Program. Expectations for advisors and advisees are outlined in the Faculty Manual and in the Baccalaureate Academic Manual.

A need to improve academic advising was recognized by the faculty and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs largely as the result of student program evaluations. This need is consistent with recommendations from CUE. In August 2003, a Faculty Advisement workshop was held for all faculty under the direction of the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and the Associate Dean for Student Affairs. These workshops will be held each year. A method for evaluating academic advisement and for recognizing excellent advisement is under discussion.

The School of Nursing offers no sports teams of its own, but nursing students may participate in teams offered on the Homewood campus. Currently, one senior is a member of the Johns Hopkins University Women’s soccer team.

Procedures for student grievances are outlined in the Baccalaureate Academic Manual as are nursing students’ rights and responsibilities. Student complaints or concerns about the baccalaureate program are submitted to and reviewed by the Associate Dean for Student Affairs or the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

All student academic records are maintained in the Office of the Registrar. The Statement Regarding the Privacy Rights of Students is located in the Baccalaureate Academic Manual and in the School of Nursing catalog. See the NLNAC Self-Study Report for a detailed description of maintenance of student educational and financial records.

Student support services are evaluated by each graduating class. In the past, this evaluation was in the form of an open-ended questionnaire. In 2003, questions were added to the EBI (Educational Benchmarking, Inc.) Nursing Student Program Assessment Questionnaire. Three areas for improvement were identified:

1) **The need for more information about student housing and roommates.** The School of Nursing offers no residential housing except for one dormitory (Reed Hall) on the East Baltimore campus. During the summer 2003, additional information about housing and links to a variety of websites were added to the School of Nursing website. In addition, rental agents from local real estate companies and apartment complexes were invited to the annual Accepted Students Day.

2) **Services provided by the uniform vendor.** Students were displeased with the disorganized business practices of the current vendor and the poor quality of the new uniform. To date, three new vendors have been interviewed, and a new one will be chosen for 2004-05.

3) **Slow reimbursement by the health insurance provider (Chickering Group).** Students expressed frustration with billing practices. The providers are reviewed each year by a University-wide
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committee that includes student representation. Comments from our students will be forwarded to this group.

Career services have been greatly improved for School of Nursing students with the addition of a Career Specialist during the 2002-03 academic year. Opportunities for summer internships have been developed and communicated on the web, a series of “Lunch & Learn” sessions with nursing professionals in a variety of clinical specialties has drawn large crowds of students to the career website, resources have been greatly expanded, and networking with potential employers has increased. Many of these changes were made possible by the strong message of need identified during the CUE process and the willingness of School of Nursing administration to fund the position. A newer area of development will be increasing international opportunities for students.

STANDARD 10: FACULTY

As of January 15, 2004, there are 175 faculty members: 75 full-time and 100 part-time. The part-time faculty consists of 89 clinical instructors, five lecturers, and six adjuncts. The full-time faculty includes 42 full-time on rank (assistant professor or higher). Thirty-nine of the full-time faculty hold doctoral degrees. All faculty are experts and qualified in their teaching area and the courses to which they are assigned

Evidence that the faculty are appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions that they hold can be seen in the 2002 NLNAC Self-Study Report. Forty-three faculty currently have advanced practice certification. Many faculty have received federal, local, and private funding for their research. One faculty member received a Fulbright Teaching Scholarship for teaching in Zarqa, Jordan in fall 2000. Faculty of the School are members of national, regional, and local nursing organizations and research review boards, advisory panels, and editorial boards. Faculty have received national recognition for excellence in teaching, community or professional service, and nursing practice. Twelve faculty are fellows in the Academy of Nursing. An additional two faculty members were inducted into the Academy of Nursing in fall 2003; two new faculty members are already members. Faculty productivity has been exceptional in the area of scholarly presentations and publications.

It must be noted that in 1999 the Academic Council approved a recommendation that all ranked faculty who did not have an earned doctorate must be enrolled in an approved doctoral program by July 1, 2002. The faculty member would be expected to complete the degree by the end of seventh contract year of continuous appointment. Ten faculty members are currently enrolled in doctoral programs; at least two will complete programs in May 2004.

One of the teaching responsibilities of the faculty is that of designing, implementing, and evaluating the curriculum. The Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee is responsible for developing policy, courses of study, making decisions about curricular issues, and reviewing and evaluating all baccalaureate courses. The committee consists of the Director of the Baccalaureate Program, two voting members of the Faculty Senate, a Chairperson appointed by the Dean or a delegate of the Dean, and course coordinators of all required baccalaureate courses. The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs serves as an ex-officio member, and student representatives are non-voting members. The committee meets bi-monthly. Courses are reviewed and presented regularly. Task groups are formed as necessary to examine and analyze content placement within and across courses. Recommendations for major curricular changes are brought to the Faculty Senate by the Curriculum Committee for approval by voting faculty. The School’s plan for systematic evaluations and assessment of educational outcomes can be found in the 2002 NLNAC Self-Study Report. This Evaluation Plan guides the School’s assessment of baccalaureate and master’s curricula.
All faculty who hold the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor are expected to be actively contributing not only to teaching but three other areas as well: scholarship, service, and professional practice. A faculty member is appointed by the Dean, at a rank of Instructor through Professor, to one of two tracks in the School: the Research Education Track or Practice Education Track. Faculty appointed to the Research Education Track are involved predominantly in discovery scholarship and focus on activities related to the conduct of research projects, teaching of research methods, advising doctoral students, and assisting with dissertations and other research-related scholarly activities. Faculty appointed to the Practice Education Track are predominantly involved in clinical practice and focus on activities that include teaching related to clinical practice and research and scholarly products related to clinical outcomes. The well-delineated roles for faculty in the two tracks are a strength of the program. There are 14 Research Education Track Faculty and 32 Practice Education Track Faculty.

The choice of track and assignment of rank are based upon the match of the faculty member’s interests and qualifications, using the established criteria and performance examples for each of the four areas, as detailed in the School of Nursing Faculty Manual. The Preamble to this document, which specifically addresses Standard 10, is as follows: “The appointment and promotion criteria developed by faculty and approved by the Academic Council provide guidance for achieving each academic rank within the School.”

The criteria and guidelines for faculty appointment and promotion, as found in the Faculty Manual, are intended to provide recognition of different forms and measures of achievement for faculty engaged primarily in research and for those involved in clinical practice. Faculty are expected to provide local, state, regional, national, and international leadership in nursing and health care within teaching, scholarship, service, and professional practice arenas. At each successive rank, an expanding scope of influence is expected. This expectation has several dimensions, from instructors evaluated for their contributions and influence at the local level to full professors at the national and international levels. In addition, the criteria also embrace different professional and scholarly audiences, the context of health care, and other major venues of faculty activity. Moreover, the materials prepared by faculty, when being considered for appointment or promotion to a rank, should illustrate the faculty member’s impact and contributions, not mere quantity of activity. Faculty members also are expected to demonstrate continuing contributions commensurate with rank at each evaluation point.

The Dean, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, and the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs each serve in a mentoring role to faculty by reviewing CVs and annual faculty reports that document a commitment to expertise in teaching, scholarship, practice, and service. The role of Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs was initiated specifically to assist faculty with scholarly productivity and mentoring. At the end of each academic year, all full-time faculty complete an annual Faculty Activity Report outlining accomplishments in the four key areas not only within the School but also across the University, state, nation, and globe. Goals for the ensuing year also are stated. These reports are kept on file in the Senior Associate Dean’s Office. Each full-time faculty member then meets with the Senior Associate Dean to review performance and accomplishment of goals. This review has multiple purposes. Faculty productivity is evaluated for merit raises. Decisions regarding assignments for the next academic year are discussed. Administrative decision-making regarding faculty reappointment is facilitated. The review also serves as a guide to full-time faculty regarding promotion. Guidance is provided as needed, and faculty are assisted in achieving their goals. For example, if service to the University is needed, the Provost’s Office is made aware of faculty who should be considered for membership on University-wide committees.
Although the faculty in the Research Education Track and Practice Education Track constitute the core of faculty directly responsible for the educational programs of the School, they are supported in the clinical teaching mission by a group of faculty with the title Clinical Instructor. The clinical expertise of the Clinical Instructors and other part-time faculty is invaluable to the baccalaureate program. Clinical Instructors also lead by example and set standards for learning in their interactions with students. They also are active participants in the affairs of the School. Though they are non-voting, they enrich the discussions in Faculty Senate meetings and in other ad hoc groups. They, too, are evaluated and reviewed annually by course coordinators and the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

The Faculty Manual provides written information needed by all full-time, part-time, and clinical instructors: Academic Council Policies and Procedures; Appointment and Promotion; Faculty Senate Standing Committees and Membership; Faculty Practice Plan; and Grievance Procedures, Conflict of Interest and Advisement Guidelines. In the event changes occur prior to the next scheduled publishing of a specific academic manual, the changes are sent to students and/or faculty in writing. Academic freedom, within the institutional mission, is adhered to.

**STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS**

Faculty recognize that nursing exists in a dynamic state of interaction with its internal and external environments. Nursing is a part of a complex health care system and as such is subject to contemporary influences. Preparation of graduates who can practice in a rapidly changing and diverse world requires a curriculum grounded in evidence-based practice and a faculty with a futuristic perspective. Baccalaureate and master’s students in the School are taught in a manner that meets or exceeds the scope of nursing practice as defined by Maryland Law and Statutes on Scope of Practice. The baccalaureate and master’s curricula, program purposes and objectives/competencies are based on core standards of practice put forth by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing in their publications: *The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice* (1998) and *The Essentials of Master’s Education for Advanced Practice Nursing* (1996). Likewise, the faculty used the *Baccalaureate Essentials* as a framework to shape and evaluate the baccalaureate curriculum with respect to program purposes and objectives while paying close attention to the current scope of nursing practice and contemporary professional values and beliefs. This document helped the faculty shape the competencies expected of the baccalaureate nursing student. The *Essentials* are consistent with the School’s philosophy and have represented the organizing framework for the baccalaureate and master’s programs. (See the report of the Task Force on Baccalaureate Curriculum Review and Revision; available after March 2004.)

**BACCALAUREATE CURRICULUM**

There are two options for the B.S. degree with a major in nursing, as represented by the figure below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options for Bachelors of Science Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without B.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years (4 semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5 months (4 semesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With B.S./B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.N.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• The Traditional Option is two academic years (four semesters) and is available to students with and without a previous bachelor’s degree. This option begins annually in September. The School has articulation agreements with eleven colleges and universities in six different states. These agreements allow students to obtain essential pre-nursing coursework in an affiliated institution and to receive preferential admission. In some cases, when requirements for another major have been met in addition to the nursing prerequisites, the students earn a degree from each institution within five years of study.

• The Accelerated Option is offered over 13.5 months (four semesters) and is available to students with a previous bachelor’s degree in any non-nursing major. This option begins annually in June and includes two summer sessions and one academic year. The same material in each of the courses is covered as in the Traditional Option.

The upper-division baccalaureate curriculum (Levels II and III) is composed of the nursing major and, for the non-degreed student, nine credits of electives.

Outcomes for each level are listed and linked with program outcomes. Coursework in Levels II and III is sequential and planned for full-time study. Level II courses build on knowledge from Level I coursework. Courses focus on the acquisition of knowledge, situation/context analysis, and application in nursing practice. Level III courses provide students with greater depth in analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The curriculum is organized so the student initially focuses on the health care needs of individuals, then on families, and finally on communities. The NLNAC Self-Study Report provides a detailed description of the School’s plan for evaluation and assessment of educational outcomes. Additional information regarding program effectiveness can be found in the CCNE Self-Study Report. At graduation, baccalaureate students are evaluated on their attainment of three program outcomes: critical thinking, communications, and therapeutic intervention skills.

In general, the requisite knowledge, theory, and technology needed for practice are taught in upper-division theory courses. Clinical nursing courses focus on synthesis and application of knowledge and skills from a variety of disciplines to meet the nursing care needs of various patient populations. For example, in Level II, there are eight theory courses and three clinical courses. Theory relevant to pathophysiology and pharmacology is taught, respectively, in NR100.313 Principles of Pathophysiology and NR100.314 Principles of Pharmacology. Nursing theory and concepts (e.g., collaboration, use of resources, and the health care system) are taught in NR100.301 Context of Nursing in the Health Care System. Mastery of nursing psychomotor skills and complex nursing and healthcare technologies are taught in NR100.304/312 Principles and Application of Nursing Technologies I and II. Utilization and application of information technology and statistical tests in nursing practice are taught in NR100.494 Introduction to Information Technology, NR100.316 Information Technologies in Nursing, and NR100.308 Biostatistics. Clinical courses build on didactic coursework through knowledge and skill application in target populations and health care settings.

Clinical resources for the baccalaureate courses are varied and plentiful. In the baccalaureate program, where the focus is primarily on inpatient care, there are from 14 to 20 inpatient sites located throughout the Baltimore/Washington metropolitan area available for each course. The faculty to student ratio varies from 1:4 to 1:8, depending on the rotation. Enrichment experiences associated with key rotations include placements at a variety of ambulatory and home care sites, in operating rooms, intensive care units, emergency departments, and detention centers. Depending upon the number of students, rotations in Community Health use from 11 to 18 clinical sites throughout the city and surrounding counties and also use many additional sites for enrichment experiences. For example, students may visit the state capital or Washington, D.C. to view the legislative process, or travel to the federal offices of the Indian Health Service or the Pacific Asian Health Organization to explore the variety of national and international
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public health initiatives being pursued. The final clinical practicum, NR100.407 Leadership in Contemporary Nursing, a seven credit hour course, is divided into three credit hours of theory and four credit hours of clinical practice. Students choose a practice setting from an extensive list of sites in Virginia, Washington, D.C., Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. During this seven week clinical practicum, students work with a clinical preceptor in their assigned practice setting for 32 hours/week, or 224 total hours. The clinical practicum is managed by assigned faculty mentors from the School. Students involved in the community outreach track also have a wide variety of clinical sites (over 25) from which to choose.

Faculty and students systematically evaluate the curriculum and teaching-learning practices. Individual course evaluations are presented each year to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee. This committee meets every two weeks (September through June). Aggregated student evaluations and course coordinator recommendations are reviewed. Relevant concerns about the content or teaching/learning practices are discussed and addressed. In addition, the entire Baccalaureate Curriculum is being reviewed during 2003-04 with input from an external consultant.

Coursework is enriched by the participation of a number of interdisciplinary guest lecturers drawn from other Hopkins divisions and the community. For example, community health faculty invite nurses from the Bloomberg School of Public Health to address environmental health and the health care delivery system. Other guest lecturers include the Baltimore City Commissioner of Health and the Program Director for the State Lead Program. Three lectures in the pharmacology course are taught by a pharmacist affiliated with the School of Medicine.

The traditional and accelerated baccalaureate options utilize the same faculty, the same coursework and clinical sites and the same number of clinical hours. Differences lie in prerequisite requirements (accelerated students must have a previous baccalaureate degree in another field) and vacation. Traditional students have no classes in the summer and the January Intersession. Accelerated students attend class year round. Graduation, NCLEX passage, and employment rates are compared under Standard 14.

TECHNOLOGY AND LIBRARY RESOURCES FOR FACULTY, STAFF AND STUDENTS

Computer technology resources are located in several sites across the campus, with dedicated computer labs for nursing students available in two larger computer labs, one small doctoral lab, and a tiered teaching lab located on the third floor of the School. Students receive formal class instruction on the use and integration of computer technologies and health care through courses at both the baccalaureate and master’s levels (NR100.316 Information Technologies in Nursing, NR100.494 Introduction to Information Technologies in Nursing, and NR100.515 Nursing Informatics). Faculty and staff may participate in computer software courses offered by the Welch Medical Library and the computer services department within the School. Assistance also is available to students, faculty, and staff from both the School’s computer services department and Welch Medical Library.

Baccalaureate students use a variety of technologies throughout their courses of study. A major new initiative is the integration of personal digital assistants (PDAs) and pocket PCs into the clinical experiences of students and practice sites of faculty. In collaboration with the School of Medicine, students have access to six infra-red ports that allow them to use synching technology to download free software to their PDAs. Frequently used software includes drug and clinical management databases.

The School has current and comprehensive library resources available at a variety of sites not only within the building, but at multiple sites on the East Baltimore campus, including both clinically-based and
school-based satellites, at the University’s extensive library system, and through full access to other libraries’ resources across the country.

The Nursing Information Resource Center (NIRC), located on third floor of the School, is a satellite of the William H. Welch Medical Library and is 1,297 square feet with 13 study carrels, two eight seat desks, a 15-seat group study room, and two copy machines. This reserve room contains over 1,100 books; four print journals; and many audiovisuals, pamphlets, and reserve readings targeting specific study needs of the student population. In spring 2003, the School moved from hard copy reserve material to electronic reserves. Students are able to access key reserve journal articles via an e-reserve site within each course website. Required textbooks as well as other supportive course materials are available in the NIRC. The NIRC has two computer workstations to search the Welch Medical Library as well as Sheridan Libraries’ databases and online catalog.

The William H. Welch Medical Library is the central information resource for the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions. The library’s mission is to provide the institutions on the East Baltimore campus (Schools of Nursing, Medicine, and Public Health; the Johns Hopkins Hospital; and Kennedy-Krieger Institute) with information services that advance research, teaching, and patient care. The library collection contains over 2,600 nursing books and nearly 400,000 books overall. Total journal holdings exceed 2,400 with 111 nursing journals, of which 48 are available online as well as in print and another 31 only online.

Other satellites of the Welch Medical Library open to students and faculty are the Lillienfeld Library, housing public health resources; the Meyer Library, housing collections in psychiatry, neurology and anesthesia/critical care; and the Population Information Resource Center, a collection of population dynamics information.

On the Homewood campus, the Sheridan Libraries provide a wealth of print and electronic resources. Together its collections provide the major research library resources for the University and its academic programs worldwide. The Sheridan Libraries have over 2.5 million books and 14,000 print journals with specialized facilities and collections in international affairs, medicine, public health, and music. Electronic resources include more than 3,000 e-journals, 500 e-books, and 300 e-databases available for searching. The Sheridan Libraries’ Digital Library Program employs emerging technologies and staff expertise to develop new information resources, advance distance education opportunities, and experiment with emerging technologies including robotics.

Books and journal articles not available on the East Baltimore campus may be requested from other libraries through interlibrary loan. This service has recently merged with document delivery, allowing faculty and students to request and receive books and documents free of charge. Faculty and students can search the literature and all of the University’s holdings through a wide array of search mechanisms. The ability to search from a home computer via Remote Access to University Libraries (RAUL) is available to students and faculty.

The Library Committee meets quarterly and includes representation from faculty, administration, library staff and students. The committee evaluates current library holdings, discusses additional resources and services needed, and identifies new acquisitions and services available to faculty and students. Requests for new acquisitions may be submitted at any time either directly to the Acquisitions Director, to a faculty committee representative, or online. Student input is gleaned through periodic surveys and direct discussion with library staff or administrative/faculty representatives. All course coordinators are encouraged to submit required course books and other resources to library staff for prompt purchase and accession.
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The Associate Dean for Finance and Administration is the School’s representative to the Welch Medical Library Advisory Committee Financial Group. Administrative decisions including budgetary considerations are made by the committee. The School contributes to the overall budget of the Welch Medical Library and the NIRC according to a formula applied to all East Baltimore campus schools. The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs serves on the Welch Library Advisory Committee Service Group.

There is an active education program for students and faculty addressing the services and resources provided by the Welch Medical Library, the library search systems and databases, reprint file management, and use of Internet resources. The School has a designated library liaison responsible for meeting the learning needs of students, faculty, and staff. The library liaison also is charged with improving and expanding collection development; increasing faculty, student, and staff use of library resources; and supporting teaching, research, and clinical needs of library users. Over the past year the library liaison has provided approximately 30 sessions for students covering topics such as Welch Library orientation and resource training. The liaison also attends all library meetings and, at least annually, meets with faculty and staff to review and update services available and to respond to requests and questions. The Welch liaison recently developed Internet resources and associated links useful for students as they begin to search the World Wide Web on health-related topics.

Many course coordinators have created course websites that allow student access to online syllabi and other course materials including practice quizzes, case studies, and chat rooms. Assuring web support for all courses and adding e-reserves to course websites were goals for this academic year.

Course syllabi are distributed for each course and include expected learning outcomes. Current syllabi will be available for review by the Evaluation Team during the March visit.

**STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION**

The School of Nursing seeks students who bring qualities of scholarship, motivation, and commitment. Applicants are required to have a strong academic record for acceptance. There are two options for entry: First degree option and Second degree option.

**FIRST DEGREE OPTION**

Student progression through the baccalaureate curriculum includes prerequisite (foundational) coursework which is general education. Foundational coursework is referred to as Level I coursework. Level I coursework supports the upper-division nursing major and is a prerequisite to the student’s matriculation. For non-degreed students, this includes 60 prescribed credits in the humanities (9 credits), social sciences (15 credits), natural sciences (6-8 credits with lab requirement), and electives (15-18 credits). All applicants must complete anatomy and physiology (all systems) and microbiology. Students are held accountable for any information from the prerequisite coursework not part of their initial bachelor’s degree (e.g., nutrition). Their coursework in the upper-division (Levels II and III) is composed of the nursing major and nine credits of electives that can be focused on nursing electives or electives in general education offered in other schools in the University.

**SECOND DEGREE OPTION**

This is an option for students who have completed a bachelor’s degree in another field and now choose to pursue a career in nursing. There are fewer prerequisites in the second degree option. The program requires coursework in Anatomy and Physiology covering all body systems (usually 2 semesters, 6-8
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credits) and 3-4 credits of Microbiology. Courses that may enhance the student’s applications but are not required include courses in Nutrition, Chemistry, Human Growth and Development, and basic Biostatistics.

The general education courses, either in the first two years of a baccalaureate degree for non-degreed students or in the backgrounds of the already degreed students, are essential to success and to the achievement of the ultimate program outcomes for nursing practice. Level II and Level III outcomes build on those achieved in general education courses.

As was previously noted under Standard 8, all policies and procedures for prerequisite coursework, transfer of lower-division credit, challenge examinations, special instructions for evaluation of international coursework are explained in the School of Nursing catalog.

The School of Nursing affirms the educational standards of the 1998 American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing. The Essentials describe liberal education as providing a “solid foundation for the development of clinical judgment skills required for the practice of professional nursing.” Prerequisite coursework (and/or previous baccalaureate degrees in other fields) are designed to provide the professional nurse with the ability to:

- Develop and use higher-order problem-solving and critical thinking skills;
- Integrate concepts from behavioral, biological and natural sciences in order to understand self and others;
- Interpret and use quantitative data;
- Use the scientific process and scientific data as a basis for developing, implementing and evaluating nursing interventions;
- Apply knowledge regarding social, political, economic, and historical issues to the analysis of societal and professional problems;
- Communicate effectively in a variety of written and spoken formats;
- Engage in effective working relationships;
- Appreciate cultural difference and bridge cultural and linguistic barriers;
- Understand the nature of human values;
- Develop and articulate personal standards against which to measure new ideas and experiences; and
- Appreciate and understand the character of professions.

Upper-division nursing courses are designed to enhance oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis, synthesis and evaluation. Clinical nursing courses focus on synthesis and application of knowledge and skills from a variety of disciplines to meet the nursing care needs of various patient populations.
STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

The School of Nursing’s mission is to provide leadership to improve health care and to advance the nursing profession through education, research, practice and service. Faculty affirm the educational standards of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing’s The Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice (1998). Baccalaureate program outcomes flow directly from the Essentials and are leveled to reflect prerequisite knowledge as well as outcomes at the end of the junior and senior years. Course outcomes flow logically from the level outcomes.

In recent years, the School has placed greater emphasis on the use of outcome data as a means of evaluating program effectiveness and student achievement. Outcome data include number of graduates per class admitted, along with attrition rates; success of graduates on NCLEX; positions and settings in which graduates are employed; employers’ satisfaction with graduates; and graduates’ positions of leadership in state, regional, national and international organizations; scholarly productivity; and other forms of recognition attained.

Assessment of student achievement on the program-level is reflected in the School of Nursing Evaluation Plan. In the section titled “Program Effectiveness,” the following anticipated outcomes are identified:

- On an internally developed instrument that measures critical thinking, communication, and therapeutic intervention skills, a mean score of 3.0 or above (on a 4.0 scale) will be achieved in each area by graduating baccalaureate students;

- Baccalaureate – 95% of students who matriculate will graduate in 2 years;

- Baccalaureate – 90% of graduates will pass NCLEX on first attempt;

- At least 95% of graduates who seek employment will obtain jobs or enter educational/experiential programs commensurate with their educational preparation within 6 months of graduation;

- Within six months of graduates being employed, employer satisfaction will be at an 80% level;

- At least 70% of baccalaureate graduates will report achievements in professional public service and scholarship; and

- Data are to be gathered every year, and data synthesis and development of findings, recommendations, and decision-making are to occur every four years.

COURSE EVALUATION OF BACCALAUREATE STUDENTS

Students are evaluated throughout their program of study via multiple measures of achievement of course objectives and level outcomes, with such strategies as teacher-made tests, written and oral assignments, and clinical performance tools. Course coordinators and clinical faculty/preceptors determine the appropriate use, content validity and reliability, and applicability of student performance measures.
Clinical evaluation of student performance includes both faculty evaluation of the student and student self-evaluation. Academic advisors, who are regularly notified of their advisees’ progress by course coordinators, monitor students’ academic progress. Course coordinators refer students who have end-of-course academic failures to the Baccalaureate and Master’s Progression and Graduation Committee for discussion and action.

Students must achieve at least 70% in order to pass a course. If the course evaluation measures include both examinations and other assignments, the student must achieve at least a 70% average in the examination component. Academic probation or dismissal may be assigned to any student who earns a semester GPA below 2.0 (C), whose cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 (C), or who does not achieve a minimum grade of C in both theory and clinical components of nursing courses. Students placed on probation must regain good standing within the next academic semester in which they are enrolled. Failure to do so may result in dismissal from the School.

At graduation, students are evaluated on their attainment of three broad program outcomes: critical thinking, communications, and therapeutic intervention skills. The Program Director is responsible for data collection and summarization, data synthesis, and development of findings that are presented to the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee for development of recommendations, action, and reporting to the Faculty Senate.

**BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM GRADUATION RATES**

Graduation rates are noted under Standard 8. Attrition rates are reviewed by the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee and their implications for admissions, curriculum, and evaluation are identified and addressed by the Committee. The high graduation rates are believed to be the result of the excellent pool of candidates who apply to the program and an admission process that includes careful evaluation of applicants so that those selected are most likely to be successful in the program. Graduation rates are noted in the School of Nursing catalog.

**NLCEX OUTCOMES**

The average pass rate on the national licensing examination (NCLEX) over the past four years has been 93.8%. The 2002-03 pass rate was the highest for baccalaureate graduates in Maryland.

The Director of the Baccalaureate Program and the Chair of the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee review the academic records of those graduates who fail the NCLEX exam in order to identify predictors of failure. These perceived predictors are then used to better screen applicants to the program, to provide additional academic services, and to monitor progression through the curriculum.

**PROGRAM EVALUATION BY STUDENTS, ALUMNI, AND EMPLOYERS**

During fall 2002, the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee compared the AACN/EBI (Educational Benchmarking, Inc.) Nursing Student Survey with the Program Assessment Questionnaire, a School-generated form which had been used in past years to measure student satisfaction with the baccalaureate program. The Committee adopted the EBI form, with questions added to address student services issues. Among the questions on the form are several which address the degree to which students perceive they have met program/learning outcomes. The survey was administered to classes graduating in May and July 2003. The highest mean ratings for students were in the categories of technical skills, core competencies, professional values, and role development, all of which reflect satisfaction with their attainment of program outcomes.
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The Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee also adopted the EBI Alumni Survey for administration to the May and July 2002 graduates. This survey replaced a School-generated form which had been used in past years to determine alumni satisfaction with the program. The EBI form, additional questions, and a letter from the Program Director were mailed in October 2003. The Committee anticipates receiving returned forms by the end of the calendar year. Results of the EBI Survey will be made available for the Evaluation Team’s review.

**EMPLOYMENT OF GRADUATES**

During graduation week, students are surveyed about employment. If they do not have a job at the time of graduation, they are given an addressed, stamped postcard to send to the Associate Dean for Student Affairs when they have secured employment. The rates of employment at the time of graduation for baccalaureate students who completed the program in years 1999-2003 are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Students Graduating</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Total With Job at Graduation</th>
<th>*Total Continuing Into Graduate Study</th>
<th>Total Not Yet Employed or Continuing Into Graduate Study At Time of Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Accelerated, 98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors, 91</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Accelerated, 79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors, 90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Accelerated, 119</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors, 90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Accelerated, 165</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors, 80</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Accelerated, 96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seniors, 88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes graduates who are full-time master’s students
** Staying at home with newborn

The Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and a professor with expertise in instrument development are drafting an Employer Satisfaction Survey to be considered by the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee. This survey will replace a School-generated survey which has been of limited value in determining employer satisfaction with baccalaureate graduates.
CHAPTER 4: THE PEABODY INSTITUTE SELF-STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

The 2002-03 academic year has been a very busy time for Peabody, due to the simultaneous occurrence of a major construction project and two decennial accreditation processes: for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) (of which the present document forms part), and for the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). In preparation for accreditation, the entire Peabody population - faculty, staff, students, and alumni - was surveyed. Most offices were required to provide data and analyses of that data. A very large proportion of the faculty was involved, either through their departments or individually, in preparing material for the NASM self-study. The process of the NASM self-study was guided by a joint committee of faculty, students, and staff. JoAnn Kulesza, Chair of the Faculty Assembly, and Eileen Soskin, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, provided leadership in accomplishing the NASM self-study.

The NASM self-study benefited from the debate on many issues which has been going on throughout the year in a very broad context and reflects the thinking of a wide cross-section of the Peabody community. The present document, therefore, has been prepared mainly from data obtained in the course of the NASM self-study and will frequently refer to it. Additional data have been obtained where necessary.

The NASM self-study attests that Peabody reflects indicators of quality that are appropriate for institutions of higher learning and the basis for judging institutional effectiveness. Peabody has a mission appropriate to higher education, is guided by well-defined goals for student learning, and has established conditions and procedures under which the goals can be realized. Peabody also is accomplishing its goals substantially and has the organization, staff, and support structure to expect to continue accomplishing its goals. Peabody is dedicated to *Excellence in Higher Education*. Nothing else will do.

STANDARD 1: MISSION, GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Peabody Conservatory is one of two branches of the Peabody Institute of The Johns Hopkins University, the other being the Peabody Preparatory. Both the Conservatory and the Preparatory have mission statements. The mission statement of the Conservatory was revised in October 2002, and the mission statement for the Institute was written and finalized in April and May 2003, during retreats held for faculty, administrators, and staff of the Institute.

MISSION STATEMENT FOR THE PEABODY CONSERVATORY

The Peabody Conservatory strives to provide aspiring artists with the skills to pursue professional careers in music as well as the education to become leaders in the cultural life of their communities.
MISSION STATEMENT FOR THE PEABODY INSTITUTE

Through comprehensive excellent education, The Peabody Institute nurtures talent and creativity; provides aspiring musicians with the skills to sustain professional careers; fosters lifelong involvement in music and dance; and prepares students in artistic performance at the highest level, providing inspiration and enlightenment to regional, national and international communities.

The revised mission statement of the Peabody Institute strives to reflect the aspirations of the mission and vision of undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins, as described in the CUE Final Report. Particular emphasis has been placed on the aspects of intellectual and cultural leadership within the national and international communities, as well as lifelong learning, civic engagement, and community service.

VISION STATEMENT FOR THE PEABODY INSTITUTE

1. Peabody is among the finest music schools in the world, dedicated to comprehensive education and excellence, while preparing students to become participative members of society.

2. Peabody is a place where the most gifted students desire to study with distinguished faculty.

3. Peabody is dedicated to a diverse student body.

4. Peabody is a place that provides lifelong music and dance opportunities through instruction, performance and outreach to regional, national, and international communities.

5. Peabody achieves its goals through individual and collaborative instruction in a caring and compassionate environment.

6. Peabody has the finest, state-of-the-art facilities and operates in a secure financial environment.

Peabody affiliated with The Johns Hopkins University in 1977 and became a full division in 1986. Peabody’s objectives - both historically and currently - are based on a standard of professional excellence within a diverse community of ideas and, thus, are entirely congruent with those of the Johns Hopkins University.

The admissions process at Peabody has been developed to ensure that Peabody’s mission and objectives have the best possible chance for realization. The Admissions Office is charged with the task of recruiting a qualified but diverse group of students. Recruitment materials are designed to attract those students who will prosper; very few students apply based on a false notion of what Peabody is about.

Peabody seeks to hire faculty and staff whose outstanding accomplishments in their fields of expertise are coupled with a dedication to our mission and vision.

Faculty, administrators and staff are constantly engaged in making connections to the past, functioning in the present, and looking towards the future. In trying to balance these three goals, they struggle to reconcile ideals with financial and size constraints. In the past ten years, significant progress has been made in the areas of internal and external connections including:

- Erasing some of the artificial boundaries between the Conservatory and the Preparatory divisions;

- The creation of fourteen functional departments in the Conservatory and a Council of Chairs where every member of the faculty is represented by their Department Chair;
• A greater Peabody presence on the Homewood campus both with course offerings and on University-wide committees;
• A more ethnically diverse student body on the Peabody campus, largely as a result of the new jazz undergraduate and graduate degree programs;
• A greater number of successful outreach programs;
• A significantly higher profile for Peabody in the community as a presenter of cultural events; and
• The affiliation with the National University of Singapore and the July 2003 admission of the first class to their Conservatory.

Peabody is fulfilling its objectives and living up to its promises as stated in its mission statement and promotional materials. The past decade has seen a tremendous growth in Peabody’s endowment, as well as preparation for and the commencement of a huge construction project that will underscore our aspirations and successes as a major presenter in the Baltimore/Washington, D.C. area. Peabody’s visibility at Homewood, locally, nationally, and internationally has never been as great, and we are poised to build on our present position. Constraints of space and finances have always been present and continue to nip at our heels; nonetheless, both have been addressed more effectively than anyone could have imagined ten years ago. The future looks bright.

STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS

ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

All admissions policies, auditions and proficiency-testing procedures are clearly described in the current catalog of the Peabody Conservatory supported by various publications of the Public Information and Admissions Offices.

Students are admitted into all performance programs via audition with the major faculty. An additional interview is required for Music Education and Recording Arts applicants. All applicants take placement tests in Music Theory and Ear-Training. The results of these tests become significant when an applicant is otherwise marginal. Academic records are flagged for review if they fall short of established benchmarks. Undergraduate applicants living more than five hundred miles from Peabody may audition via audiotape. All Jazz auditions must be performed live at Peabody.

ACADEMIC CATALOG

The Peabody Conservatory prints its academic catalog every two years, with the policies therein applicable for the course of a student’s study at the Institute. Among the first elements presented is the Academic Calendar setting out the dates for the opening and closing of semesters, observed holidays and vacations, as well as deadlines and dates of important academic issues (i.e., course drop/add periods, exam periods, and applications for graduation). The catalog clearly articulates information about our history, mission, size, facilities, breadth of faculty, performance and competition opportunities, honorary and professional organizations, career counseling, and outreach. Procedural Information (recital requirements, inter-institutional academic arrangements, the Peabody/Homewood double degree program) and Administrative Regulations (codes of conduct, grading system, and academic standing) also are found in the catalog. The rest of the catalog covers the specifics of all degree programs and their requirements,
a list and description of courses offered, student life, financial information (including endowed scholarships, fellowships and graduate assistantships) and a list of current faculty and their biographies.

**ADMISSIONS ADVERTISING AND MATERIALS**

In consultation with the Director of Admissions, the Public Information Office (PIO) designs, writes and places recruitment ads in major instrumental and vocal publications. PIO spends about $30,000 a year on space advertising for both the Conservatory and the Preparatory divisions. The majority of space ads are placed in statewide and national publications including daily newspapers, magazines and programs of other arts organizations. Each ad is a custom design, with little or no standardization. Copies of all the advertisements placed by PIO are contained in Peabody’s 2003 NASM Self-Study Report.

PIO also produces program sheets, information applying directly to the expressed instrument/medium of choice of the applicant. Student search mailing is targeted at a national pool of approximately 17,000 students whose SAT scores and identification of music as a career objective make them potential applicants to Peabody. The PIO also produces a brochure, *The Path to Peabody*, that discusses with unusual candor the advantages and disadvantages of attending Peabody.

**DEPARTMENTAL BROCHURES**

One of the elements which sets Peabody apart from its sister institutions is its entrepreneurial philosophy; this reflects the way of life of The Johns Hopkins University, the umbrella under which Peabody lives. Each department at the Conservatory echoes its own personality in its individualized brochure, outlining the accomplishments of that department’s faculty, its particular offerings, the department’s unique allure and the specifics of its degrees and requirements. Though perhaps less glamorous than full-color promotional brochures, the black-and-white format provides an unusually quick recognition of the materials as Peabody’s (according to the Director of Admissions). This lack of unification of publications across the School as a whole produces a look that we feel is unique and representative.

**THE WEBSITE**

The Peabody website makes the Conservatory catalog with all admissions and auditions requirements available online. Peabody’s website was redesigned during the academic year 2002-03 to make online inquiries and down-loadable application forms available to prospective students. As an added resource to inquiring minds, computer-savvy faculty and students were able to design their own webpages which show departmental schedules and performance events, including elements of their personal and professional lives outside of Peabody.
The Peabody Conservatory owes its healthy enrollment in large part to the size and scope of its international student population. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, Peabody’s international student population nearly tripled. In recent years, the international student population has leveled off in total size and in its relationship to the overall population of the School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Conservatory Enrollment</th>
<th>International Student Enrollment</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The international student population was mostly responsible for the rise in the overall student population from the academic years 1992-93 to 1993-94, but since then has fluctuated rather independently relative to the overall student population. Students from Asian countries represent over three quarters of the overall international student population. The dip in the international student population in the late 1990s is attributable to the difficulties experienced in the Korean financial market. As Korea’s financial picture has slowly improved, Peabody has seen a return of that segment of the international student population. Currently, Korean students represent 55% of our international student population; Taiwanese students represent 26% of our international student population.

While the talent and assiduity of these students is often extraordinary, their needs also are great. Nearly every international student has special needs regarding language, academic advising, immigration status and financial resources that require the care and attention of our staff. Faculty, especially at the graduate level, note the impact of the large international student population on the pace at which they are able to teach and, thus, on the content and quality of their classes.
**AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS**

Peabody’s African-American population has fluctuated in the past ten years and is now at its highest level although the percentage of these students in the Conservatory has fallen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of African-American Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Conservatory Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-1994</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-1996</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peabody is committed to recruiting a diverse student body and is eager to recruit students of color whose chances for success in our programs are promising based on their audition ratings and their academic records. As noted, a Jazz program has been introduced with the expectation that it will provide musical enrichment and also attract the interest of diverse students and faculty.

**RETENTION**

Peabody takes retention seriously. The Institute can make its best efforts in evaluating a student’s talent, academic pedigree and maturity, and can offer appropriate support services, but no one can ever guarantee a student’s success. Retention at Peabody is contingent upon a student following the established guidelines. Improper student conduct, such as underage drinking or use of drugs, is an offense that warrants possible suspension or dismissal. Issues of perjury, cheating or otherwise disregarding the academic code of conduct are serious matters that can result in suspension or dismissal. Probation is a possible disciplinary action that allows a student to remain enrolled/on campus while attempting to change his conduct. The definition of unacceptable behavior is clearly spelled out in the Student Handbook, which is distributed to each student during the orientation week at the beginning of the fall semester.

Peabody affords its students numerous opportunities to remain at Peabody while working through academic, performance, or personal difficulties. The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs handles academic issues which need immediate attention. She brings cases to the appropriate governance committee when matters arise which need their consideration. The Associate Dean for Student Affairs and her staff deal with most non-academic student issues, staying well-informed and up-to-date regarding University policies and maintaining a current directory of skilled professionals and resources for addressing those issues for which students may require outside assistance.
**ADVISING**

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs officially advises all students in all programs. Individual students also may be advised by their major teacher. In addition, the Office of the Registrar reviews every single student file at least twice a year, doing checks of credit hours and program evaluations. All incoming freshman and transfer students are assigned faculty advisors with whom they consult during orientation week and throughout their first-year of study.

Academic advising is undertaken by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in tandem with a student’s major-field teacher. Individual teachers also may offer professional mentoring and, on occasion, personal guidance, but these teachers must always work closely with the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs because major teachers are not always aware of a student’s entire academic record and may not know of academic problems that a student might be experiencing in other classes. Consequently, the major faculty member relies on the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs as well as other teachers to provide information and support.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The present system of recruiting and retaining students at Peabody seems to do its job quite well, thanks to the diligence and review of the staff of the Offices of Admissions, Academic Affairs, and Registrar, as well as a regular assessment of what is outdated or inadequate. The review and assessment of virtually each student’s progress in the Undergraduate, Graduate, and Doctoral Committees does not allow a student to wander off track or exhibit signs of distress for very long. Peabody also has the advantage of being a small community. News of every kind travels quickly; if a problem outside the academic realm presents itself, the Associate Dean for Student Affairs and her staff are usually able to attend to it almost immediately.

The subject of admissions, however, is always a topic of concern, as far as attracting “the best and brightest.” Thanks to an outstanding faculty, and the ability of the Director of Admissions and his staff to market this ‘competitive edge,’ Peabody usually does not lack a pool of highly qualified applicants for undergraduate or graduate programs. The challenge at Peabody is in having a supply of scholarship money to make a competitively attractive offer with our sister institutions which court the same applicants.

Peabody has lagged in its effective use of technology. We are putting considerable financial resources and effort in upgrading our web presence. It is our intention to place greater emphasis on the newly redesigned website as an additional marketing tool. We have taken the first major step by placing our application forms online for the coming academic year.

**STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

**GENERAL DESCRIPTION**

Peabody maintains its own student service operations in all areas except health and psychological services. These include housing, food service, a campus fitness facility, and a bookstore/café. Health services are provided by the Mt. Royal Medical Association, which is located six blocks from campus and is accessible by van service. Psychological services are available to Peabody students at the Homewood campus of Johns Hopkins University, likewise accessible by van service. Peabody students also are eligible to participate in student organizations on the Homewood campus, though few elect to do so, perhaps due to the two mile distance between the two campuses.
The student services program is coordinated and supervised by Peabody’s Associate Dean for Student Affairs. Responsibilities of this position include overseeing the Residence Life Office and International Student Advising. The Associate Dean for Student Affairs views her role as that of a facilitator, with a particular focus on the personal development of the students. Other areas that fall within her purview include the process of orientation for new students, matters of non-academic discipline, student government, and student activities. Additional responsibilities include dealing with contractors who staff or contribute to service aspects of student life including the bookstore, dormitory administration, cafeteria, security, and vending services.

**The Student Handbook**

The Office of Student Life publishes the Peabody Student Handbook. It informs students of all important policies regarding acceptable and unacceptable conduct and its consequences, sources for personal counseling, mediation of problems, specifics regarding the residence hall, the cafeteria meal plan, student organizations, practice room usage, Student and Residence Life personnel, and the like. Peabody students can refer to it often; it is one of the most important sources of information dealing with life at the Conservatory.

**Counseling and Discipline**

The Associate Dean for Student Affairs also serves as an advisor for students and student groups on non-academic matters. In all matters of student life, Peabody attempts to provide a supportive environment. Even disciplinary issues have their primary focus on education and counseling as opposed to punishment. Formal disciplinary hearings regarding social conduct violations or violations of academic integrity are relatively rare, as many matters are able to be resolved through more informal discussions with the Associate Deans.

**Residence Life**

Over a quarter of the Peabody student population resides in the school’s Residence Hall. The six floors of the Residence Hall have a capacity of 168 residents. There is a floor exclusively for women; a floor for upper-classmen and graduate students; and four coed floors.

In recent years, some of the double rooms have had to be used as triples, a less than ideal situation that Peabody is hoping to address by housing some graduate students in the Waterloo Apartments directly across the street from our campus.

Since 1993, Peabody’s policy has been the same as that at Hopkins’ Homewood campus: we require that all freshmen and sophomores reside on campus. There are several reasons for the two year residency requirement. Living on campus helps students adjust to a new environment and fosters a sense of community. This is particularly important for Peabody’s international students. Living in an urban environment has special challenges, especially when combined with the extremely high expectations that are placed on a Conservatory student. The two year residency requirement also assures the financial solvency of the Residence Hall and its food service operation.

The Residence Hall has undergone frequent renovations in the past decade. A major change occurred in 2000, when the Institute’s bookstore that at one time occupied a portion of the Residence Hall’s first floor was moved across the street from the Peabody campus. What was once a very cramped and limited store is now a spacious bookstore located on Centre Street, just south of Peabody. The relocation of the bookstore made possible the creation of a sophisticated student computing center with 16 complete
computer workstations. The other two computing centers available to students are located in the library and in Leakin Hall. They have midi keyboards and multiple workstations.

A new Peabody fitness facility was dedicated in October 2002 and is located in Leakin Hall. Before its creation, Peabody students had only one exercise bike and one universal machine wedged into a small alcove of a dance room. The new facility has four Stairmasters, three exercise bikes, and two treadmills.

Although cafeteria food is often a source of dissatisfaction for students, the offerings have become more varied, and the amount and quality of fresh food has increased in the past few years. In addition, there is a greater sensitivity to individual needs. In recent years, the configuration of the cafeteria has been improved to help traffic flow, especially at high volume times. The cafeteria is not just for students; it is also a gathering place for many faculty and staff at lunchtime as well as participants in the Elderhostel program. In the warmer months, the plaza is full to overflowing with all the constituents of our community. The cafeteria and plaza remain the central gathering place at Peabody outside of concert and recital halls.

Once students are eligible to move off campus, many choose the convenient and affordable housing across St. Paul Street (to the east of Peabody). Other students choose residences within walking distance of the campus. A shuttle van service run by Peabody Security is available to students 24 hours a day.

**Residence Life Coordinator**

Along with the coordination of campus-wide student activities, the Residence Life Coordinator is responsible for the physical and programmatic life of the Residence Hall which includes arranged talks on Substance Abuse Awareness and Diversity Training, the organization of a Relaxation and Health Fair, the organization of a Career Development Day in conjunction with the Ensemble and Alumni Office, and the supervision of several blood drives. The Residence Life Coordinator works closely with the Associate Dean of Student Affairs in crafting and scheduling events of interest to our diverse student population. The Residence Life Coordinator also reviews students’ requests for exemption from the two year residency requirement.

**Student Activities**

In 1996, the Peabody Student Council, which was a rather ineffectual elected student government, was replaced by a volunteer collective called OASIS. OASIS is described by the Associate Dean of Student Affairs as “a non-hierarchical organization that seeks to foster student activism by interest rather than popularity.” On average, OASIS sponsors two to three new formally recognized, student-run organizations annually. Students are responsible for most of the funds available for student activities, including social activities and excursions that take students away from the Peabody campus. New educational programs tend to originate in the Office of Student Affairs in conjunction with the Residence Life Office. The most popular offerings in recent years have been classes that address the stressful and physical nature of music performance: yoga, Feldenkrais, Alexander Technique, and Tai-Kwon Do.

Consistent with a major CUE objective, in the past few years, our faculty has been discussing how to foster a greater sense of community with our students from the very first day they set foot on campus. There have been many discussions concerning the creation of a Freshman Seminar with an open sharing of ideas on broad topics of interest to musicians and, more specifically, musicians at Peabody. During the 2002-03 academic year, three seminars were held in the lounge areas of the Residence Halls, led by faculty volunteers. All students were invited. Topics included How to Practice and How Not to Practice, Preparing for Juries, and How To Practice Over the Summer.
ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT FOR ESL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDENT SERVICES

Since the 1993 NASM and MSCHE reaccreditations, additional staffing has been added to support the international student population. One staff member formerly served as International Student Advisor and Residence Life Coordinator. In 1993 these responsibilities were split into two full-time staff positions. Ms. Janice Shannon was hired in 1993 as International Student Advisor, a full-time staff/faculty position. She continues in that role today, working out of the Office of Student Affairs. A part-time ESL teacher was hired in 2002 to assist her.

International students also travel extensively for competitions and summer music festivals, and more than their amateur counterparts, they must change their immigration status to enable them to remain in the United States after they conclude their studies. Each trip out of the country requires the attention of the International Student Advisor, as does every request for change of status, permission to work, and approval for professional training activities.

The amount and complexity of paperwork and staff-to-student time has risen exponentially in response to new Department of Homeland Security regulations. There is a new federal tracking system and new University student regulations, both accompanied by long applications and longer waiting periods. The increased demands on an already short-handed staff are both worrisome and significant. The tighter regulations make it harder for students to apply for an extension of their visa. Students must often return to their home country in order to seek an extension. First-time students can enter the United States no more than 30 days prior to the start of school. This is a handicap since they would benefit greatly from taking English classes or special summer programs prior to their studies at Peabody. This past year has been particularly difficult for international students and their staff support in light of the world situation and the SARS outbreak. There has been an increased need for student advisement.

LANGUAGE AND INSTRUCTIONAL ISSUES

Issues related to English language proficiency are among the most challenging student issues. Peabody does not impose a strict standard for English proficiency prior to admission. The School requests the submission of TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) scores and informs students that they must demonstrate a score of at least 550 to gain full admission to the programs offered. Students who test below the 550 levels at admission are re-tested at orientation. If our applicants without TOEFL scores or with poor TOEFL scores were admitted conditionally, many would be unable to secure papers allowing them to come to the U.S.; therefore we admit them unconditionally, but warn them that their course of study may take longer due to language problems. All international students are interviewed when they arrive at Peabody to help assess their English proficiency. On average, some 40 students per year are not tested at the time of admission and must be tested at orientation. Upon completing the TOEFL and an interview, international students are advised to take one of the following classes as appropriate:

- English As A Second Language, Level 1: For undergraduate and graduate students with poor English skills; a non-credit class that meets six hours/week. Students may not enroll in any academic classes until they complete this course, but students may enroll in lessons and ensembles.

- English As A Second Language, Level 2: Survival at Peabody is offered to graduate students for four and a half hours a week. It is a non-credit class with an emphasis on reading and writing skills and making oral presentations. Students can register for any academic classes as well as lessons and ensembles.
• English As A Second Language, Level 3: This 3-credit class (6 credits for two semesters) is for undergraduate students whose English skills are more advanced than Level 1. This class counts as a language credit.

• International students are offered additional organized support in study groups. International students who are enrolled in “Music History Intensive” (a graduate level review course) meet with Ms. Shannon to discuss and review class work.

• Conversation Partners: International students are given the opportunity to converse with American students to practice their English skills. Peabody provides a partial assistantship to a graduate student for organizing these groups.

**ALUMNI**

The Office of Alumni Relations is headed by Ms. Debbie Kennison. Alumni are contacted by mail, e-mail and phone throughout the year by both Peabody and Johns Hopkins and are solicited for both professional information and financial support. Professional information about alumni is collected and published in the *Alla Breve* section of *Peabody News* (published five times a year), in a *Reunion Book* of Alumni, and in an annual newsletter. The Office of Alumni Relations also compiles a *National Calendar* featuring alumni performances and other activities. Peabody also hosts a Homecoming Weekend every second year, usually scheduled to coincide with a large musical event on campus. 2004's Homecoming will take place during the Grand Opening festivities to celebrate the completion of the campus construction project. In Homecoming’s off years, an Annual Meeting for alumni takes place at Peabody.

**OFFICE OF CAREER COUNSELING AND PLACEMENT**

The Office of Career Counseling, in conjunction with the Alumni Office, offers career preparation seminars on a regular basis. These seminars and workshops cover the most important aspects of career preparation for musicians, from effective resume writing to mock auditions for orchestral positions. The office also publishes a “Job Vacancy Bulletin” on the 15th and 30th of each month. The Bulletin opens with a list of performances, accomplishments and reviews of various Peabody students and departmental performances, followed by job vacancies in a variety of venues, frequently closing with pertinent articles on careers, orchestras, and other related items. The Office of Career Counseling also offers a gig placement and musician referral service for the greater Baltimore community.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The Student Survey conducted for the self-study consistently reflected the concerns closest to the hearts of our students. Students living on campus are often critical of those who most closely represent parental authority, and comments and ratings for the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Residence Life reflect this bias. This is not surprising in light of the many inconveniences caused by the construction (including hot water outages and climate control outages). Our current staff (the Associate Dean of Student Affairs and the Coordinator of Residence Life) are dedicated professionals whose tireless efforts continue to have a profoundly positive effect on student housing, cafeteria food, and community affairs.

We have identified the following areas for improvement:

• Better mechanisms for advising international students (more staff);

• More workshops for faculty, staff, and students to explore cultural differences; and

• More frequent formal solicitations of feedback from students concerning quality of life issues.
STANDARD 10: FACULTY

QUALIFICATIONS, NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION

Peabody’s faculty numbered 166 members in the 2002-03 academic year. The following table summarizes general information for the 2002-03 academic year as compared to the 1992-93 academic year. Additional detailed information as to the professional qualifications of Peabody’s faculty is provided in the current Peabody catalog as well as the Higher Education Data Services (HEADS) Report and the Faculty Record Reports submitted as appendices to the NASM Self-Study Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Faculty</td>
<td>73 (53.7%)</td>
<td>74 (44.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>63 (46.3%)</td>
<td>92 (55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Faculty</td>
<td>98 (72.1%)</td>
<td>109 (65.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom music Faculty</td>
<td>27 (19.9%)</td>
<td>47 (28.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Academic Faculty</td>
<td>11 (8.1%)</td>
<td>10 (6.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>93 (68.4%)</td>
<td>111 (66.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43 (31.6%)</td>
<td>55 (33.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Ultimate responsibility for all matters pertaining to faculty positions and appointments resides with the Director of the Institute; the Dean of the Conservatory acts in consultation with the Director and makes faculty appointments on his behalf. The Academic Council is charged with advising on all faculty appointments, ensuring due regard to the needs of the Conservatory and to its instituted hiring policies and procedures, as outlined below.

Full-time faculty appointments are made only to fill full-time continuing positions. Full-time faculty are recruited via a national or international search. In exceptional circumstances, the Dean may appoint a full-time faculty member without a search, following approval at a regular or special meeting of Academic Council. Full-time faculty are issued yearly contracts with normal expectation of renewal. In some cases, the Dean may offer an initial multi-year contract to a new full-time member of the faculty.

Limited-time faculty appointments are made only to fill limited-time continuing positions. The Dean in consultation with the appropriate department appoints limited-time faculty. All limited-time appointments must be approved at a regular or special meeting of Academic Council. In exceptional circumstances, when time is of the essence and when no meeting of Academic Council can be scheduled, the Dean may seek the written endorsement of the appropriate Department Chair and four or more voting members of Academic Council in lieu of formal approval by Academic Council. Limited-time faculty are issued yearly contracts with expectation of renewal.

Adjunct faculty appointments are made only to fill non-continuing positions. The Dean, in consultation with the appropriate department, appoints adjunct faculty. Academic Council is to be informed of all adjunct appointments, but such appointments are not subject to its approval. Adjunct faculty are issued a one year contract with no guarantee of renewal. Successive one year contracts may be issued to meet the needs of the Conservatory.

Temporary faculty appointments may be made either to fill a full- or limited-time continuing position on a temporary basis, or to fill a non-continuing temporary position. Temporary appointments are typically made in the following situations: when a continuing position is temporarily vacated by
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sabbatical or leave of absence; when an unexpected vacancy of a continuing position (for example, a resignation late in the academic year) does not allow time for a national/international search; or when an unexpected situation, such as a surge in enrollment, renders a department temporarily unable to meet the instructional needs of its students.

The Dean, in consultation with the appropriate department, makes temporary faculty appointments. Academic Council is to be informed of all temporary appointments, but such appointments are not subject to its approval. Temporary faculty receive appointments of one year’s duration. A temporary appointment may be extended to, but is generally not to exceed, a period of two successive years. In the event that extension beyond two years is desired, the Dean will present a recommendation to Academic Council after consultation with the appropriate department.

When the Dean is making an adjunct or temporary appointment to an individual of great distinction, these titles may be considered inappropriate. In such cases the Dean may offer an appointment to such an individual as “Distinguished Visiting Faculty,” informing Academic Council of the decision. In all other respects, the conditions for adjunct or temporary faculty apply to such appointments.

**APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION AND ADVANCEMENT**

To achieve its educational mission, the Peabody Conservatory encourages members of its faculty to fulfill their potential as performers, composers, scholars, and educators, and to uphold its academic and personal codes of conduct. Peabody and its faculty must act together to model the highest moral and ethical standards for the community of students, faculty and administrative staff. Both Peabody and its faculty have basic and general obligations to one another.

The obligations of the Peabody to all its faculty members are:

- To honor the right of each faculty member to academic and artistic freedom;
- To cultivate a stimulating intellectual and artistic environment conducive to excellence in teaching, and to encourage professional growth and achievement;
- To inform the faculty in written form of the criteria and procedures by which decisions regarding hiring and the renewal of contracts will be made;
- To seek fair and expeditious resolution of faculty grievances and concerns; and
- To provide equitable compensation for the contracted services of its faculty members.

In order to understand the significance of developments in faculty evaluation and compensation at the school since the arrival of Director Sirota, it is essential to understand the norms under which we have operated since the affiliation of Peabody with Johns Hopkins University in 1977. Peabody’s faculty is neither formally ranked nor tenured, with the exception of a very few individuals who held tenure before 1977. In questionnaires and in formal votes, the Peabody faculty has rejected tenure, preferring to remain with a system that better fosters the School’s prized collegiality.

Faculty are offered one year contracts that allow for non-renewal with reasonable notice (equivalent to a year and a half for faculty who have gone beyond their first-year of employment), but the system leaves the faculty fairly vulnerable. This administration feels that once careful search procedures have been followed, it is better to help current faculty solve whatever teaching problems may exist than to terminate
faculty members. Many faculty feel that the current approach amounts to *de facto* tenure, which may explain why the school has always been able to attract tenured faculty from other schools.

Over the past two academic years, the approach to evaluation and advancement has become more systematic, and a more formal salary structure has begun to be introduced to replace the previous reliance on the market. Each faculty member previously negotiated a base salary with the Dean; that salary was increased by a common (across the board) percentage annually. Salaries have grown incrementally from their own unique starting point, which creates, over time, endemic salary compression. The highest paid faculty earned a greater share of the salary increase pool; the lesser paid earned a perpetually lesser share of the pool.

When persistent problems of performance have arisen, the administration has sometimes not given a raise, or given only a very small one. Individuals can and do petition the Dean on an *ad hoc* basis for increases. Until recently, when measures were put in place to address salary equity and compression issues, salary distribution was primarily the product of independent hiring negotiations brokered by a long succession of deans and hardened into place by the salary compression phenomenon.

The absence of any promotion scheme or salary structure is tolerated and even championed by some. It is a widely cherished Peabody value that when an individual is hired for a position at the school, he or she joins an artist community of equals. Another popular and parallel notion is that Peabody is a community of entrepreneurs, where people of talent and energy can create their own niche, shape their own jobs in their own unique way, make their own unique contribution to fulfilling the educational and artistic mission. Though the Working Group of the Provost’s Committee on the Status of Women’s survey of spring 2000 indicated some feeling that this works better for men than for women faculty, the often cited “collegiality” of the Conservatory is prized. Professional parity is surely one reason that the lack of a mechanism for achieving salary progress was tolerated.

The challenges and costs posed by the lack of an equitable system have begun to be addressed in recent years. Since 1993, Peabody’s culture concerning evaluation and compensation has begun a remarkable evolution. The single most influential change is an increasing involvement of the faculty in planning and decision-making at the Institute, supported - indeed welcomed and encouraged - by Director Sirota and Dean Justen. Three substantial efforts all arising from the Faculty Assembly prepared the way: a Faculty Long Term Contracts Committee in the 1993 and 1994 academic years; an Academic Faculty Concerns Group, which met in 1995 and 1996; and as passed in spring 1995, a resolution urging that the new administration work towards improving conditions for faculty development for studio and academic faculty alike. This last resolution urged the following improvements:

- Reducing teaching loads in order to free time and energy for professional development;
- Instituting sabbatical leaves;
- Increasing and standardizing the procedures for obtaining funds for travel to enable faculty to participate in professional conferences;
- Making available seed grant money for faculty performances and research;
- Assisting in the subvention of publication expenses; and
- Addressing the questions of salary scale and salary equity.
In the fall 1998, the Faculty Assembly and the administration created a joint Faculty/Administration Evaluation/Compensation Committee charged with considering a future course of action for the Institute. This committee generated a proposal for a trial Merit Plan for full-time faculty whereby full-time faculty would submit a self-report of annual activity in areas of teaching, professional activity, and service. Each report would be assessed by a Faculty Self-Report Review Committee, whose ratings of the report would constitute a judgment of job performance. These ratings, accompanied by a short commentary by each person’s Department Chair, would be used in an advisory capacity by the Dean to award merit increases drawn from a special pool set aside for the purpose. Self-Reports were used for the 2002-03 contract season, but the Dean was hampered by the Committee’s recommendations that every single member of the faculty was worthy of a meritorious salary increase. For that reason, the Evaluation/Compensation Committee, after a vote by the Faculty Assembly, put the trial Merit Plan on hold for the academic year 2002-03 and authorized Dean Justen to grant equity increases based on longevity, teaching load, merit, starting salary, and salary compression. The Faculty Self-Report Review Committee did not convene, per the faculty vote giving the Dean their endorsement to ameliorate the salary compression and bring those affected up to a more equitable salary.

Reflecting faculty awareness that we should continue the momentum for change, in September 2002, the Faculty Assembly called for the Evaluation/Compensation Committee to convene once again in order to come up with a plan for salary structure that might continue the momentum for change begun in the trial Merit Plan. That committee continues to meet to craft a mutually agreeable solution.

The Administration has, to a great extent, sought to address salary equity in the following ways:

- Remedying the grossest salary inequities stemming from both historical gender bias and the salary compression phenomenon; creating one semester and full-year faculty sabbaticals at half salary;
- Establishing a Faculty Development fund for travel and special projects; and
- Instituting endowed chairs, such as the two funded by money obtained in the Singapore initiative, which have the effect of freeing up funds for other purposes, including improving salaries and augmenting scholarship funds.

Great strides have been made in addressing gender differences in average faculty salaries at Peabody, as shown in the following chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$58,770</td>
<td>$48,278</td>
<td>$55,564</td>
<td>$10,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$59,543</td>
<td>$51,353</td>
<td>$57,121</td>
<td>$8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$60,334</td>
<td>$59,172</td>
<td>$60,012</td>
<td>$1,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As described in the 1983 NASM Self-Study Report, the faculty have for a long time been resistant to the kind of student and peer evaluation common in universities. The old conservatory tradition of the master teacher inviolate in his own studio dies hard. There also was a legitimate pride in the history of academic and artistic freedom at Peabody, and the value of being part of a community of artists, which the faculty sought to preserve at all costs. Many faculty who have come here from state institutions have welcomed the comparative freedom from red tape and attendant paranoia that is all too common elsewhere.
CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE

The Peabody faculty is at something of a crossroads, realizing that any improvement and maintenance of excellence go hand in hand with evaluation. Our challenge is to come up with a system that preserves the sense of the dignity of each person’s contribution and the resulting collegiality that is so prized here while introducing our own version of evaluation processes. The healthy market competition for students means that we are all being evaluated all the time.

We need to find some way of corroborating this informal evaluation with a scheme that rewards the achievements and progress of a Peabody career with stepped compensation. Besides the self-reporting involved in the trial plan, we also have a requirement for compulsory distribution of anonymous student feedback forms for studio, classroom, and ensemble situations at the end of each course or annual study period. These forms were generated by an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Assembly, ratified by the full Assembly, and approved by the administration, but faculty have the option of substituting their own forms. These forms are compiled by the faculty secretary into typed readouts that are returned to the faculty member. Faculty members are not required to show these reports to their Department Chair or the Dean. It is therefore difficult to have the benefit of this input in strengthening the quality of instruction at the Conservatory.

STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS

A full listing of all undergraduate curricula and the present course offerings are found in the Peabody academic catalog. The NASM Self-Study Report thoroughly describes the standards leading to graduation with the Bachelor of Music degree so that only an overview is provided here.

The NASM standard is a minimum of 120 semester credit hours for the granting of a Bachelor of Music degree. Peabody requires a minimum of 122 semester hours (excluding ensemble credits) for a BM, putting it above the NASM norm. Most students exceed the minimum requirement and often expand the usual four year residency into five.

The post-baccalaureate degrees require a minimum of thirty semester hours and the equivalent of one academic year in residence to meet NASM requirements. Peabody’s Master of Music degrees have a minimum residency of one year and between 32 and 42 credit hours for completion of the degree. Master’s programs carry a five year completion deadline; petitions to extend this limit must be approved by the Graduate Committee. The doctoral programs require a one year full-time residency (between 18 and 36 credits for this one academic year, including eight credits of private study) with a normal two year residency. The total number of credits required is between 60 and 62. Doctoral degrees carry a seven year completion deadline; petitions to extend this limit must be approved by the D.M.A. Committee.

NASM is appropriately non-specific regarding time requirements for non-degree granting programs, leaving it up to the individual institution to structure the framework appropriate to the goals and objectives of the defined programs. The Performer’s Certificate at Peabody, an undergraduate track, is normally a three year course of study demanding a minimum residency of two years. At least 80 semester hours of course credit are needed to complete these requirements. The Graduate Performance Diploma generally takes two years of study and 32 semester credit hours to achieve. Completion in less than two years requires the permission of the major teacher and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Performers in the Artist Diploma program are expected to complete a minimum of two years of study and accumulate 32 credit hours. The program must be completed in five years; petitions to extend this limit must be approved by the Graduate Committee.
AWARDING CREDIT AND TRANSFER OF CREDIT

The grading system at Peabody falls into two categories: letter grades and credit/no credit. Grade point averages are computed each semester. The cumulative average is used in determining status prior to graduation. The system is clearly spelled out in the catalog, as are Peabody’s policies regarding transfer credits, transfer students, and their incoming standing.

Transfer students must fulfill a two year full-time requirement and obtain a minimum of 60 hours at Peabody in order to receive the Bachelor of Music degree. The applied level of transfer students is determined by the department at the time of the audition and validated by the year-end departmental jury. Required music course credits may be established through verifying examinations taken at Peabody. Elective music course credits with a grade of C or better may be transferred pending approval of the Registrar in consultation with the faculty. Liberal arts credits with a grade of C or better may be transferred from an accredited college or university without examination, pending approval by the Registrar in consultation with the Humanities Department Chair.

PUBLISHED POLICIES

Each student accepted into a course of study at Peabody receives a copy of the current Peabody catalog at the time they matriculate. The catalog clearly lists policy, credit hours, and classes required for each level of study. Each individual department also publishes its own flyer outlining courses required for the competition of degrees and diplomas. A tentative schedule of course offerings for the next semester is published by the Registrar’s Office at the end of the current semester which includes the course name, level, and scheduled meeting times. Course descriptions, prerequisites, and competencies are given in the catalog. Each classroom and studio faculty member is required to file with the Faculty Secretary a copy of each class or studio syllabus, including attendance and grading policies. The Ensemble Office and Opera Department publish their policies in the catalog or in separate publications distributed to the students participating in these activities.

CURRICULAR INNOVATIONS

Undergraduate curricular innovations in the past ten years have moved the Conservatory forward in many ways. These include:

- New curricula: BM in Jazz Performance (NASM approval in December 2000; State of Maryland approval in April 2001);
- BM in Early Music Instruments (Baroque Violin/Viola, Baroque Cello) (internal approval in 1993);
- Revitalized courses of study due to the dedication of a new organ in the newly-named and renovated Griswold Hall (B.M. in Organ, G.P.D. in Organ, M.M. in Organ, D.M.A. in Organ);
- Expanded English as a Second Language offerings and an intensive graduate level ethnomusicology seminar for international students;
- A revised three year curriculum in music theory for all undergraduate students;
- Institution of half-recitals in some departments as a requirement for juniors in the BM programs to be given in lieu of third-year juries; and
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- New elective courses beginning in the 2002-04 academic years taught in a two year rotation (English Poetry, Italian Poetry, French Poetry, German Poetry).

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

The Undergraduate Committee began work in the 2002-03 academic year on a proposal for a five year BM/MM degree. It is hoped that this program can begin to be advertised for the 2005 admissions cycle.

**STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION**

Peabody’s Humanities Department provides a complement to the structured musical training of the Conservatory, bridging the focused life of musical endeavor and the broader, ever-changing world from which that life draws shape and meaning. The Humanities Department offers programs in liberal arts and languages, a forum in which students are urged to formulate, explore, and express their ideas. Humanities classes rely heavily on student participation; writing also receives special emphasis. The courses are flexible in order to serve the widely diverse academic backgrounds and needs of our students. While humanities offerings serve the entire student population, they are mostly required of and taken by undergraduates.

The Peabody Liberal Arts program offers, as its required undergraduate core, a historically organized sequence of two interdisciplinary courses which explore the development of the intellectual and cultural traditions of Western Civilization. The main goals of this yearlong study are to help students develop an understanding of the key values and modes of inquiry that inform Western thought and to refine the students’ own ability to analyze and apply these concepts. These courses are interdisciplinary in nature and are built on discussions rather than lectures. All undergraduates also are required to take two courses in Advanced Studies in Liberal Arts and two courses in Liberal Arts electives. A special intensive course is offered to international students, as are an English skills laboratory and several other courses and tutorials in writing and research. Peabody offers a variety of courses to fulfill the Advanced Studies in Liberal Arts and Liberal Arts electives requirements. During the 2002-03 academic years, the two Liberal Arts courses offered were “Art and the Human Body” and “Art and Censorship.”

Four new undergraduate liberal arts elective courses were approved by the Undergraduate Committee in the spring 2002 semester. These four courses (Explorations: English Poetry, Explorations: Italian Poetry; Explorations: German Poetry; Explorations: French Poetry) are being offered on a two year rotating schedule.

The Writing Skills course offers two options. Highly motivated students with excellent skills can petition to take the “Independent Option,” working at their own pace and meeting individually with the instructor. Most students take the “Classroom Option” in which they participate in class presentations and work on specially designed assignments while receiving individual help and direction from the instructor. Students who do not reach an acceptable level of competency in one semester of study must enroll in a second semester of study.

A minimum of four semesters of Language Study is required in all baccalaureate programs with the exception of Recording Arts, Music Education and Jazz. Students may fulfill this requirement by completing two years of study in one foreign language or one year of study in each of two foreign languages. Instruction in French, German, and Italian is offered in sequences of up to four semesters. All language classes meet three times a week for fifty minute periods. All voice majors must complete one year of study in each of the three primary languages (French, German and Italian) with the objective of
the mastery of grammar and diction. Active participation and discussions in the foreign language are stressed in all classes, although maximum effectiveness is limited by the lack of a language lab where students could practice their aural comprehension skills. Special courses in French, German, Italian, and English which combine instruction in language, diction, and musical style also are offered to singers. Singing in Russian has been offered in alternate years since the 1993-94 academic year.

Although the lack of synchronization of the weekly course schedule makes it difficult, Peabody students can choose to take courses at the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences on the Homewood campus to fulfill their liberal arts requirements or otherwise augment their Peabody experience. Some may complete their humanities requirements entirely at Homewood. International students also may follow a sequence of courses diverging from the norm. Entering international students are tested for English language competency. Some are then placed in required English as a Second Language (ESL) courses. A two semester course, “Introduction to Liberal Arts,” serves as a first-year course for these international undergraduates who then take “The Western Tradition” and “Writing Skills” in their second year. Other ESL courses also are offered to serve the range of needs of our international student population.

The Humanities Department is staffed by three full-time and three limited-time faculty members, and the equivalent of one adjunct faculty for two semesters.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

There is consensus among administration, faculty, students, and staff about the good quality of our instructional programs in basic musicianship. This assessment is reinforced by the experience of Peabody graduates who generally report that they are prepared to meet the musicianship requirements and succeed in courses at their graduate schools. Peabody’s success in this area is the result of a strong curriculum developed with the cooperation of many members of this administration and faculty. The Liberal Arts courses also are a matter of pride, and they are treated by their faculty as a central element in the education of the students.

The range of students’ academic abilities causes special problems in the Liberal Arts. While some students write well enough to succeed at the most competitive colleges and universities, others write at a pre-college level, and still others have difficulty constructing a coherent English paragraph. Some students are articulate in discussion; others have difficulty speaking in class or understanding what is said in class. In a liberal arts college, this spread would be accommodated by an equally broad range of courses. Peabody is not able to do this, partially because of faculty constraints and partially because of scheduling difficulties. The scheduling difficulties make it impossible to assign students according to their skills and preparation. On the other hand, the Writing Program, which has been growing rapidly since its establishment in the 2001-02 academic year, does allow some flexibility, since it is based on the assumption that each student is different and offers some degree of individual instruction to all students. It matches writing assistance tutors (select Peabody undergraduates and graduates) with students who seek help. A small training program for tutors and drop-in sessions have helped this program grow in the past two years.

**STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

Multi-level assessment has always been standard procedure at Peabody, beginning with assessment before admission and continuing through graduation. They include the following:

- Targeted recruitment, based upon giving potential students as full a picture of the program as possible, so that the actual applicant pool is self-selective;
• Entrance auditions before the full faculty of each department;

• Placement tests in core subjects;

• Auditions for instrumental and/or vocal ensembles, held at the start of each year and required of all undergraduates;

• Jury examinations, before the full faculty of each department, held at the end of each year except the last;

• A special review at the end of the sophomore year, examining both musical and academic performance;

• A graduation recital during the senior year;

• A variety of ad hoc auditions for special purposes, internal and external competitions, held at various times during the course of study; and

• Nomination and selection for prizes and awards, especially in the graduating year.

ASPECTS OF ASSESSMENT AT PEABODY

The processes given above are well-established and provide an accurate picture of the progress of each student. However, the Conservatory tradition places much emphasis on the central relationship between a master teacher and his or her “private” students. The greater part of the assessment, and the majority of the feedback, will come in the weekly lesson with the major teacher, and this individual nurturing is essential to conservatory education.

Given the highly personal relationship between student and teacher, and the individualized course of instruction, the Assessment Committee for the 1993 MSCHE self-study under the leadership of faculty member Roger Brunyate had articulated four tenets upon which the assessment process at Peabody has traditionally been based. Each of the assumptions emphasizes some particular aspect in which the conditions at a conservatory of music tend to be different from those at a liberal arts college, for example. Since these four assumptions have not changed, they will be restated for the purpose of this document.

ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE GOAL-RELATED.

The purpose of outcomes assessment is to test the stated goals of an institution against its actual results. The closer the focus on a particular area of the institution, therefore, the greater the need for detailed definition of the overall goals as they apply to that area. For that part of the Peabody mission which is concerned with professional training, goal definition is seldom a problem. The profession sets its own standards, and the training goal is simply to help the student attain those standards. But Peabody can and should go somewhat farther than it has in defining goals for those components of its education which support and balance the professional one.

Certainly, there are goals for the training of a musician, over and above the development of technical skill. Specific goals might include imparting knowledge of the history of music, an understanding of its structures, and the ability to "see with the ear and hear with the eye." General goals, in common with other fields of liberal education, might include developing the ability to contextualize information, to question it, to redefine it, to integrate it with knowledge from other sources, and to use it in solving...
ASSESSMENT SHOULD TAKE A LONG-TERM VIEW.

One set of goals listed in the previous section - those related to the suspension of judgment - call for great subtlety in the assessment process. A key principle in the education of an artist is the idea of continual learning, keeping an open mind, amassing experience over time. A student will be taught to mistrust the seduction of the immediate payoff. The best teachers aim to sow seeds, many of which may not germinate until many years later. If the assessment process should create pressures which run counter to this, it would be immensely harmful. Notwithstanding the value of defining goals, as discussed above, the only acceptable process for outcomes assessment is one which recognizes that artistic excellence is not reached by a single path or at a single rate.

It also should be noted, however, that while the present focus on assessing learning outcomes is confined to undergraduate students, almost half of the teaching at Peabody is on the graduate level. While the undergraduate curriculum can give adequate preparation for some musical careers (Music Education, Recording Arts, and some orchestral instruments), it cannot allow sufficient time for a student to develop the level of excellence and wealth of experience necessary to compete as a solo performer. So, for the most part, the true outcome of undergraduate education in music is measured in terms of its preparation for graduate study, rather than as a gateway to a career.

ASSESSMENT SHOULD BE FORMATIVE RATHER THAN SUMMATIVE.

The distinction is often made between "formative" and "summative" approaches to evaluation. Formative approaches are concerned with improving the content of a program; summative evaluation attempts to measure its success in quantitative terms for comparison with other programs and other institutions. The Peabody approach is to emphasize formative evaluation almost exclusively, since the principal goal of assessment is to enable us better to fulfill our mission. In that Peabody has a unique mission, not duplicated by any other institution of higher education in the State of Maryland (and by few beyond), comparisons between institutions are meaningless. And, it is of little value to compare one program with another, even between departments at Peabody, since the various disciplines are themselves so different.

Quantitative approaches are especially suspect in the field of music, since the musical talent itself is such an individual matter. Success in music comes from a combination of technique, motivation, knowledge, personality, inborn talent, and sheer luck. We can and do set technical goals for each level, and measure each student's success in attaining them. We can grade on assiduity, consistency, and hard work. We can ensure that our students acquire a body of knowledge which will support them in their professional endeavors. As for talent and personality, we can nurture and encourage these qualities, but not pin them down with numbers - yet these are probably more important to a musician than any of the factors which can be quantified.

ASSESSMENT SHOULD EMPHASIZE THE INDIVIDUAL.

A similar distinction may be made between "individual" and "aggregate" assessment. Peabody has a detailed and comprehensive system of individual assessment already in place, which tracks the progress of each student from admission through graduation and beyond. Several times each year, we assess students by means of auditions, juries, and academic reviews. Although we may use quantitative means in some instances, our main purpose is to form a picture of our students as individuals, so as better to help them achieve their potential. Since we have a relatively small student body (approximately 300 undergraduates) and know our students as individuals, we have little need for aggregate methods to tell us
how they are doing. But the fact that the information comes to us on an individual basis does make it harder for us to extrapolate to a wider picture when we need to do so.

Much of the problem has to do with music itself. The assumption behind most assessment schemes is that one is dealing with evidence which can be picked up and handled - an essay, a test paper, even a drawing. These things exist in space; music, by contrast, exists only in time. The portfolio approach to assessment implies looking at a number of pieces, of work side by side. But to do the same thing for a musical performer would involve listening to recordings of many performances, each of which would have to be played in real time. The process is enormously time-consuming and objective comparisons, whether between individuals or between various stages of the same individual's work, are virtually impossible because of the difficulty of juxtaposing the materials.

In practice, what we can compare is not the students' performances themselves, but the faculty evaluations of those performances. Each individual evaluation will be somewhat subjective, and it is generally impossible to set down absolute standards. But if sufficient faculty are involved in evaluating each student (as is the case with Peabody juries and recitals), and if each faculty member tracks the student's progress over a substantial period of time, then there is likely to be a reliable consensus as to how that student is doing. This works very well for individual departments, since the entire faculty evaluates the same group of people. But it is very difficult to compare performance standards across departments, except through the indirect evidence of the orchestras and other ensembles in which students of different majors all work together.

**ASSESSMENT BY JURY AND JURY COMMENT SHEETS**

Students in performance programs (who constitute 98% of all undergraduates) are evaluated on an annual basis by means of jury examinations performed before the entire faculty of their department. In spring 1993, a new type of jury form was introduced. These are three part self-carbon forms: one copy goes to the files, as before; one directly to the student; and one to the major teacher. Individual faculty members fill out grade sheets with written comments which go into the student's permanent file. Students are encouraged to visit the Registrar's Office to examine these comments.

Normally, the teacher also will discuss the jury performance with the student and use this as a means of summing up the work of the past year and setting goals for the future. All teachers, however, have their own methods, and there is no means of ensuring that 'the loop will be closed' in the same way in every case, or that it will even be closed at all. It does enable the teacher, however, to calibrate his or her judgment against that of the other faculty - and for the student to see the range of opinion that commonly exists in the profession.

**GRADUATION RECITAL: CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE AND FINAL ASSESSMENT**

Prior to graduation, students in performance programs also are evaluated by means of a senior recital performed before a committee of faculty of their department. Some performance areas also require a junior recital prior to the seventh semester. Passing the junior recital will advance the student to senior status and is a prerequisite for obtaining permission to prepare the senior recital.

Senior recitals are true capstone experiences of the kind the Commission on Undergraduate Education on hopes to encourage in other disciplines. They represent the culmination of several years of intense instrumental, vocal, and linguistic skills and repertoire acquisition, supported by the theoretical and historical knowledge which, by necessity, support this artistic enterprise. Both junior and senior recitals are public performances under the scrutiny not only of friends, family, and peers, but also of faculty who grade them.
AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

The existence of a formal mission statement is essential to outcomes assessment, since it articulates the goals against which outcomes may be measured. The revised Peabody mission statement is remarkable in that it places musical training firmly within the larger context of the musician's place in society and role as a human being. Professional success as defined by career moves and competition awards is thus by no means the only desirable outcome. In addition to the rigorous technical training which can so easily become the single narrow goal of many young musicians, and even for those who do pursue a career in these terms, the mission statement emphasizes “the education to become leaders in the cultural life of their communities.”

Peabody produces many musicians who are leaders in their fields. To maintain this ideal and to strengthen the preparation for leadership among its graduates, Peabody will have to make progress in a number of critical areas:

Departmental Reviews

The system of departmental self-studies leading to a written report to the Academic Council is long established, but does not have an impact due to the descriptive nature of these studies. The immediate discussions need to center on clear statements of pedagogical objectives and learning goals and the commitment of the faculty of the respective departments to assess their students’ achievements with respect to these goals. This pertains to academic as well as to performance faculty.

Course Syllabi and Grading Policies

Peabody requires all classroom faculty to submit course syllabi to the Faculty Secretary. Most syllabi have grading and attendance policies spelled out, but desired course outcomes are not routinely stated. Greater consistency will be sought in this area.

Grading Policies for Studio Lessons

The Peabody Undergraduate and Graduate Committees passed a resolution at their November/December 2003 meetings to require all faculty to file grading policies for their courses. The resolution will be submitted to a vote by the Council of Chairs, with the hope of giving students clear guidelines as to expectations and grading policies for private lessons. As previously mentioned, some syllabi have this information. This policy will include studio faculty, however, who generally do not use course outlines and, up to the present, have not been asked to furnish this information.

Faculty Accountability

As described under Standard 10, great strides have been made during the last few years to convince faculty that a formal review process will be inevitable if there is to be any kind of progress towards long-range contracts, a formalized salary structure, or any kind of ranking. Unlike many schools, Peabody has never had a formal system of faculty evaluation, whether through peer evaluation or student feedback. The reasons for this lie in the Conservatory tradition, which has grown up around a number of master teachers and their individual pupils. The privacy of the studio has been regarded as sacrosanct, and faculty have long resisted any attempt to prescribe teaching methods or to make value judgments between one teacher and another. It is significant that Peabody faculty have neither rank nor tenure.

However, several things have happened in recent years to break down the faculty's resistance to evaluation. One has been the gradual acceptance of the educational philosophy stated in the new mission
statement, which gives classroom, ensemble, and social experience equal place with the technical training which goes on in the studios. Along with this has come the appointment over the past decade of a large number of new faculty, especially in the classroom areas, who come from different traditions and who look for the support which orderly feedback can provide. Also, the Director of the Institute as well as the Dean of the Conservatory have been insistent that some form of faculty evaluation must be put into place and are working with the Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Committee to establish a mechanism for mandatory classroom and studio evaluation. This move towards greater accountability by all segments of the Peabody community also is supported by the Change Team, a group of faculty, administrators and staff members charged by the Director of the Institute to examine a number of criteria deemed crucial as Peabody prepares itself to rise to the next level of excellence in the years and decades ahead.

**Final Comment**

Peabody’s former mission statement ended with the following paragraph:

The Peabody Institute has become an acknowledged leader in the cultural life of Maryland and has built a reputation that is truly international. As a division of the Johns Hopkins University, Peabody takes its place beside the other world-famous centers of research and learning in the sciences, humanities, and medicine, poised to define the contribution of music in our lives as we enter the twenty-first century.

We believe this to be a true assessment of the past as well as of Peabody’s path and commitment for the future.
CHAPTER 5: THE SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES IN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION SELF-STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

From its founding in 1909, the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education (SPSBE) has a distinguished history of serving adults who seek to advance themselves while fulfilling work and family obligations. Throughout its nearly 100 year evolution, SPSBE has served regional needs for workforce development in the areas of business, information technology, public safety leadership, and P-12 education through innovative academic programs and partnerships with the school systems, corporations, government agencies, and not-for-profit organizations of the Baltimore-Washington community.

Many of SPSBE’s innovative programs, designed to meet regional needs, have emerged as national models for best practices in university-community partnerships. Across the years, SPSBE has achieved significant milestones for Hopkins: it was the first Homewood School to admit women as undergraduates; the first to offer Hopkins degrees for working professionals enrolled on a part-time basis; and the first to extend Hopkins’ reach across the region by opening off campus centers.

THE UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE

In 1997, SPSBE reconfirmed its commitment to the adult undergraduate through the establishment of the Division of Undergraduate Studies (UGS) headed by an Assistant Dean to advocate for the unique needs of adult undergraduates. This division monitors the undergraduate experience and recommends supportive policies and procedures. The Division of Public Safety Leadership (PSL), established in 2002, houses its own undergraduates while maintaining a close relationship with the UGS to ensure consistency among admissions for all SPSBE undergraduates. The two divisions share a common admissions advisor and work cooperatively to assure the success of adult undergraduates.

These divisions provide standards-based programs in applied disciplines, often targeted to workforce needs and delivered in flexible and accommodating schedules, locations, and formats. Their faculty blend research and expert practice in educational experiences that students can apply immediately to the issues in their workplace.

The faculty serving adult undergraduates consists of full-time faculty and faculty associates who together are involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the curriculum. Full-time faculty serve as the Program Directors for the major discipline areas: Business and Management, Information Systems, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Police Executive Leadership. They represent the needs of undergraduates on the Academic Policy Council and the Academic Council. In addition, they expend considerable effort and resources to forge and strengthen an engaged adult undergraduate learning community that participates in the academic and social life of the School and the University.

STANDARDS-BASED LEARNING OUTCOMES

The Divisions of Undergraduate Studies and Public Safety Leadership strive to provide a rigorous, integrated, outcomes-based academic experience grounded in standards (when available) and measured through authentic assessment processes. The faculty are engaged in a multi-year process that involves the
development of undergraduate competencies in general education, the identification of unique professional standards and indicators, and a program monitoring/evaluation system for continuous program improvement. It is the School’s intent that the Undergraduate Competencies define the adult undergraduate experience, regardless of major, and serve as the hallmark of its graduates.

Faculty have been trained to redesign their courses from an assessment perspective. Many have designed and aligned their syllabi to center on learning outcomes and are creating varied assessments to serve as indicators of successful student learning. They also are examining their instructional strategies to strengthen the relationship between instruction and outcomes. The next step in this process will be the integration of a portfolio assessment process that will illustrate student-learning outcomes and will be defended before a panel of faculty and expert practitioners.

**FLEXIBLE DELIVERY OF INSTRUCTION**

Undergraduate programs are available in either the traditional 15-week semester format or a cohort format (at the upper-level) depending on the specific program. In response to demand, programs are located at five campus locations throughout the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan region and at partnership sites. All programs and sites are supported with academic advising and student services. Undergraduate programs have both internal (SPSBE and the University) and external (businesses, nonprofits, government agencies, and corporations) partnerships.

UGS has focused on building the cohort format to facilitate the educational goals of adult undergraduates. By its nature, this format requires students to be stronger academically at admission and to garner the support of family and employers. Students in the cohorts receive extensive advising. Students commit to a prescribed 30-month program of study with a set schedule and program plan. The students form a bond of support that encourages completion (94% graduation rate) and often remains long after graduation. SPSBE’s approach to undergraduate education has been included in a University Continuing Education Association (UCEA) pending publication on models of excellence in adult undergraduate education.

**MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION ACCREDITATION STANDARDS**

Faculty and staff from the Division of Undergraduate Studies and the Division of Public Safety Leadership formed a working group to engage in a self-study of the undergraduate experience in the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. They created a matrix of the evidence that addresses the *Fundamental Elements* and, where relevant, the *Optional Analysis and Evidence* within the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) Accreditation Standards 1, 8 through 12, and 14 (Appendix 5-A). The narrative below provides additional information on initiatives and identified needs in relation to the matrix.

**STANDARD 1: MISSION, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES**

**SPSBE CORE VALUES**

SPSBE has a clearly articulated mission aligned with the mission of the University.

*SPSBE seeks to improve the quality of life in the Baltimore-Washington region – and beyond – through the creation of exemplary models for university support of business and educational institutions and activities.*
A group representing a cross-section of SPSBE constituencies developed the *Vision 2009* document that established the core values of community, learning, scholarship, creativity and innovation, diversity and civility, collaboration, financial responsibility, and continuous improvement. *Vision 2009* guides faculty, staff, and governing bodies in determining priorities and resources for activities within the School. Faculty and staff regularly use it to determine priorities for undergraduate initiatives.

**ALIGNMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE COMPETENCIES**

The SPSBE Undergraduate Competencies (UGC), developed by the undergraduate faculty, are outlined in the 2003-04 academic catalog. The UGC are aligned with the mission statement of the CUE Final Report, with the SPSBE core values, and with the individual program goals and course objectives.

The Undergraduate Competencies describe expected outcomes for student learning. They include: oral and written communication, critical thinking and problem-solving, human relations, leadership and change, value-based decision-making, technology proficiency, historical and global perspectives, aesthetic appreciation, a sense of lifelong personal and professional development, and information literacy. The UGC are derived from the continuous dialogue and research by the faculty to ensure that students have an effective and comprehensive educational experience. They are regularly measured against guidelines from professional associations, similar programs and academic disciplines to continuously improve the Hopkins adult undergraduate experience.

The UGC are integral to the general education requirements and the major concentrations within each program. They are integrated throughout the individual courses of each program. Faculty are engaged in an instructional design process to develop learning outcomes-based programs and courses based on the UGC, national professional standards, and workforce trends.

Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 1 is found in the SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A). This evidence includes information garnered from course midterm feedback and IDEA Form Evaluations. It also includes policies and procedures, council and committee minutes, and division agendas.

Additional evidence includes a diverse student body and a 94% graduation rate. The Alpha Sigma Lambda Honor Society provides orientation services and tutoring to fellow students. Qualitative evidence exists in graduate school acceptances, senior projects, and job advancements and promotions. The five year SPSBE Student Satisfaction Survey and the new Alumni Survey provide feedback on the students’ experience. Additional mechanisms to gather quantitative evidence of student learning include the new Undergraduate Experience Survey, the senior and community-oriented student projects, and the initiatives of the student honor society.

Moreover, initial efforts to create a community of learners among adult undergraduates and faculty show promise. National figures from the business field speak at a funded, annual undergraduate symposium. An annual networking event, honor society installations, and an annual recognition ceremony provide the opportunity for social interaction and relationship building.

**STANDARD 8: STUDENT ADMISSIONS**

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education admits students whose goals and abilities are congruent with its mission and whose interests align with business and management, information systems, interdisciplinary studies, and police executive leadership. A noted strength of the undergraduate programs is the service provided to potential and enrolled students by academic advisors.
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

**ADMISSIONS ADVISING**

Each applicant to a SPSBE undergraduate program has an admissions interview with an advisor and a review by the appropriate Program Director. Advising services during the admissions process include a review of prior academic work and educational goals, and an inventory of personal time commitments and support systems. The services also include extensive explanations of the programs, academic requirements, and the Undergraduate Competencies. During graduation exit interviews, students consistently report the value and helpfulness of these services.

Information is available to students on the School’s website, in the academic catalog, in brochures, on admission and program worksheets, and on information sheets. Examples of senior projects are available for review by prospective students.

The adult undergraduate student population contributes to the diversity within the School and the University with 28% representing African-American, Asian, and Hispanic populations and 64% women. In addition, a large number of Hopkins employees enroll in courses at the undergraduate lower-levels. Current efforts to support the success of these students and to prepare them to matriculate into degree programs need to be expanded.

**FACULTY AND ADVISORS**

Students have access to an assigned advisor and Program Director. Consistency in advising across divisions is ensured through the use of a common advisor in the admissions process.

Pre-admissions advising and support are available to students who intend to transfer into Hopkins. Advising for admissions is regularly available onsite at partnership programs. Feedback from the SPSBE Student Satisfaction Survey, administered every five years, indicates that students are satisfied with their advising experience.

**ADMISSIONS PROCESS**

Applicants are admitted into programs designed specifically for adults, if they meet admission criteria that include the completion of at least 15 academic credits. Applicants for cohort programs must meet more rigorous criteria including the need to provide evidence of family and employer support. Entry into the Police Executive Leadership Undergraduate Program (PELP) is only by nomination of a superior officer. Articulation agreements have been developed and are regularly revisited with regional community colleges to maximize a smooth transition into the discipline specific programs.

Applicants present transcripts, essays, and resumes as evidence of proficiency levels in the competencies to be used to create appropriate academic program plans. Applicants for the traditional format and those for cohort formats receive an academic program plan or schedule. Advisors and faculty members work together to ensure appropriate advisement and support throughout the students’ tenure. Programs are kept small to facilitate student-faculty interaction.

Matriculated students tend to remain in school and make progress. Sixty-six percent of admitted students graduate within three years. Adult undergraduates who enter the cohort programs have a graduation rate of 94%. Cohort classes form virtual support groups for their members. These support systems are strong, effective, extend into students’ personal lives, and in many cases continue beyond the tenure of the programs. Upon completion of their undergraduate studies, students pursue graduate school, earn job promotions, seek new careers, or explore new personal interests.
Students who qualify for admission to a program that has insufficient space are placed on a wait list. Applicants who, matriculate are at the lower undergraduate level, mostly Hopkins employees, are guided through general education requirements.

**FINANCIAL AID**

Applicants receive extensive advising and support from the SPSBE financial aid office. SPSBE is in the process of increasing its endowment to make more scholarship funds available to students, 31% of whom are on financial aid. Within the last five years the amount of scholarship funds has increased substantially, but there remains a large gap between available funds and qualified applicants. As part of the new Baltimore Scholars Program, SPSBE will provide full tuition to Baltimore city residents (with three years of residency) who graduate from Baltimore City Community College (BCCC) and meet the criteria for admission into the undergraduate programs.

Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 8 is found in the attached SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A). Feedback from a periodic review of the admissions process guides modifications to the process and content. Anecdotal data indicate that a more lucrative financial aid package is often a factor that contributes to accepted candidates attending other institutions.

A major premise of Hopkins’ adult undergraduate programs is that flexible and responsive formats can be developed and used successfully without compromising the quality of the academic experience. Given that many adult undergraduate programs sacrifice quality for expediency, SPSBE programs are beginning to attract the attention of experts in the field. The systematic study of this model and its impact is a new focus within SPSBE. Initial efforts are underway to examine the conditions that motivate enrollment and maximize success in adult undergraduate students. Key members of the undergraduate division and the Dean’s Office have met to discuss plans for a Center of Adult Learning and have included its establishment in the current development campaign.

**STANDARD 9: STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES**

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education offers strong and continuous support to its returning adult undergraduates through its admission, advising, enrollment management, and other student services. Academic advisors provide advising support from the point of inquiry through graduation. Undergraduate faculty provide advising services in relation to program requirements. Advisors and faculty work closely together to address student needs and are regularly accessible both electronically and in person at times and locations accessible to students. Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 9 is found in the SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A).

**ADVISING**

Undergraduate students have regular access to academic and support services throughout their academic tenure. The advising process is flexible yet timely to meet the needs of working adult students at multiple locations. Qualified professionals with advanced degrees and extensive experience serve as advisors. They review transcripts, facilitate credit transfer, assist with course selection, suggest academic skill preparation, explain program demands, and guide general education course selection. Advisors also educate potential students regarding the rigors of the program and urge them to seek the support of their employers and families. Advisors act as advocates for students and help design student-centered policies and procedures. Finally, advisors assist students during personal crises. Issues that require expertise beyond that of the advisors and faculty are referred to the Office of Student Services.
ADVISORY RECORDS

SPSBE’s academic advisors as well as its Office of Enrollment Management maintain advising records in locked files. Admissions and advising records are secured and available to authorized personnel and are signed out when removed from the files. Records of graduates are secured in an archive and are available to authorized personnel through written request. Discarded records are shredded before being disposed. The Office of Enrollment Management has policies and procedures for safe and secure maintenance of student records. Student support services are assessed continuously under the direction of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs.

THE CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

The SPSBE Center for Teaching and Learning provides undergraduates with online learning resources, a learning resource library, online Blackboard platform support, and the contact for the Tutorial Referral Network.

STUDENT COMPLAINTS, GRIEVANCES, AND CODE OF CONDUCT

The policies and procedures for addressing complaints and grievances are published annually and are designed with multiple appeal layers to ensure that students’ needs are given all due consideration. A student code of conduct has been developed to supplement the academic code of conduct. Issues that arise are addressed first through discussion with the involved parties. If not resolved, they are then referred to the Program Director with appeals to the division director and finally to the Dean of the School. Appeals to the Dean are addressed through an appeals committee. Student misconduct is addressed in a similar fashion. Records of student complaints or grievances are kept secure in the Dean’s Office.

Consistent with the thrust of the CUE recommendations, the Academic Policy Council (APC) has recently engaged in serious review of the issues of cheating and plagiarism. APC has developed appropriate policies and commissioned the creation of an online tutorial on cheating and plagiarism, currently being piloted, to ensure that the SPSBE community has a common understanding of appropriate behavior. One suggestion under consideration, proposed by an undergraduate student representative on the Council, is currently being piloted the creation of an honors board to address such issues.

STUDENT SERVICES

Student Services works in conjunction with the academic units to create a responsive system to address the various needs of returning adult undergraduates. These offices advocate for students within the School and the University community at large. Student Services encompasses Admissions, Financial Aid, the Registrar, International and Disability Services, and Career Services. These offices process admissions applications, offer a menu of financial support, provide records and registration related services, support students with special needs, assist international students, and help students and alumni with all phases of career development. Student services also supports student organizations and provides opportunities for students to network and socialize.

The Registrar designs systems to accommodate various calendars and schedules associated with diverse and dispersed academic programs that vary by term, format, location, and partnership arrangement. Qualified professionals with advanced degrees and extensive experience serve as providers and supervisors of student support services.
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The SPSBE Office of Financial Aid works closely with the academic units to identify all possible financial aid support for which individual students are eligible. In emergency situations the Financial Aid Office works in conjunction with the Registrar’s Office and the academic units to provide all possible support to students.

In addition to federal aid, SPSBE has sought to increase the number and amount of available grants and scholarships and instituted more flexible payment plans to support undergraduates. To this end, SPSBE has made a major effort to grow its endowment. The newly established Decker-Gabor Scholarship provides full financial support for an outstanding student with financial need. The Offices of Development and Financial Aid work with the academic divisions to help provide funds for high quality students with demonstrated financial need. Moreover, SPSBE has made a payment plan available for students. The creation of an emergency loan fund remains a high priority.

The Office of Career Services offers a variety of services, mostly online, to accommodate the demanding schedules of SPSBE students and alumni. Individual career counseling is available by appointment in Baltimore, D.C., Columbia, and Montgomery County and is supported by various career and personality inventories as well as a career library. All job and internship listings are managed via E-Recruiting that also contains targeted resume books, a SPSBE Networking System, and an Employer Contact Database. Other services include a newsletter, expert panels, career information services, job search workshops, and resume development and interview support.

Issues and concerns regarding the effectiveness or need for change for student support services are addressed as identified and appropriate solutions are developed, approved, and implemented through the Academic Policy Council and other groups.

**STUDENT SURVEYS**

SPSBE conducts a Student Satisfaction Survey every five years that includes questions aimed at gathering data on the effectiveness of the services available to students. These surveys reflect high satisfaction levels among graduates. An Alumni Survey was conducted in spring 2003 to gather data on the experience of alumni and the impact of their education on their professional lives. Advisors conduct Exit Surveys as part of the graduation process. There is a need for the consistent tracking of graduates of the undergraduate programs in SPSBE that is being addressed by the Undergraduate Experience Survey.

**STANDARD 10: FACULTY**

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education’s instructional, research, and service programs are devised, monitored, and supported by faculty and other professionals qualified for the positions they hold, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and sufficiently numerous to fulfill those roles appropriately. Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 10 is found in the attached SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A).

The full-time faculty are recruited and selected through a rigorous process that involves a national search, extensive minority recruitment, a teaching demonstration, and multiple interviews by faculty and senior administrators. Quality of teaching is a critical component of this process.

Part-time faculty are selected by appropriate Program Directors from expert practitioners in the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area. The process includes the selection of candidates from recommendations, encouragement of minority candidates, the review of the candidate’s curriculum vita, and an extensive interview process. The candidates’ credentials and a list of appropriate courses for
assignment are forwarded to the Division’s Faculty Review Committee for approval. Faculty are required to submit a syllabus for each of their courses and an updated CV each year.

Qualified faculty and other professionals design, maintain, and update educational curricula. Changes to courses and programs are made from a systemic perspective to address effectively identified needs within the discipline. Faculty meetings are devoted to the review and, when deemed necessary, the revision of curriculum. The Academic Policy Council recommends proposed program changes that are approved by the Academic Council. New programs or those with substantive changes are forwarded to the University’s Committee on Part-time Education for an internal University-wide review and then to the Maryland Higher Education Commission for final approval.

Within the Division each instructor receives feedback from students through a midterm course evaluation form and an IDEA Survey form. The results of these are used to monitor the effectiveness of teaching and to alert the departments to instructor/course issues. The effectiveness of the current midterm feedback process is being enhanced through the implementation of an electronic delivery and dissemination system that will be piloted in classes during the spring 2004 semester.

Full-time faculty engage in professional growth activities. They have budgeted funds to support their attendance at conferences and meetings for the purpose of sharing their expertise and providing service to their profession. Scholarship is a topic of discussion at all division and department meetings, and part-time faculty meetings include faculty professional development activities.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) provides continuous support for instructors and conducts faculty development activities throughout the academic year. The CTL hosts a faculty website that includes resources for effective teaching and professional development. Through a grant-funded initiative CTL trains selected faculty to design instruction from an assessment perspective using the principles of Understanding by Design. These faculty in turn serve as guides on assessment-based instructional strategies to other faculty.

Each year, a faculty associate is selected from the undergraduate division and recognized by the University to receive the Excellence in Teaching Award. This award includes a cash gift provided by the alumni office and awarded at a formal dinner celebration as well as recognition in an extensive article in The Gazette (the University newspaper). Faculty associates are included in faculty meetings and faculty development initiatives with the full-time faculty.

SPSBE recognizes the appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service. The faculty promotion process addresses four criteria: teaching and advising, program development, scholarship, and community service. Each year full-time faculty submit the Faculty Activity Report to reflect their work in these areas. The standards and procedures for faculty and other professionals’ appointments, promotions, grievances, discipline and dismissal are based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons.

The Faculty Appointments and Promotion Committee evaluates the credentials of the full-time faculty and makes recommendations to the Academic Council for initial rank and promotion of the faculty. This committee also provides technical support and guidance to faculty preparing promotion portfolios.

SPSBE has carefully articulated equitable and implemented procedures and criteria for review of all individuals who have responsibility for the educational programs of the institution. Faculty and Program

---

Directors have clearly articulated job descriptions that assign them responsibility for the success of their students and the growth of their programs. In addition, they meet regularly with their division directors who meet regularly with the Dean of the School. Moreover, faculty and Program Directors complete Performance Reviews or Faculty Activity Reports that are reviewed by their division directors.

There are extensive procedures for the appointment, supervision, and review of effective teaching for full-time faculty and faculty associates. SPSBE engages expert practitioners as faculty associates to prepare effectively students for their chosen disciplines. These faculty associates are integral members of their programs and engage in the development and monitoring of the student learning. They are selected through a process that includes a curriculum vita/resume, an interview by the Program Director, a formal approval of their credentials by the Undergraduate Faculty Review Committee, and a clear indication of the courses that they are approved to teach.

**STANDARD 11: EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS**

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education provides rigorous and coherent undergraduate programs for adults based on national discipline standards and trends; they are offered in flexible and responsive formats for the working professional. SPSBE undergraduate programs for adults are designed to foster a coherent learning experience and to promote a synthesis of learning. Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 11 is found in the attached SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A).

Program Directors and expert practitioners prepare students for professional advancement or graduate study. For each of the disciplines, advisory committees consisting of faculty and expert professionals regularly advise Program Directors on the design and evaluation of programs from the professional viewpoint. In addition, professional associations provide advice on program content and format during the development process. The School’s Academic Policy Council reviews and recommends approval of new programs or concentrations within programs. The Academic Council provides approval from SPSBE before the program is submitted for final approval to the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

Faculty integrate the Undergraduate Competencies and individual program goals through a combination of general education with discipline knowledge and skills. The course outcomes are aligned with the program goals and the UGC. Courses are sequenced to build on previous learning experiences. Through a final project or capstone, students address a real life business issue or conduct a research project.

Program goals are stated in terms of student learning outcomes. Faculty align discipline standards, undergraduate competencies and program goals with specific course objectives from an assessment perspective. Faculty meetings, advisory committees, midterm feedback forms, IDEA course evaluations, periodic Student Satisfaction Surveys, informal student-faculty conversations, alumni feedback, and class observations are used to continuously monitor progress toward achieving the UGC and program goals.

The co-curricular activities for SPSBE undergraduates create community, celebrate achievements, and provide opportunities for community service while responding to the unique needs of the working professional. SPSBE has an active chapter of Alpha Sigma Lambda (ASL), an honor society for adult undergraduates. Focused on scholarship, leadership, and service, ASL members provide tutoring services, host lectures, and engage in student recruitment. In addition, SPSBE works closely with Delta Sigma Pi, a business fraternity, to encourage students to become part of this lifelong network of students and alumni.
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The Division of Undergraduate Studies annually hosts three critical events that bring students from diverse disciplines and campus locations together to create and sustain a single learning community. The annual fall networking event brings students, faculty, alumni, and friends together. The spring symposium with a leading business leader as a speaker expands the intellectual community beyond the confines of the classroom. The Undergraduate Recognition Ceremony at graduation provides the opportunity for students and graduates to celebrate their achievements with their families, friends, and faculty.

**Facilities, Technology, and Library Support**

SPSBE undergraduates benefit from excellent facilities designed for professionals at the School’s multiple campus locations. Food service is available through small cafes at each SPSBE site, and as one result of the CUE recommendations, the dining services at Homewood have extended meal hours to accommodate adult undergraduate students.

Students have access to state-of-the-art technologies and library support. Each campus site has facilities with open lab time for technology-based classes. In addition, off campus sites have “smart classrooms” that are equipped with wireless technology access. Grant funds targeted to technology support for undergraduate information systems programs supported much of this development (*MAITI*). All courses are supported by the Blackboard platform, and the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) offers Blackboard training to faculty. Both students and faculty access technical support for Blackboard through CTL.

Currently the UGS is collaborating with six universities in the United States and Europe in the EUMAX Partnership to provide an international dimension to adult undergraduate business programs. Should this initiative receive funding, a high-speed Internet connection will connect students in real time across the two continents to exchange information and discuss ideas related to international business.

Librarians, assigned to each campus, are available to assist SPSBE students and faculty in identifying and securing appropriate resources for courses and projects. Librarians provide class sessions and tutorials on use of the library and the virtual library from the perspectives of different disciplines. All materials at the Sheridan Libraries are available free of charge to remote sites with many full-text resources available online.

**Information Literacy**

In addition, resource librarians and the information systems faculty have developed and piloted an information literacy project targeted to technology students. Plans are for this project to expand to SPSBE business and interdisciplinary studies undergraduate programs. In conjunction with this project, the Program Directors have developed information literacy components in the communication sequence for the majors.

**Adult Undergraduates**

SPSBE designs programs and policies that are rigorous, yet flexible to support the unique needs of adult undergraduates. There is no content and quality difference among programs offered at different sites, or between those offered in traditional (Homewood only) or accelerated formats. Courses are scheduled to include time for examinations and final papers. Students are able to take similar courses scheduled at different locations. Faculty teach at multiple sites and in both traditional and accelerated formats. Students who apply for programs in accelerated format are expected to demonstrate higher academic performance and committed support from their family and workplace.
**TRANSFER POLICY AND PRACTICE**

The majority of the students in the undergraduate programs transfer from other institutions. Transfer policies and practices are designed to be flexible and accommodating while ensuring that students have sufficient preparation for the rigorous demands of the major. To maintain consistency, the admissions director in consultation with Program Directors makes transfer decisions with written rationales for any variations.

New processes are being developed to collect additional student outcomes data. A pilot of the Undergraduate Experience Survey has been conducted, and the results are being used to make final modifications.

**STANDARD 12: GENERAL EDUCATION**

The undergraduate full-time faculty in the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education developed, implement, and continuously renew the Undergraduate Competencies, which guide the undergraduate general education experience. The list of UGC is the result of extensive discussion and analysis of what constitutes the hallmark of the SPSBE undergraduate experience. The UGC are met through learning experiences in both general education and the major. To ensure engaging intellectual interactions between faculty and students, the undergraduate general education courses are held to limited enrollments. Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 12 is found in the attached SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A).

The UGC integrate and promote students’ critical thinking, problem-solving, communication skills, ethical decision-making, information literacy, technical skill and analysis, human relation skills, global awareness, historical perspective, civility, and continued professional and personal development. The UGC provide the students with a broad exposure to varied ideas and deep understandings of academic skills and ethical dispositions.

Program Directors meet monthly to discuss approaches to integrate more fully the UGC throughout the undergraduates’ educational experiences with special emphasis on the major. Faculty development activities assist faculty associates to incorporate the UGC into their course objectives.

Most students transfer into the degree programs at the upper-level and fulfill their general education requirements through transfer of credits. Students (mainly Hopkins employees), who complete the majority of their lower-level coursework within SPSBE, experience a program centered on the UGC. Both groups are required to have 30 credits in general education. In addition, both groups experience the integration of the UGC through specific required courses and learning experiences in the major.

Because a majority of students transfer into the degree programs, a challenge facing SPSBE is to ensure that these transfer students achieve the UGC. The Program Directors have worked together to design an approach to address this need effectively. It involves a sequence of courses that are anchored by a writing and research course at the beginning of each major course of study, a professional communications course at the midpoint of the major, and an applied or research project as a capstone. The first and last courses of the sequence were developed three years ago. The professional communications course was added for the current year in response to feedback on the annual program reviews.

Currently, the faculty are reviewing detailed descriptions of the competencies to assist in the process of clearly identifying and measuring outcomes. These will then be integrated into the course outcomes to illustrate integration across the undergraduate academic experience. These descriptions will serve as the
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indicators for a student portfolio development and defense process that is in the planning stages and will be used to more fully demonstrate students’ achievement of the UGC competencies.

A major initiative in SPSBE is a renewed emphasis on ethics. Specifically, a tutorial addressing plagiarism and cheating has been developed and is being piloted with the members of the Academic Policy Council. The business and information technology faculty reviewed this pilot and have made plans to incorporate it into their courses.

**STANDARD 14: ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING**

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education prepares professionals for initial career preparation and/or advancement. Faculty develop programs and courses that focus on the assessment of student learning demonstrated in the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of its graduates. Evidence for the achievement of MSCHE Standard 14 is found in the attached SPSBE Middle States Accreditation Standards Matrix (Appendix 5-A).

The Undergraduate Competencies from SPSBE served as a foundation for the new mission statement for undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins, as indicated in the CUE Final Report. SPSBE undergraduate divisions have examined their programs through the lens of the CUE Final Report and have developed initiatives based on its recommendations.

The CUE and MSCHE self-study processes coincide with the faculty’s efforts and plans to expand current qualitative and quantitative data-gathering and analysis from a student outcomes perspective. Full-time faculty and faculty associates are restructuring their courses from an assessment perspective focused on student learning outcomes. They are aligning their course outcomes with program goals that, in turn, are being aligned with the SPSBE Undergraduate Competencies, the SPBE core values, and the CUE mission dimensions. Program Directors are beginning to develop matrices to illustrate the alignment of specific course outcomes with program goals and the Undergraduate Competencies.

**FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES**

The process of aligning course activities and assessments to identified outcomes is integral and continuous for all programs and faculty. To facilitate the shift to a student learning outcomes perspective, the undergraduate business Program Director and two faculty associates assessed and modified their courses through participation in a School-wide pilot outcomes-based instructional design process. They shared their findings with the SPSBE deans, full-time faculty, and faculty associates.

Based on the results of the pilot, undergraduate Program Directors are guiding their faculty associates in the redesign of syllabi and courses based on student learning outcomes. Through workshops and individual sessions, faculty learned to examine their courses from an assessment perspective by establishing course goals and their respective indicators. They then used these to identify specific learning objectives, assessment strategies, and instructional techniques. The target date for the conversion of all business syllabi to the outcomes approach is the end of the spring 2004 semester; all information systems and interdisciplinary studies syllabi will be converted by the end of fall 2004.

**FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION**

A midterm evaluation and the IDEA form are administered at the midpoint and end of each course to help Program Directors monitor the quality of the students’ educational experiences.
Midterm Feedback Forms were developed by the faculty to provide an interim process for receiving information regarding the student’s perceived experience so that adjustments could be made as needed. Program Directors and division directors review all Midterm Feedback Forms and provide indicated guidance and/or support to the faculty. A database summary of each group of evaluations is kept on each course and instructor and used to determine future faculty development initiatives.

The IDEA form is administered at the end of each semester. It allows the instructor to rate a list of criteria in order of their importance to the course. This rating is compared to the students’ experience in the course. Program Directors and division directors review each IDEA report and share the results with their faculty members. Program Directors intervene directly or by referral to the Center for Teaching and Learning to assist faculty whose performance indicates a need for improvement. A database of faculty performance on the IDEA form is maintained and used in faculty development and hiring decisions. Future faculty development activities are being planned to more closely align the UGC and the IDEA form faculty rating system.

**CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE AND PORTFOLIO PLANS**

The senior project serves as the capstone experience in the SPSBE undergraduate major. As such, undergraduate faculty ensure that students are able to integrate general education competencies, discipline knowledge and skill, and professional dispositions appropriate for each major. To accomplish this, faculty have instituted major changes over the last three years to prepare students effectively and to provide them with the opportunity to demonstrate their learning. Faculty have modified the requirements of the programs to include additional writing, professional communications, and research learning experiences.

Senior projects place emphasis on the proposal development process and the components of a research project including, if necessary, approval of the JHU Institutional Research Board for use of human subjects. Sponsors are carefully selected for their interest in and ability to support the students throughout the entire research process. In addition, regular seminars are held under the direction of a coordinator to provide support and ensure consistency in the students’ experience.

At present, faculty are developing plans for a portfolio process and have created the Undergraduate Experience Survey to enhance the data-gathering process needed to demonstrate students’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions consistent with identified student learning outcomes. Once the portfolio process is implemented, students will defend their accumulated undergraduate experience before a panel of faculty and expert practitioners. This will provide authentic feedback to the students in relation to their future professional development and to the Program Directors in regard to program development efforts.

**STUDENT AND GRADUATE SURVEYS**

Currently, SPSBE conducts a Student Satisfaction Survey every five years. The results of the last survey were shared among the SPSBE leadership and used as a catalyst for change in the students’ experiences. A new Alumni Survey has been developed and administered in spring 2003 to recent SPSBE graduates at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Results from this survey are being analyzed to determine potential areas for change.

Faculty, staff, and advisors have recently developed an Undergraduate Experience Survey to provide additional feedback regarding the students’ experiences and their impact. The survey was sent to May 2002 and 2003 graduates. Additional versions of the survey will be administered to students at program entry, after the completion of 90 credits, at graduation, and at both two years and five years after graduation.
SUMMARY

The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education serves returning adult undergraduate students with family and work responsibilities. The two divisions that provide undergraduate education, Undergraduate Studies and Public Safety Leadership, work together to provide a quality academic experience in a flexible and supportive environment.

The Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education self-study processes provided the opportunity to examine the undergraduate experience through a set of external lenses. The self-study process affirmed efforts and faculty development activities within SPSBE to focus instruction on the assessment of student learning outcomes. It also served as a catalyst to accelerate the instructional development initiative designed to accomplish that goal.

In the self-study process members of the SPSBE undergraduate community identified strengths, current initiatives, and new challenges in relation to the 34 CUE recommendations as indicated in the SPSBE Status Implementation of CUE Final Report recommendations found in the SPSBE Document Resource File.

STRENGTHS IN RELATION TO THE CUE RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, SPSBE’s strengths in relation to the academic experience include: an assistant dean position that advocates for undergraduates and is part of the Dean’s leadership team; capstone and/or senior project experiences in all undergraduate programs; small group formats for all programs; and an emphasis on integrity in conduct and academics. Other strengths include excellent teaching facilities at sites beyond the main campus and rewards for good teaching that include a significant emphasis on teaching for promotion and the Excellence in Teaching Award. Moreover, enrollments are targeted to match resources, and schedules and formats are consistent and designed to meet student needs.

Strengths in regard to advising and career support include: an excellent and accessible advising support system that involves assigned professional advisors and faculty; the centralization of the admissions and graduation advising processes; an Office of Career Services that is housed in Columbia but accessible to all SPSBE students; employment support for undergraduates; and a regular process for student feedback.

In reference to the CUE recommendations on diversity, SPSBE has a substantial number of undergraduate students representing minority groups. The graduation rate for SPSBE students enrolled in the cohort programs is 94% with two thirds of them graduating within three years. Each year, the curriculum is reviewed from a diversity perspective and revised, if indicated, based on information from evaluations, surveys, workforce trends, professional standards, student feedback, advisory group suggestions, and faculty discussions. SPSBE funds an annual undergraduate spring symposium to enable students to interact with national business leaders. Lastly, the composition of the staff in SPSBE includes representation from minority populations.

In relation to student life, SPSBE has created or has available facilities for informal student-faculty interaction and group projects at all of its sites. These sites all offer appropriate food services. The academic administrators, including the Dean of the School, interact regularly with the students at all campus sites to gather feedback regarding the undergraduate experience.
IN\[\text{INITIATIVES IN RESPONSE TO THE CUE RECOMMENDATIONS}\]

With respect to the current efforts that advance the undergraduate academic experience, the CUE and the MSCH\[\text{E self-study processes have provided impetus to the efforts to expand and refine data-gathering processes in regard to program reviews. These initiatives include the SPSBE Alumni Survey; the new SPSBE Undergraduate Experience Survey with its multiple data-gathering points; and the refinement of the approach to gathering evidence of student learning in relation to the undergraduate competencies and program goals. There remains the constant challenge to identify opportunities to reward faculty for good teaching. Finally, the EUMAX partnership with three American and three European universities, if funded, would add an international dimension to the SPSBE undergraduate experience.}\]

In regard to teaching and advising, the CUE and MSCHE processes have encouraged faculty to continue to engage extensively in student advising. They have served as the catalyst to initiate the scheduling of regular meetings between the two divisions serving undergraduates in order to share successes and to address common needs and issues. The Office of Career Services has begun to focus efforts on the unique employment needs of undergraduates. Technical facilities at Homewood are being enhanced, and the SPSBE facilities in addition to Homewood are continuously updated. The data gathered from the SPSBE Alumni Survey and the new SPSBE Undergraduate Experience Survey will enhance efforts to track graduates and improve advising and career support.

In relation to the CUE recommendations addressing diversity, SPSBE is preparing to implement the Baltimore Scholars Program that will provide full scholarships to qualified graduates of Baltimore City Community College. Also, SPSBE continues its concerted effort to recruit qualified minority faculty to both full-time and faculty associate positions. Lastly, in reference to student life, the CUE recommendations have resulted in extending the Homewood campus food service hours in the evening to better accommodate adult undergraduate students.

CONCLUSION

Through engagement in the Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Middle States Commission on Higher Education self-study processes, SPSBE administrators, faculty, students, and staff have grown in their knowledge and understanding of the adult undergraduate experience. These processes provided the opportunity to reflect upon the selected topic (in this case, undergraduate education) and to reinforce and expand existing continuous quality movement efforts. Moreover, these processes require extensive interactions of the entire SPSBE community in order to gather data, share successes, design new initiatives, and prepare the reports. The momentum gained from this effort will continue to fuel efforts to enhance the SPSBE undergraduate experience.

The CUE and MSCHE self-study processes served to bring the positive characteristics of the adult undergraduate more fully into the consciousness of the Hopkins community. Through CUE, students and faculty across the five Hopkins schools were able to share experiences, discuss challenges, and address issues around common needs of undergraduates. These processes facilitated the sharing of the extensive professional accomplishments of SPSBE undergraduates and the quality of their educational experiences. The accomplishments of many SPSBE undergraduates give testimony to the value of Hopkins effort to provide a second chance for a first class education for these students. As a direct result of the CUE and MSCHE self-study processes, there now exists a deeper understanding and a better appreciation across the Hopkins undergraduate community for the potential and contributions of the SPSBE adult undergraduate who, though different, is nevertheless an asset both to SPSBE and the Johns Hopkins University.
### Standard 1 – Mission, Goals, and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by: Clearly defined mission, goals, and objectives that: Guide faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes;</td>
<td></td>
<td>CUE Final Report: Mission, p. 19 “Dimensions,” p. 19 (Doc. 35) SPSBE Academic Policy Manual, 2003, pp. 4-6 (Doc. 1204) CUE Final Report: Mission statement (Doc. 35) SPSBE, Vision 2009 Core Values (Doc. 1200) UG Meetings, agendas, minutes (Doc. 1230) Contract packages to instructors (Doc. 1228) Undergraduate Studies Retreat Agenda – June 2001 (Doc. 1230)</td>
<td>“A Highly Effective Faculty Associate” sent to instructors with their letters of agreement as a statement of the goal we have articulated for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) Include support of scholarly and creative activity, at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution’s purposes and character;</td>
<td>Faculty Appointments and Promotion Guidelines (Doc. 1218) Recommendations from the Appointments and Promotion Committee (Doc. 1207) Minutes of the Academic Council that reflect the approval of promotion recommendations. (Doc. 1207)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) Are developed through collaborative participation by those who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional improvement and developments;</td>
<td>Academic Council minutes, (Doc. 1207) Academic Policy Council minutes (Doc. 1207) Appointments and Promotion Committee decisions (Doc. 1207) Division of UG Studies monthly faculty meetings (Doc. 1230) PSL weekly division meetings and semi-annual faculty meetings (Doc. 1231)</td>
<td>Goals and objectives were developed at the initiation of the program by police managers, police chiefs, educational specialists, and other academicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Are formally approved, publicized and widely known by the institution’s</td>
<td>PSL-goals and objectives are transmitted through the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSL is beginning to assemble student projects and may use pre and post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td>Faculty manual-semi-annual full faculty meetings with discussion of details of issues and processes (Doc 1231) Faculty submits detailed syllabi; coupled with in-class observations and student feedback, courses are continuously assessed to ensure that goals and objectives are being met (Doc 1222).</td>
<td>Promotions and Tenure Committee Decision (Doc 1207) Academic Council Minutes (Doc 1207) Conference presentations, see conference programs (Doc 1254) Dean’s Leadership Council Meetings agendas and minutes (Doc 1211) Academic Policy Committee agendas and minutes (Doc 1207) Faculty Meeting agendas (Doc 1230 and 1231) Department meeting agendas (Doc 1230 and 1231) Faculty Review Process (Doc 1218) Academic Policy Committee minutes (Doc 1207) Academic Council agendas and minutes (Doc 1207) Undergraduate Studies Retreat Agenda (Doc 1230) PSL – MISSION – BRIEFING BOOK, SEC 1 PSL– GOALS – 3 (Doc 1233) SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 162 (Doc 1201) Objectives, SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 162 (Doc 1201) PSL mission, goals and objectives that relate to external and internal contexts and constituencies – value 1, and 3, briefing book, sec. 9 (Doc 1233) and Goal 2, SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p.162 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>knowledge tests. Evaluation form used to determine learning outcomes. New student orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission, goals and objectives that relate to external as well as internal contexts and constituencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fundamental Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Institutional goals and objectives that are consistent with mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goals and objectives that focus on student learning, other outcomes, and institutional improvement</td>
<td>CUE Final Report mission dimensions (Doc. 35) UG competencies, pg 180 (Doc. 1201) SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, Undergraduate Division Mission, p. 180 (Doc. 1201) Competencies (objectives) (Doc. 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the evidence inherent within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:

- Analysis of how institutional goals are applied at different levels within the institution and how the implementation of goals is coordinated

- Analysis of the processes used to develop goals and objectives for the periodic review of mission, goals and objectives

- Review of policies and processes used to disseminate mission and goals to new faculty, staff, students and members of the governing body and efforts intended to maintain awareness and commitment among continuing members of these groups

- Evidence of curriculum review used to change and improve educational programs, consistent with institutional values, purpose, and goals

Academic Policy Manual (Doc 1204) Department Meetings (Doc 1230 and 1231) Midterm Evaluations (Doc 1232) and IDEA Evaluations (Doc 1219)
## Standard 8 – Student Admissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by: | | See SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201)  
SPSBE Website (Doc 1215)  
Academic Policy Manual, pp. 4, 15-16 (Doc 1204) | Admissions policies and criteria have been developed and are reviewed to support the mission statement. The policies and criteria are clearly stated and are readily available in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, marketing materials, SPSBE Website <www.spsbe.jhu.edu>, presentations and recruitment events. The undergraduate admissions checklist and the admissions rating form are utilized to support the mission statement and division objectives. |
| - Admissions policies, developed and implemented, that support and reflect the mission of the institution | | | |
| | | See SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201)  
SPSBE Website (Doc 1215)  
Program Brochures (Doc 1234)  
Program Worksheets (Doc 1235)  
Admissions Checklist (Doc 1235)  
Subjective Rating Form (Doc 1235) that is being reinstated 8/1/03 | Specific information regarding academic programs, content and any applicable testing or prerequisites are clearly stated and are readily available in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, marketing materials, & SPSBE website <www.spsbe.jhu.edu>. This information is also reviewed in detail during the mandatory admissions interview and optional prospective student interview. Specific program worksheets are reviewed extensively. |
| - Admissions policies and criteria available to assist the prospective student in making informed decisions | | | |
| - Accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, including any required placement or diagnostic testing | | SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 181-220 - program and course descriptions (Doc 1201)  
Admissions Checklist (Doc 1235)  
Subjective Rating Form (Doc 1235)  
Undergraduate Summary Worksheet (Doc 1235)  
Program worksheets for each of the four disciplines (Doc 1235) | | |
| - Information on student learning outcomes available to prospective students | | SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 180 (Doc 1201)  
UG Experience Survey (Doc 1236) and follow-up  
Senior Projects (Doc 1237) | Ten key areas of general learning outcomes and competencies as listed in SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 180 & p. 162 are reviewed during admission interview. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 29-35 (Doc 1201) SPSBE Website (Doc 1215) Financial Aid materials distributed to students during prospective student interviews, admission interviews, open houses (Doc 1238)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information regarding financial aid, loans, grants and scholarship opportunities are made available in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 29-35 and the SPSBE Website &lt;www.spsbe.jhu.edu&gt;, - (financial aid section) distributed by financial aid office at open houses and recruitments events and distributed in all recruitment materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college-level learning</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 16-17 (Doc 1201) ARTSYS-Maryland System (Doc 1248) Articulation Agreements (Doc 1239) Academic Policy Manual, p. 16 (Doc 1204)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer policy is made available in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 16-17 and are communicated to students during the required admissions interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Ongoing assessment of student success, including, but not necessarily limited to retention, that evaluates the match between the attributes of admitted students and the institution’s mission and programs | In additional to the evidence inherent within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:  
  • Evidence of the periodic review of admissions catalogs, viewbooks, websites, recruiting and other relevant materials for accuracy and effectiveness |                                                                                                               | Periodic observation of all classes, student/advisor meetings and updates and student assessment survey in the development process Use of teacher and program evaluations |
|                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                               | Catalog updated yearly Brochure updated as needed Website updated as needed, currently being redesigned to improve its effectiveness |
| • Review of the procedures that guide the admissions program and policies or guidelines regarding the type of information the institution makes known to potential students and the general public |                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                               | Utilization of exit survey Improvement of website Coordination of various student support offices |
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of periodic review of the accuracy and effectiveness of financial aid information, scholarship material, and academic advising materials</td>
<td>Financial aid procedures (Doc 1238)</td>
<td>Formal and informal ongoing review of academic advising material to meet needs of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of the utilization of information appropriate to the review of financial aid practices, to reflect whether practices adequately support admission and retention efforts</td>
<td>SPSBE Student Satisfaction Survey (Doc 1249) UG Experience Survey (Doc 1236)</td>
<td>Implementation of ISIS will allow for better reporting and evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of the utilization of information appropriate to the review of student retention, persistence, and attrition, to reflect whether these are consistent with student and institutional expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Student Satisfaction Survey (first-year student survey, exit survey, Alumni Survey) Use of ISIS to chart students’ experience from entry through graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of the utilization of attrition data to ascertain characteristics of students who withdraw prior to attaining their educational objectives and, as appropriate, implementation of strategies to improve retention through changes in admissions criteria or procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing evaluation provided by Office of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 9 – Student Support Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by: A program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 56-60 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td></td>
<td>The SPSBE Office of Student Affairs provides a comprehensive program of student services as listed in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp.56-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Qualified professionals to supervise and provide the student support services and programs</td>
<td>Organizational chart (Doc 1205), resumes (Doc 1208)</td>
<td>A knowledgeable and qualified staff orchestrate well-developed and comprehensive student services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral</td>
<td>Advisement procedures (Doc 1255)</td>
<td>Through the coordinated efforts of the Office of Student Affairs and academic advisors, students are provided both formal and informal academic advisement and supporting services as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate student advisement procedures and processes</td>
<td>Advisement notes (Doc 1255)</td>
<td>Formal and informal evaluation (advisement session, Student Satisfaction Survey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If offered, athletic programs that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles, norms, and procedures that govern other institutional programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No athletic programs are available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 38-39, 43 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>All SPSBE complaints and grievance policies are clearly addressed in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 38, 39, 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Records of student complaints or grievances</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 47 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>Confidentiality of student information and record keeping are addressed in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Procedures (Doc 1250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Published and implemented policies for the release of student information</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 47, 37 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>Transcript requests, privacy rights of students, retention of records are addressed in catalog section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fundamental Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing assessment of student support services and the utilization of assessment results for improvement</td>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey (Doc 1249)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the evidence within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:

- Analysis of support services available to students, including any distinctions among physical sites or modes of delivery and the particular support services those sites/modes require (instructional technology support, library/learning resources support, etc.)

- Evidence of a structure appropriate to the delivery of student support services (organizational chart)

Review of student handbooks, catalogs, newspapers, and schedules, including materials showing availability and explaining the nature of services (published in print and/or available electronically)

- Evidence of student grievances and resolutions, and review of such records to determine whether there are noteworthy patterns.

### Standard 10 – Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>CVs of faculty and faculty associates (Doc 1251)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Faculty and other professionals appropriately prepared and qualified for the positions they hold, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined, and sufficiently numerous to fulfill those roles appropriately. |                                                                                                 | Faculty approval forms (Doc 1218)  
Faculty meetings (Doc 1230 and 1231)  
Budget 2003-04 (Doc 1202)  
Promotion criteria (Doc 1218 and 1207)  
Faculty handbook (Doc 1240)  
Faculty contracts (Doc 1229) |                                                      |
| • Educational curricula designed, maintained, and updated by faculty and other professionals who are academically prepared and qualified. |                                                                                                 | Documentation of faculty meetings (Doc 1230)  
Documentation of meetings for specific discipline areas (Doc 1230 and 1231) |                                                      |
| • Faculty and other professionals, including Teaching Assistants, who demonstrate excellence in teaching and other activities, and who demonstrate continued professional growth |                                                                                                 | Course evaluations (Doc 1219 and 1232)  
Resumes (Doc 1251) |                                                      |
| • Demonstrated institutional support for the advancement and development of faculty |                                                                                                 | Faculty meetings with sessions related to training (Doc 1230 and 1231)  
Faculty handbook (Doc 1240)  
Faculty resource webpage (Doc 1206)  
Center for Teaching & Learning (Doc 1253)  
Blueprints mentoring program (Doc 1221)  
Excellence in Teaching awards (Doc 1252) |                                                      |
| Recognition of appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, student learning, research, and service |                                                                                                 | Faculty presentations (Doc 1254) |                                                      |
| • Published and implemented standards and procedures for all faculty and other professionals, for actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal, based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons |                                                                                                 | Faculty promotion policies (Doc 1218)  
Academic policy manual (Doc 1204)  
Relevant Academic Policy Committee minutes (Doc 1207) |                                                      |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented procedures and criteria for review of all individuals who have responsibility for the educational program of the institution</td>
<td>Course evaluations (Doc 1219 and 1232) Faculty Activity Report (Doc 1220)</td>
<td>Faculty approval forms (Doc 1218) Midterm and final evaluation (Doc 1219 and 1232) Faculty handbook (Doc 1240 SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Adherence to principles of academic freedom, within the context of institutional mission | Syllabi (Doc 1222) Program brochures (Doc 1234 SPSBE Academic Catalog (Doc 1201 | In addition to the evidence within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:  
• Evidence of faculty productivity in the scholarship of teaching as well as in discipline-specific research and scholarship and in the creation of knowledge, consistent with the institution’s mission  
• Analysis of the relationship between faculty characteristics and performance and student learning outcomes | Faculty Mentoring Project - Blueprint project (Doc )1221 | |
| | | • Review of results of implemented appointment, promotion, and tenure standards and procedures | |
| | | • Evidence of dissemination of evaluation procedures and criteria | Midterm (Doc 1232) and final IDEA evaluation (Doc 1219)w/ accompanying letters to faculty |
| | | • Analysis of student evaluations of teaching | Midterm Evaluation Data (Doc 1232) |
### The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of reports from faculty peer evaluations of teaching, scholarship and service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of institutional practices for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty on time-limited contracts</td>
<td>Faculty approval process (Doc 1218) Midterm Evaluation (Doc 1232) Blueprint project (Doc 1221)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of the training, role, and effectiveness of graduate students who provide undergraduate instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 11 – Educational Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative to this standard, an accredited institution, whatever its mission, is characterized by the elements listed below. These elements also apply to all other educational activities addressed within Standard 13. • Educational offerings congruent with its mission, which include appropriate areas of academic study of sufficient content, breadth and length, and conducted at levels of rigor appropriate to the programs or degrees offered</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 -Course descriptions in catalog (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>Programs which include both a breadth (42-45 credits, up to 18 credits of electives or industry prep courses) and focused education (60+ credits of upper-level concentration courses) appropriate to the specific discipline: business, information technology, interdisciplinary studies and public safety leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Formal undergraduate, graduate, and/or professional programs – leading to a degree or other recognized higher education credential – designed to foster a coherent student learning experience and to promote synthesis of learning</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201) SPSBE 2003-04 fall/spring schedule (Doc 1242) Sequencing of courses (PSL)</td>
<td>Programs with a specific structure and sequence, offered in standard format and cohort format SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp. 172-174 (PSL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Program goals that are stated in terms</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 162 (PSL) (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>Program recommendations specified by professional organizations, program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Fundamental Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>of student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Advisory group meetings Industry rep. meetings ATM/AITP Undergraduate I.T. Program recommendations</td>
<td>advisory groups, and 1 on 1 meetings with industry representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of any curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences it provides its students and utilization of evaluation results as a basis for improving its student development program and for enabling students to understand their own education progress</td>
<td>Course evaluations (Doc 1219 and 1232) Alumni feedback (Doc 1217) Faculty meeting agendas (Doc 1230 and 1231)</td>
<td>Informal discussions with students during the program Informal discussion with alumni Frequent in-class monitoring by program faculty and staff (PSL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning resources, facilities, instructional equipment, library services, and professional library staff adequate to support the institution’s educational programs</td>
<td>Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td>JHU language lab Krieger Hall computer labs and internet connections Computer labs and internet connections at each facility Smart classrooms at each facility. (some deficiency at Homewood for smart classrooms) Library resources: electronic, print, staff all excellent and readily available to students and faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between professional library staff and faculty in teaching and fostering information literacy skills relevant to the curriculum</td>
<td>Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td>Input from MSEL staff on IL concepts and ideas in pilot program: MSEL staff [Andi Bartelstein, Heather Tapager] Regular support to students and faculty, all cohort classes receive instruction from library staff on how to obtain resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that promote student use of information and learning resources</td>
<td>Program goals and objectives: SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04(Doc 1201) Course syllabi (Doc 1222) Student assignments and projects (Doc 1237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of comparable quality of teaching/instruction, academic rigor, and educational effectiveness of its courses and programs regardless of the location or delivery mode</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201) Course syllabi (Doc 1222) John Hopkins Information Technology Resources (Doc 1257) Course evaluations (Doc 1219 and 1232)</td>
<td>Computer labs and internet connections at each facility Smart classrooms at each facility. (some deficiency at Homewood for smart classrooms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit. The</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackboard software (Doc 1258), Faculty CVs (Doc 1251)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptance or denial of transfer credit will not be determined exclusively on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basis of the accreditation of the sending institution or the mode of delivery but,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather, will consider course equivalencies, including expected learning outcomes,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with those of the receiving institution’s curricula and standards. Such criteria will</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be fair, consistently applied, and publicly communicated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures to assure that the educational expectations, rigor,</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201) Course syllabi (Doc 1222) Faculty Handbook (Doc 1240)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and student learning within any accelerated programs are comparable to those that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterize more traditional program formats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with the institution’s educational programs and student cohorts,</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201) Course syllabi (Doc 1222) Faculty Handbook (Doc 1240)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices and policies that reflect the needs of adult learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabi that incorporate expected learning outcomes</td>
<td>Course syllabi (Doc 1222) Syllabi (Doc 1222)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of student learning and program outcomes relative to the goals and</td>
<td>Course evaluations (Doc 1219 and 1232)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives of the undergraduate programs and the use of the results to improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student learning and program effectiveness (see Standard 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the evidence within or necessary to document the fundamental</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 (Doc 1201) Course syllabi (Doc 1222) Senior project (Doc 1237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>standard:</td>
<td>Evidence of completed analytical reviews (of educational offerings) that address topics such as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Appropriateness to institutional mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance to student goals, interests, and aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clarity of educational goals and related strategies for assessing student achievement of those goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provision of adequate time on task and information to learn and to practice the knowledge, skills, and abilities imparted by each program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provision of adequate balance between theory and practice, given programmatic and institutional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Opportunity to integrate instructional and non-instructional experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Opportunity for active student engagement in the learning undertaken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opportunity to practice and improve upon skills associated with the field of area studied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Opportunity for collaborative learning and to work with others in the completion of learning tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provision of an atmosphere of inquiry where diverse backgrounds and perspectives are valued</td>
<td>▪ Review of results from the institution’s implemented outcomes assessment plan</td>
<td>SPSBE Technology Support (Doc 1257)</td>
<td>Computer labs and internet connections at each facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of local and remote information resources, access structures, and technologies adequate to support the curriculum</td>
<td>Conference presentation on Information Literacy (Doc 1254)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of information literacy incorporated in the curriculum with syllabi, or other material appropriate to the mode of teaching and learning, describing expectations for students’ demonstration of information literacy skills</td>
<td>JHU Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of accessible reference tools to ascertain where relevant materials exist and are located</td>
<td>JHU Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Assessment of information literacy outcomes, including assessment of related learner abilities</td>
<td>JHU Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td>MSEL staff available at most facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of trained instructional and reference staff, or other support services, available on-site or via remote access, to help students and teaching staff locate and evaluate information tools and resources</td>
<td>JHU Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of an adequate policy and process, tailored to the mission and goals of the institution, for the development and management of information resources</td>
<td>JHU Library Support (Doc 1256)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of transfer trends and patterns, both to and from the institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 12 – General Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, pp 181 (45 credit core curriculum) (Doc 1201) SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 p. 180, ten competencies (Doc 1201) Program Worksheets for B.S. in Business</td>
<td>Map the 10 competencies on most commonly offered lower-level courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ A program of general education of sufficient scope to enhance students’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intellectual growth, and equivalent to at least 15 semester hours for associate degree programs and 30 semester hours for baccalaureate programs (An institution also may demonstrate how an alternative approach fulfills the intent of this fundamental element.)</td>
<td>&amp; Management, IT, PSL, and Interdisciplinary Studies (Doc 1235) Articulation agreements (Doc 1239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A program of general education where the skills and abilities developed in general education are applied in the major or study in depth</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 p. 180, competencies (Doc 1201) Syllabi (Doc 1222)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consistent with institutional mission, a program of general education that incorporates study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 p. 180, competencies 4, 5, &amp; 7 (Doc 1201) Syllabi (Doc 1222)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General education requirements assuring that, upon degree completion, students are proficient in oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, technological capabilities appropriate to the discipline, and information literacy, which includes critical analysis and reasoning</td>
<td>ETS placement tests (Doc 1259) Syllabi (Doc 1222) Senior Projects (Doc 1237) Writing Checklist for Students and Evaluating Student Writing (Doc 1245) Center for Teaching and Learning (Doc 1253)</td>
<td>Oral and written communication Technology capabilities and quantitative reasoning Information literacy Statistics-based research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• General education requirements clearly and accurately described in official publications of the institution</td>
<td>SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 pp. 180, 181, 187 (Doc 1201) Information on SPSBE Website (Doc 1215) Program brochures (Doc 1234) Worksheets (Doc 1235) Articulation agreements (Doc 1239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of general education outcomes within the institution’s overall plan for assessing student learning, and evidence that such assessment results are utilized for curricular improvement</td>
<td>Student Writing checklist and handout on Evaluating Student Writing (Doc 1245) UG Competencies (Doc 1247) Senior project objectives (Doc 1237)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In addition to the evidence within or necessary to document the fundamental</td>
<td>Notes from faculty meetings (Doc 1230) and 2001 retreat (Doc 1230)</td>
<td>Liberal arts foundation important to a broad education that prepares student to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:  ▪ Evidence of institutional statements of the rationale supporting the curriculum and the benefits of a quality general education program; and evidence that this rationale has been communicated to students, parents, advisors, employers, and other constituencies</td>
<td>Catalog description of undergraduate programs (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>change and adapt throughout all programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of statements of institutional mission, goals, or objectives relative to core knowledge and skills (general education)</td>
<td>CUE Final Report (Doc 35)  SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 p. 180 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Analysis of statements of individual curricular or degree program goals/objectives relative to core knowledge and skills (general education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of institutional support for the general education program (administrative structure, budget, faculty incentives)</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning (Doc 1253)  Writing support provided by the Sheridan Libraries (Doc 1256)  Blackboard resources (Doc 1258)</td>
<td>Institution of strong writing requirements throughout program of study  Support offered through various websites throughout JHU and SPSBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Evidence of curriculum review processes that include general education components</td>
<td>Minutes of Academic Policy Committee (Doc 1207)  Meetings to discuss UG scheduling (Doc 1230)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:  ▪ Articulated expectations of student</td>
<td>Vision 2009: A Working Document and the January 2003 Progress Report for the Division of Undergraduate Studies (Doc</td>
<td>Identified undergraduate competencies are aligned with school core values and the institutions mission dimensions for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamental Elements</td>
<td>Optional Analysis and Evidence</td>
<td>Indicator/Evidence</td>
<td>Annotation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning at various levels (institution, degree/program, course) that are consonant with the institution’s mission and with the standards of higher education and of the relevant disciplines</td>
<td>1200) SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04, p. 180 (Doc 1201)</td>
<td>undergraduates</td>
<td>Undergraduate Competencies are listed in the SPSBE Catalog AY 03-04 and in the process of being incorporated into all programs and their respective courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A plan that describes student learning assessment activities being undertaken by the institution, including the specific methods to be used to validate articulated student learning goals/objectives</td>
<td>Faculty Retreat minutes (May 5, 2003), Faculty Meetings minutes (June 6 and 25, 2003), and Department Meetings (Doc 1230) Faculty Development Seminar (October 19, 2002) (Doc 1246) Faculty Mentoring Project/Blueprints Presentations (May 15, 2003) (Doc 1221)</td>
<td>Describes the process of aligning the course objectives with the program, school, and institution goals Faculty attended a session by Jay McTighe on Understanding by Design instruction Faculty presentations on the incorporation of assessment-based instruction into their course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence that student learning assessment information is used to improve teaching and learning</td>
<td>Individual course syllabi (Doc 1222) Midterm Feedback Forms (Doc 1232) and communications with faculty IDEA Forms and records (Doc 1219) Advising Records (Doc 1235)</td>
<td>Course syllabi beginning to reflect assessment-based instruction Midterm Feedback forms are given and reviewed by the Program Directors and the division director. All faculty receive feedback in addition to the forms. Serious issues receive immediate intervention by the Program Director. IDEA process used to assess the experience of students against the value of the course as determined by the instructor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documented use of student learning assessment information as part of institutional assessment</td>
<td>IDEA Forms and records (Doc 1219) IDEA Forms and records (Doc 1219) IDEA Forms and records (Doc 1219)</td>
<td>IDEA process used to assess the experience of students against the value of the course as determined by the instructor. All faculty receive feedback in addition to the forms. Serious issues receive immediate intervention by the Program Director and/or the division director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to the evidence within or necessary to document the fundamental elements above, the following, although not required, may facilitate the institution’s own analysis relative to this accreditation standard:</td>
<td>IDEA Forms and records (Doc 1219)</td>
<td>IDEA process used to assess the experience of students against the value of the course as determined by the instructor. All faculty receive feedback in addition to the forms. Serious issues receive immediate intervention by the Program Director and/or the division director.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Evidence of assessment approaches that derive from the institution’s mission and which might incorporate such outcomes as cumulative learning, analytical and information skills, specific competencies, knowledge and cognitive abilities, student attitude development and growth, life skills, student activity involvement, and physical skills and techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Director and/or the division director.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of assessment results including:</td>
<td>Syllabi (Doc 1222)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessments of math abilities determine student’s placement or recommendation to enroll in remedial courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Where applicable, basic skills development programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subject area knowledge</td>
<td>Program competencies (Doc 1247)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course syllabi (Doc 1222)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course assignments and grading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Development of general education and lifelong learning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Attitudes and values that relate to the mission of the institution and to the programs of study</td>
<td>Undergraduate Competencies (Doc 1247)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Meeting minutes (Doc 1230)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course assignments and grading Department meetings focused on student writing and research skills Course assignments aligned with institution and school mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of direct and indirect indicators of student achievement such as persistence and graduation rates, student satisfaction and other evidence of student goal attainment, licensure examination results, alumni satisfaction and achievement, including consideration of parity of outcomes across different student groups</td>
<td>Undergraduate Competencies (Doc 1247)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student enrollment and graduation records (Doc 1250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort completion rates (Doc 1250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Analysis of results from a variety of assessment strategies, including</td>
<td>SPSBE Student Satisfaction Survey (Doc 1249)</td>
<td></td>
<td>SPSBE receives consistently high satisfaction results from this survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamental Elements</th>
<th>Optional Analysis and Evidence</th>
<th>Indicator/Evidence</th>
<th>Annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standardized tests, local comprehensive tests, course-embedded assessment, self-reported measures, and portfolio assessment</td>
<td>Syllabi (Doc 1222) Faculty Meetings (Doc 1230 and 1231)</td>
<td>Faculty meetings are designed to address consistency issues and to constantly improve instruction and its assessment The Senior Project has been redesigned to ensure consistency and to enhance research skills as appropriate to each discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysis of course, department or school reports on classroom based assessment practices and their outcomes, including grading approaches and consistency</td>
<td>Faculty meeting minutes on grading rubrics, writing assignments (Doc 1230 and 1231) Senior project examples and guidelines (Doc 1237) Faculty meeting minutes reflect focus on topics related to faculty development (Doc 1290) Faculty Development opportunities through the Center for Teaching and Learning (Doc 1253) Faculty Mentoring Project/Blueprints Documents (Doc 1221) IDEA forms and feedback (Doc 1219) Division Faculty Blackboard Site (Doc 1258) Faculty Website (Doc 1260) School and Division budgets (Doc 1202)</td>
<td>Faculty development focused on issues that emerge from assessments is a component in every program and division meeting This project prepares faculty to develop assessment based courses Faculty are supported by their Program Directors to continuously enhance instruction and to utilize more authentic assessments Resources are available through the Center for Teaching and Learning and through the Division for the improvement of their courses and for ensuring that the course learning goals are aligned with the program, division, and institution goals. A continuous program monitoring and evaluation approach is employed to continuously improve instruction and support. Funds are available on the school and program-level to support identified professional development activities. Budgets adjusted to meet identified needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 2: JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
2002-2004 REACCREDITATION PROCESS

Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE)
[January 2002 - May 2003]

JHU Accreditation Steering Committee
[2002 - 2004]

All divisions collect documents to demonstrate compliance with all 14 standards.
[Summer 2003]

5 undergraduate schools convene School Self-Study Working Groups (SWG) to respond to CUE recommendations and to seven identified “undergraduate” standards.
[Summer & Fall 2003]

All divisions assist Provost’s Office to prepare a “Road Map” for document review.
[September/October 2003]

Each undergraduate school prepares a 20 page School Self-Study Report.
[First draft due November 1, 2003; Final Report due December 1, 2003]

Document Review by Evaluation Team Chair or her designee either during Chair’s Preliminary Visit.
[November 20, 2003]

Provost’s Office prepares Institutional Self-Study Report of 125 pages on behalf of Steering Committee.
[To be mailed to Team Members by February 1, 2004]

Evaluation Team Site Visit
[March 21 – 24, 2004]

MSCHE Meeting
[June 20, 2004]
APPENDIX 3: JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION CHART
THIS PAGE TO HAVE ORGANIZATION CHART INSERTED
### Recommendations Regarding the Academic Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Appoint a senior level administrator to assure quality of undergraduate education</td>
<td>[2.] The administrator has been named. [Andrew Douglas]</td>
<td>[2.] The Division of Undergraduate Studies was designed to focus on the needs of adult undergraduate students. [Ralph Fessler]</td>
<td>[2.] [Anne Belcher]</td>
<td>[2.] Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education appointed with charge to provide leadership for all aspects of the undergraduate experience, both inside and outside the classroom. [Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[2.] [Wolfgang Justen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appoint Directors of Undergraduate Studies in each department or degree program that offers an undergraduate degree</td>
<td>[3.] All programs have provided the name of a Director of Undergraduate Studies to the Assistant Dean for Academic Programs. [WSE Departments]</td>
<td>[2.] Director of Undergraduate Studies and Director of PSL. [Toni Ungaretti, Sheldon Greenberg]</td>
<td>[2.] A new position, Director of the Baccalaureate Program was developed in October 2002 [Linda Pugh]</td>
<td>[2.] Directors of Undergraduate Studies (DUS) appointed for each department and program. DUS to be responsible for overseeing reviews of undergraduate programs and enhancing quality of majors, including effectiveness of faculty advising system. [Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[2.] [Eileen Soskin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institute broad reviews of the quality of undergraduate degree programs on a regular cycle</td>
<td>[3.] (a) The Academic Council currently reviews all WSE departments every four years. ABET-accredited departments undergo additional reviews every six years. (b) All programs not accredited by ABET have been asked to undergo a self-study every 6 years (on the WSE/ABET timetable). (c) All undergraduate programs will be asked to submit annual program reports. Implementation details and timing of the reviews will be discussed with the WSE Department Chairs. [Andrew Douglas, Ed Scheinerman]</td>
<td>[3.] Each program is subject to a periodic external review. In addition, division directors, Program Directors, and full-time faculty regularly observe classes and speak with students. Evaluations are reviewed. Appropriateness of content is continually discussed. Recommend regularly scheduled meetings between division of undergraduate studies and PSL focused on the undergraduate experience. [Amy Verkes, Toni Ungaretti, Sheldon Greenberg]</td>
<td>[3.] Each undergraduate course is reviewed yearly in the Bacc. Curr. Comm. Review based on course evaluations completed by students. Committee includes all bacc. course coordinators and elected student representatives from junior, senior and accelerated classes; overall responsibility lies with Curr. Comm. chairs / NLNAC evaluated the SON in Oct. 2002 and awarded eight years of continuing accreditations for B.S. program. The CCNE visited the school in Mar. 2003 and initial accreditation was awarded in Oct. 2003. School is awaiting word from CCNE regarding initial accreditation. The Faculty revised the SON Evaluation Plan for the bacc. program, a comprehensive document that addresses mission &amp; governance, faculty, resources, curriculum and program effectiveness. Entire bacc. curr. is being reviewed during the 2003-04 by the Bacc. Curr. Comm. with input from an external consultant, Dr. Carl Miller. Curriculum review retreat held 10/25/03. [Linda Pugh]</td>
<td>[3.] Template being developed for reviews to be undertaken in spring 2004. Input of DUS is being solicited. Comparative information from peer schools being gathered by office of Academic Advising. Set of metrics under development. [Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[3.] The UG Committee is in the process of revisiting recommendations by special Curriculum Review Committee. As of 10.29.2003, NASM has completed its review of the UG program at the conservatory and will make recommendations to the Director and Dean. [Eileen Soskin, Undergraduate Committee]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assure that juniors and seniors have access to small classes and small group</td>
<td>[3.] (a) All ABET-accredited programs have</td>
<td>[2.] Senior Project or a Special Topics course exists for all programs. [2.] All senior level students take required course, NR100.407, Leadership in Leadership</td>
<td>[3.]</td>
<td>[2.] The “capstone” experience is a full recital at the end of the senior year, in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUE Recommendation</td>
<td>Whiting School of Engineering</td>
<td>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>Peabody Conservatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences, including “capstone” courses, in their major</td>
<td>already identified their capstone courses. Programs not accredited by ABET will identify existing courses which serve this intellectual role. (b) All WSE departments will be asked to ensure that students have access to the appropriate number of small classes in their major or a closely-related discipline. The names of these courses will be included in the annual program reports.</td>
<td>PSL has a Senior Topics Course, Interdisciplinary Studies has a senior project, and Business and IT have capstone courses. [Toni Ungaretti, Sheldon Greenberg]</td>
<td>Contemporary Nursing Practice, which is a capstone course. There is no capstone course at the junior level, but all students have small group clinical experiences in 7 courses divided between the junior &amp; senior year. Reviewed by Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee. [Linda Pugh]</td>
<td>courses in place. (b) Other departments will consider as part of program reviews. (c) Analysis of enrollments to be undertaken as part of program reviews. [Paula Burger, Directors of Undergraduate Studies]</td>
<td>some departments preceded by a recital during the junior year. Passing the recitals is prerequisite for graduation. [Departments, individual studio teachers]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expand opportunities for small group format courses for freshmen</td>
<td></td>
<td>[2.] Undergraduate courses are capped at 25 students with few exceptions. [Toni Ungaretti]</td>
<td>[1.] Students enter the nursing program as juniors. During AY 2003-04, a large lecture course was divided into 2 sections, and smaller discussion groups were added every other week (NR100.301 - content of Nursing in the Healthcare System). [Anne Belcher]</td>
<td>[3.] Curriculum Committee adopted recommendation in 2002 that all departments offer at least one freshman seminar. Report on implementation to be presented to Curriculum Committee in 2003-04. (b) New interdisciplinary great books seminar introduced for fall 2003. (c) Dept. reviews will address issue. [Paula Burger] Academic Advising is piloting a Freshman Study Group program in fall 2003, partially funded by the Second Decade Society, to help freshman gain good study habits and friends in an academic setting. Each group takes a “trio” of related courses together and is supported in their studies by a trained facilitator. OAA will be gathering feedback shortly to improve the program for the fall and beyond. [John Bader]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide faculty incentives for good teaching; integrate recognition of teaching excellence in faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure</td>
<td>[3.] The Homewood Academic Council is currently discussing the appropriate emphasis of teaching within tenure decisions. (b) WSE faculty members are asked to provide a summary of teaching activity and accomplishments for annual salary review. (c) WSE Department Chairs provide input on teaching to the Dean using several measures including the current teaching</td>
<td>[3.] University Alumni Association provides an annual award for each division. Faculty Appointments and Promotions Committee uses teaching as a major criterion. Teaching is one of four areas evaluated yearly. Semi-annual full faculty meetings are held with continual feedback and review of program and focus on specific issues.</td>
<td>[3.] Yearly faculty teaching awards – 2 at undergraduate level. Teaching is one of four areas evaluated yearly for determination of merit raises, teaching assignments for following year, promotion and reappointment. See Academic Council’s Policies and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Promotions and Review. See Faculty Performance Standards developed in fall 2003. [Anne Belcher]</td>
<td>[3.] (a) Dean’s Office discussion under way. (b) DUSS to consider incentive ideas [Daniel Weiss] (c) Academic Council considering weight of teaching quality in appointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. [Daniel Weiss] (d) Teaching evaluation system and</td>
<td>[6] No clear incentive for classroom faculty. Studio faculty depend on reputation as “good teacher” to attract student to conservatory. Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Committee is in process of exploring, and possibly implementing, an internal and external review process. [Robert Sirota, Wolfgang Justen]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 4: CUE Tracking Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Increase support for teaching effectiveness and improve campus physical infrastructure</td>
<td>(a) The WSE has increased teaching technology services for full-time faculty members. Linda Cortez leads faculty development and assessment-based outcomes. Facilities are excellent in all off campus locations. Facilities are improving at Homewood. [Dan Horn]</td>
<td>[Amy Yerkes, Toni Ungaretti, Sheldon Greenberg]</td>
<td>[Amy Yerkes, John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain, Shelley Chapman, Morton Grusky]</td>
<td>Instrument under formal review. Consultant has provided recommendations and revised instrument to be considered by faculty councils in early spring 2004. [Bill Conley]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed Computer Science building will house teaching technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE will contract for services with the Center for Educational Resources (CER). [Ed Scheinerman]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE will participate in an assessment of funding for smart classrooms. [Alan Friend]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3.] Faculty development and support are priorities. Faculty regularly engage in activities to develop new teaching skills.</td>
<td>[3.] Ongoing project. Active Learning Strategies Conference for faculty held in August 2003. Ongoing “in-service” programs for faculty on use of web-enhanced computer technology in the classroom. [Anne Belcher] School of Nursing has hired architectural consultants for development of new wing to provide additional classroom, laboratory, faculty and student space. Subcommittee formed in summer 2003 to assess feasibility of adding distance education programs. [Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td>[3.] Planning underway to enhance Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Planning for renovation of Gilman Hall underway. Fund-raising is high priority [Daniel Weiss]</td>
<td>(b) Plan for developing funding strategy for smart classroom renovations. [Kitty Lauer]</td>
<td>(c) Planning for enhancement of Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed Computer Science building will house teaching technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE will contract for services with the Center for Educational Resources (CER).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE will participate in an assessment of funding for smart classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3.] Faculty development and support are priorities. Faculty regularly engage in activities to develop new teaching skills. Linda Cortez leads faculty development and assessment-based outcomes. Facilities are excellent in all off campus locations. Facilities are improving at Homewood. [Dan Horn]</td>
<td>[3.] Ongoing project. Active Learning Strategies Conference for faculty held in August 2003. Ongoing “in-service” programs for faculty on use of web-enhanced computer technology in the classroom. [Anne Belcher] School of Nursing has hired architectural consultants for development of new wing to provide additional classroom, laboratory, faculty and student space. Subcommittee formed in summer 2003 to assess feasibility of adding distance education programs. [Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td>[3.] Planning underway to enhance Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Planning for renovation of Gilman Hall underway. Fund-raising is high priority [Daniel Weiss]</td>
<td>(b) Plan for developing funding strategy for smart classroom renovations. [Kitty Lauer]</td>
<td>(c) Planning for enhancement of Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed Computer Science building will house teaching technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE will contract for services with the Center for Educational Resources (CER).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE will participate in an assessment of funding for smart classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3.] Faculty development and support are priorities. Faculty regularly engage in activities to develop new teaching skills. Linda Cortez leads faculty development and assessment-based outcomes. Facilities are excellent in all off campus locations. Facilities are improving at Homewood. [Dan Horn]</td>
<td>[3.] Ongoing project. Active Learning Strategies Conference for faculty held in August 2003. Ongoing “in-service” programs for faculty on use of web-enhanced computer technology in the classroom. [Anne Belcher] School of Nursing has hired architectural consultants for development of new wing to provide additional classroom, laboratory, faculty and student space. Subcommittee formed in summer 2003 to assess feasibility of adding distance education programs. [Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td>[3.] Planning underway to enhance Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Planning for renovation of Gilman Hall underway. Fund-raising is high priority [Daniel Weiss]</td>
<td>(b) Plan for developing funding strategy for smart classroom renovations. [Kitty Lauer]</td>
<td>(c) Planning for enhancement of Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed Computer Science building will house teaching technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE will contract for services with the Center for Educational Resources (CER).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE will participate in an assessment of funding for smart classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[3.] Faculty development and support are priorities. Faculty regularly engage in activities to develop new teaching skills. Linda Cortez leads faculty development and assessment-based outcomes. Facilities are excellent in all off campus locations. Facilities are improving at Homewood. [Dan Horn]</td>
<td>[3.] Ongoing project. Active Learning Strategies Conference for faculty held in August 2003. Ongoing “in-service” programs for faculty on use of web-enhanced computer technology in the classroom. [Anne Belcher] School of Nursing has hired architectural consultants for development of new wing to provide additional classroom, laboratory, faculty and student space. Subcommittee formed in summer 2003 to assess feasibility of adding distance education programs. [Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td>[3.] Planning underway to enhance Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Planning for renovation of Gilman Hall underway. Fund-raising is high priority [Daniel Weiss]</td>
<td>(b) Plan for developing funding strategy for smart classroom renovations. [Kitty Lauer]</td>
<td>(c) Planning for enhancement of Center for Educational Resources with capacity to support pedagogical improvement. [Ostrander, Falk, Burger]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The proposed Computer Science building will house teaching technology.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE will contract for services with the Center for Educational Resources (CER).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE will participate in an assessment of funding for smart classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4: CUE Tracking Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Expand educational activities to increase awareness and understand of academic integrity</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(a) The Ethics Policy has been strengthened.</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td>(a) Review of Ethics Policy in 2002-03. Recommendations to strengthen policy implemented and communicated to all faculty.</td>
<td>[2] Academic Integrity is central focus of Orientation Week. Students caught cheating/plagiarizing routinely put on probation or dismissed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The Ethics Guide has been improved.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Brochure improved.</td>
<td>[Eileen Soskin, whole community]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) The WSE has added an Ethics Assembly for Freshmen and a regular discussion of ethics at Graduate Student Orientation and TA training.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Ethics Assembly for Freshman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) The WSE has begun a discussion on ethics with undergraduates, Teaching Assistants and faculty members. We will monitor progress through the Office of the Dean of Students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Ethics presentation at graduate student orientation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Ed Scheinerman]</td>
<td>[3.] A tutorial on using sources effectively has been developed and will be placed on the Blackboard platform. Undergraduate programs are monitored through constant observations of classes, review of instructor performance and behavior, and student feedback. Integrity is one of the underlying themes of the PSL program. Courses required in Business Ethics. Specific definitions have been developed for types of academic misconduct and guidelines for faculty to keep students sustained academic integrity.</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td>(e) Ethics presentations conducted by Preprofessional Advising as part of information sessions for pre-law and pre-health professions students. Integrity statement included in committee letters of recommendation.</td>
<td>[Eileen Soskin, whole community]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Broaden mix of academic interests to enrich intellectual discourse and to match enrollments with academic resources</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td>(a) The WSE has placed an admission/enrollment cap on the Biomedical Engineering program to ensure intellectual diversity. (b) New &quot;bio-options&quot; have helped to distribute enrollments more evenly. (c) The WSE will host the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in marketing the new Environmental Engineering program.</td>
<td>[6.]</td>
<td>[3.] Ongoing determinations. Baccalaureate numbers are currently at maximum for space, faulty and clinical sites. Students enter having completed prerequisite requirements that include humanities, social sciences, physical sciences and electives. 85 % of entering students have previous degree. Space utilization survey in progress to determine if additional students could be accommodated.</td>
<td>[2] Registrar regularly informs Dean of enrollment. When necessary, adjunct faculty will be hired to guarantee small enrollment in classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The WSE will assist the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in marketing the new Environmental Engineering program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Dean’s Leadership Team]</td>
<td>[Wolfgang Justen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[John Latting]</td>
<td>[John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assure international dimension of undergraduate experience</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td>(a) The WSE currently offers the</td>
<td>[3.] A new initiative seeks to involve part-time adult students in aspects of an</td>
<td>[4.] Limited international opportunities for undergraduate offered by the SON include</td>
<td>[3] Peabody String Fellowship sends advanced students to Singapore to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced students to Singapore to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status Options:**
- [1] not applicable
- [2] fully implemented
- [3] partially implemented
- [4] referred to committee for further study
- [5] postponed
- [6] other

---
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11. Study weekly course schedule and class scheduling practices

- [6.] The WSE faculty agreed to adopt the proposed schedule. We await a decision from KSAS.
  - [Andrew Douglas]

- [2.] Courses are scheduled at times and locations to meet the needs of students. Cohort schedules are established at the outset of the program and do not vary.
  - [John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain]

12. Give final examinations only during designated exam period

- [3.] The WSE has adopted this policy, effective spring 2004. We will publish the policy on the WSE website and notify the Student Council. The Directors of Undergraduate Studies will monitor departmental adherence to the policy.
  - [Ed Scheinerman]

- [2.] Student examinations are built into the time allotted for each course. Final exams are by individual course; there is no final exam period.
  - [John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain]

- [3.] Beginning with spring 2003 semester, no final examinations were to be given during last week of classes. Development of a reading period to be considered by Program Directors advise students and include a summary of the Exit Interview
  - [Anne Belcher, Linda Pugh]

- [2.] Notification to faculty that finals can be given only during exam period to be sent at beginning of semester.
  - [Paula Burger, Daniel Weiss]

- [2] Registrar schedules all exams and institutional jury or hearings.
  - [not identified]

Recommendations Regarding Advising and Career Support

13. Strengthen faculty engagement in advising

- [3.] (a) The WSE initiated a Faculty Advising Survey in spring 2003. This will be placed within the regular schedule of surveys.
  - [Dan Horn]

- [b] The WSE Office of Academic Affairs will publish an Advising Handbook for Faculty.
  - [Janet Weise]

- (c) WSE departments will be asked to include a summary of the Exit Interview

- [6.] Faculty advisement is utilized for independent and senior projects. Program Directors advise students and provide support as needed through the student’s tenure in the undergraduate program.

- Advising is included in the criteria for promotion.

- Faculty and academic advisors need to set periodic reviews of advisement services, practices and issues.
  - [not identified]

- [3.] Academic Advising workshop held 8/27/03 for faculty. New Faculty Performance Standards discussed in fall 2003 include advising as responsibility of each faculty member. Evaluation of effective advising as one of considerations for salary and promotion decisions has not yet been discussed.
  - [Anne Belcher, Linda Pugh]

- [3.] Advising to be considered during departmental reviews. DUSs will discuss during ADV 03-04.
  - [Paula Burger, John Bader]

- [2] All major teachers are students' primary advisors.

Even though studio and classroom faculty are fully engaged, there is a widespread in quality of advising. Many of the studio teachers are PT faculty and not totally familiar with degree requirements. The conservatory is planning formal training for all advisors.
  - [Eileen Soskin]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Improve communication and leverage activities among the career support services and academic advising offices</td>
<td>[Irene Edmond-Rosenberg, John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain]</td>
<td>[Andrew Douglas]</td>
<td>[Ed Scheinerman]</td>
<td>[David Fetter]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Explore the centralization of some advising/career support resources</td>
<td>[Janet Weise]</td>
<td>[Sheldon Grusky, Toni Ungaretti, Amy Verkes, Scott Crawford]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td>[Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Create a position in the Johns Hopkins Alumni Office to develop networking and internship opportunities</td>
<td>[Mike Moyer]</td>
<td>[Sandra Angell, Mary Somers, Anne Belcher]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td>[Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[David Fetter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Improve employment support services for undergraduates who chose to enter the workforce</td>
<td>[Andrew Douglas]</td>
<td>[Irene Edmond-Rosenberg, Michael A. Ward, Scott Crawford]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td>[Susan Boswell, Bill Conley]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>workforce</td>
<td>possible.</td>
<td>Practitioner faculty provide effective connection to employment opportunities and career guidance.</td>
<td>Dean for Student Affairs. Employment in nursing is 100%, so issues are different than on Homewood campus. Emphasis is on career-building and finding initial job placement. Annual Career Fair held annually in February for over 100 employers.</td>
<td>Programs to support employment goals of students include: career counseling, 4 annual career fairs (2 general/2 targeted), on campus recruiting program, Breaking into... Panel Series, Career Center Job Database (posting over 7,000 entry level jobs annually), Workshop series to educate students on job search skills (including writing resume and cover letter, interviewing, networking, and negotiating salaries and positions).</td>
<td>[David Fetter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Homewood Career Center]</td>
<td>[Scott Crawford]</td>
<td>[Sandra Angell, Linda Pugh]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Assure adequate physical and technical facilities for career support services</td>
<td>[3.] The WSE will support affordable improvements in Career Services whenever possible.</td>
<td>[3.] This office provides career counseling and support for students contacts for employer, and E-Recruiting Services.</td>
<td>[3.] Career services currently housed in small office in Student Services suite. IT staff provides technical support for Career Services website development. Will incorporate planning for expanded Career Services Office in new building.</td>
<td>[5] Assessment of facilities to be undertaken.</td>
<td>[Bill Conley]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[b) The WSE Department Chairs will discuss whether electronic student portfolios would be useful.</td>
<td>[Michael A. Ward and Scott Crawford]</td>
<td>[Sandra Angell, Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td>[Career Center]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Homewood Career Center, Ed Scheinerman]</td>
<td>[Adrienne Alberts]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[a) Website: &lt;www.jhu.edu/~careers&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[b) MonsterTrak Online Recruiting Program: &lt;www.monstertrak.com&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Mini-computer lab (4 Pentium 4 computers with printing capabilities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[d) Physical space with 6 recruiting rooms for private on campus interviewing options.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Physical space with 6 recruiting rooms for private on campus interviewing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sandra Angell, Claire Bogdanski]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Michael A. Ward and Scott Crawford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Track graduates’ post-baccalaureate activities</td>
<td>[3.] The WSE currently surveys alumni two and five years post-graduation regarding career and graduate education progress.</td>
<td>[4.] The Division of Undergraduate Studies, with the participation of the Division of Public Safety and Leadership is implementing The Undergraduate Experience Survey at graduation, 2 year follow up and 5 year follow up survey.</td>
<td>[3.] New graduate employment/advanced study follow-up began after 2003 graduation. Evaluation Plan states that “at least 95% of graduates who seek employment will obtain jobs or enter educational/experiential preparations within 6 months of graduation.” Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee currently developing 1 and 5 year Alumni Surveys.</td>
<td>[3] Alumni Office</td>
<td>[Debbie Kennison]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PSL tracks graduates.</td>
<td>[Sandra Angell, Linda Pugh]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[a) Professional school enrollments closely tracked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Scott Crawford, Toni Ungaretti, Sheldon Greenberg]</td>
<td>[Adrienne Alberts]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Graduate study and employment surveyed but coverage is not 100%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Cathy Lebo]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Cathy Lebo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. Evaluate academic advising/career support in satisfaction surveys

[3.] The WSE surveys current students on academic advising and alumni on advising and career support. We will discuss with the Office of Institutional Research whether career support should/will be addressed in Homewood-wide surveys of current students (sensiors). If not, we will consider whether this topic should be added to the WSE advising survey.
[Dan Horn]

[3.] Academic advisors are evaluated annually.
[4] Student Satisfaction Survey every 5-years address the issue.
[Toni Ungaretti, Amy Yerkes, Michael A. Ward]

[3.] Academic advising evaluation is part of (EBI) Educational Benchmarking Institute survey completed for first time this year by graduating students. Will compare us with other Schools of Nursing. Career support evaluation completed as addendum to EBI.
[Sandra Angell, Anne Belcher]

[2.] Items are included in COFHE Senior Survey and Enrolled Student Survey.
[Bill Conley]

Recommendations Regarding Diversity

21. Improve ethnic minority student recruitment

* detailed plan with action steps, funding, and timetable.
* The Baltimore Scholars Program
* linkages with outreach programs and partnerships with community colleges

[3.] The Office of Admissions has hired a new minority recruiter for Homewood.
[Ed Scheinerman]

[3.] The WSE has already endorsed the Baltimore Scholars Program.
[John Latting]

[3.] The WSE has requested that a certain percentage of financial aid be reserved for transfer students.
[John Latting]

[3.] The WSE Diversity Council will be asked for minority student recruitment recommendations.
[Ed Scheinerman]

[3.] The WSE will work with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions to prepare a detailed plan for enrolling ethnic minority and female students.
[Ed Scheinerman, John Latting]

22. Improve retention and graduation rates

[3.] The WSE is currently developing a retention study with the Director of

[3.] Work with community colleges to prepare transfer students
[3.] Retention and graduation rates calculated yearly for all programs.

[3.] Consideration of implementing exit

APPENDIX 4: CUE Tracking Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* detailed plan</td>
<td>Institutional Research to determine the most influential factors in persistence. Once at-risk groups are identified, these students will be the target of programs that closely monitor their success and intervene at critical points in the students’ academic career. [Dan Horn]</td>
<td>Advisors identify potential at-risk students and establish plans of actions. They provide individual advising sessions. Will revise pre-admission counseling and courses for potential candidates [John Baker, Linda Cortez, Thomas A. Crain, Irene Edmond-Rosenberg]</td>
<td>Retention and graduation rates reviewed by appropriate curriculum committee. Attrition evaluated for patterns and need for future intervention. Rates published in annual catalog. [Sandra Angell, Anne Belcher]</td>
<td>Interviews with graduating seniors and all students withdrawing prior to graduation. [Paula Burger, John Bader] (b) New interventions developed: Freshman study groups, Focus instrument, Sophomore Task Force established. [John Bader, Bill Conley]</td>
<td>Leaving, the reasons are not always clear with students who simply don’t show at the beginning of the new academic year. [Wolfgang Justen, Emily Frank, David Fetter, Eileen Soskin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Increase the number of underrepresented ethnic minority faculty
(a) The WSE recently implemented a search protocol to ensure a diverse faculty applicant pool for open positions. (b) The WSE currently employs a “target of opportunity” plan to increase the number of minority hires. (c) The incoming WSE Dean will determine whether the steps already taken are sufficient. [not identified]

24. Assess content of curriculum to assure exposure to diverse disciplines, fields, languages, cultures, and ideas
(a) The Directors of Undergraduate Studies will undertake this effort with guidance from the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. [Ed Scheinerman] (b) Aspects of distribution requirements reviewed by departments in spring 2004. (c) Overall review of curriculum to be considered for 2004-05. (d) Writing requirements to be reviewed in fall 2004 after new Writing Program Director has had time to study current program. [Paula Burger]

25. Assure array of offerings on campus that reflect diversity of our campuses, city.
(a) The WSE Dean’s Office and Departments will support efforts whenever. (b) Southern Poverty Law Center continues to provide consultation on issues of diversity. (c) Sophomore Task Force established. [Mary Fetter, Eileen Soskin] (d) Writing requirements to be reviewed in fall 2004 after new Writing Program Director has had time to study current program. [Paula Burger]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and nation; develop a special speaker’s series</td>
<td>possible.</td>
<td>SPSBE Woman Leadership forum. Open to faculty, staff and students.</td>
<td>Speaker series is being developed in the School of Nursing for FY2003-04 but the focus is not entirely on diversity issues.</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Increase number of underrepresented ethnic minority staff, especially in student support services areas.</td>
<td>[1.] (a) The WSE Diversity Council will be asked for input on ways to improve minority staff recruitment. [Danielle Herrmann] (b) The WSE will prepare a plan for minority hiring.</td>
<td>[3.] Dean’s Office encourages all departments and units to include minority candidates. [Ralph Fessler, Morton Grusky]</td>
<td>[3.] Discussed in Dean’s meetings. All supervisors encouraged to consider minority candidates. Profile of staff reviewed yearly in Dean’s group. Minority Assistant Director of Admissions hired fall 2003. [Dean’s Leadership team]</td>
<td>[5.] Assessment of Homewood student services staff diversity to be undertaken in 2004. [Paula Burger]</td>
<td>[2] [Laura Brooks]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations Regarding Student Life

| 29. Explore the possibility of a freshman campus | [6.] A preliminary assessment of feasibility has been undertaken. Planning is to begin within 12 months. | [1.] | [1.] | [4.] Feasibility study underway. Options for relocation of athletic fields also under review. [Paula Burger, Susan Boswell] | [1] |
| 30. Develop facilities for informal interaction and for group study | [3.] The WSE will survey what departments are currently providing in terms of informal group meeting space. The WSE will determine whether this is sufficient. [Andrew Douglas] | [3.] Facilities for informal interaction and group study are included at each campus center PSL Students are generally employed in several large agencies and are able to find locations for group study. [Morton Grusky, Eva Lane, Blanca Potre] | [3.] Additional furniture purchased in summer 2003 and place throughout SDON building to create additional study space. Plans for new addition to building will include more student interaction spaces. [Sandra Angell, Claire Bogdanski] | [5.] 1. Gilman lounge established for humanities departments. (b) Analysis of Homewood social space underway. (c) Plan developed for Levering Union and under review with goal of upgrading social and meeting space. (d) KSAS Advisory Council Committee on Student Life will focus on this issue. [Susan Boswell] (e) Dean of Sheridan Libraries considering provisions of group study space among other students. | [not identified] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUE Recommendation</th>
<th>Whiting School of Engineering</th>
<th>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</th>
<th>School of Nursing</th>
<th>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</th>
<th>Peabody Conservatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Provide interdivisional programming and intramural sports opportunities</td>
<td>[6.]</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td>[6.] Nursing students have access to all organizations, sports teams and intramural programs on Homewood campus.</td>
<td>[5.] Need for field and play space under consideration is part of planning for South Quadrangle and Freshman Quadrangle. Off campus options under review.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Homewood Student Affairs]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sandra Angell]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Increase participation and leadership of academic administrators in student life</td>
<td>[3.]</td>
<td>[3.] Open appointment time with the Dean, Assistant Dean, and Director at all sites.</td>
<td>[3.] Dinner meeting with student leaders and end-of-year dinner with all graduating students already on schedule with Dean. Associate Dean for Student Affairs meets regularly with student leaders.</td>
<td>[3.] (a) Dean of Student Life meets regularly with student government leaders.</td>
<td>[2] Regularly available for consultation and advising of students and faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The Interim Dean currently holds weekly office hours with undergraduates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[Sandra Angell , Alison Steinkamp]</td>
<td>(b) Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education has arranged meetings with student Council Leadership and also plans to appoint a Dean’s Advisory Panel of Students.</td>
<td>[Wolfgang Justen, Eileen Soskin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The incoming Dean will be asked to devise a plan to ensure adequate meeting time with undergraduates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[not identified]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Improve food quality and service</td>
<td>[6.]</td>
<td>[3.] Ensure food services during evening hours.</td>
<td>[5.] Expansion of food service planned for new addition to building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Homewood Student Affairs]</td>
<td>Advocate for office café in Shaffer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Morton Grusky]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Support partnerships that enhance the Charles Village neighborhood</td>
<td>[6.]</td>
<td>[6.] Determine if there are any local promotions that our students can take advantage of. Participate in plan to reinvent Charles Village.</td>
<td>[1.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Central Administration]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Morton Grusky]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPENDIX 4: CUE Tracking Chart

**Status Options:**
- [1] not applicable
- [2] fully implemented
- [3] partially implemented
- [4] referred to committee for further study
- [5] postponed
- [6] other

#### Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
- **Daniel Weiss**
  - James B. Knapp Dean
- **Adrienne Alberts**
  - Director, Career center
- **John Bader**
  - Assistant Dean, Office of Academic Advising
- **Susan Boswell**
  - Dean of Student Life
- **Paula Burger**
  - Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education
- **Debbie Cebula**
  - Assistant Dean for External Programs
- **Bill Conley**
  - Dean of Enrollment and Academic Services
- **Matthew Crenson**
  - Professor & Chair, Political Science Department
- **Adam Falk**
  - Vice Dean of Faculty
- **John Latting**
  - Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- **Kitty Lauer**
  - Senior Associate Dean for Finance and Administration
- **James McGill**
  - Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration
- **H. Carol Mohr**
  - Executive Director, Housing and Dining Services
- **Jose Monleon**
  - Professor, Department of Romance Languages
- **Gary Ostroder**
  - Vice Dean for Research and Graduate Education
- **Salem Reiner**
  - Director of Community Affairs
- **Fritz Schroeder**
  - Executive Director, Development and Alumni Relations
- **Winston Tabb**
  - Dean, University Libraries
- **Lea Ybarra**
  - Executive, Center for Talented Youth

#### Whiting School of Engineering
- **Andrew Douglas**
  - Interim Dean
- **Alan Friend**
  - Associate Dean for Finance and Facilities
- **Dan Horn**
  - Assistant Dean for Academic Programs
- **Danielle Herrmann**
  - Director of Administrative Operations
- **John Latting**
  - Director of Homewood Undergraduate Admissions
- **Mike Moyer**
  - Associate Dean for Development and Alumni Relations
- **Ed Schneiderman**
  - Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
- **Janet Weise**
  - Director of Engineering Advising

#### School of Nursing
- **Martha N. Hill**
  - Dean and Professor
- **Jeryllynn Allen**
  - Associate Dean for Research
- **Sandra Angell**
  - Associate Dean for Student Affairs
- **Anne E. Belcher**
  - Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
- **Claire Bogdanski**
  - Associate Dean for Finance & Administration
- **Jacquelyn Campbell**
  - Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs
- **Alison Steinkamp**
  - Executive Assistant to the Dean
- **Deborah Wells**
  - Associate Dean for Development & Alumni Relations

#### The Peabody Institute
- **Robert Sirota**
  - Institute Director
- **Joe Brant**
  - Director, Plant Operations
- **Laura Brooks**
  - Director, Human Resources
- **James Dobson**
  - Registrar
- **David Fetter**
  - Associate Dean for Performance Activities
- **Emily Frank**
  - Associate Dean for Student Affairs
- **Linda Goodwin**
  - Manager, Large Ensembles Office
- **Wolfgang Justen**
  - Peabody Conservatory Dean
- **Debbie Kennison**
  - Director, Alumni Office
- **Raymond Ou**
  - Director of Residence Life
- **Eileen Soskin**
  - Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

#### School of Professional Studies in Business and Education
- **Ralph Fessler**
  - Dean
- **Shelly Chapman**
  - Director, Center For Teaching And Learning
- **Linda Cortez**
  - Instructor / Program Director Business & Management
- **Thomas A. Crain**
  - Director Odysseys / Program Director Interdisciplinary Studies
- **Scott Crawford**
  - Director, Career Services
- **Kevin Cryder**
  - Interim Director, Development and Alumni Relations
- **Irene Edmond Rosenberg**
  - Sr. Academic Advisor
- **Sheldon Greenberg**
  - Director, Public Safety and Leadership
- **Morton Grusky**
  - Associate Dean, Office of Finance and Administration
- **Eva Lane**
  - Center Director - Downtown Center
- **Phyllis McDonald**
  - Asst. Professor, Director of Research (PSL)
- **Jennifer Moessbauer**
  - Admin. Director
- **Tony Ungaretti**
  - Assistant Dean, Director of Undergraduate Studies
- **L. Douglas Ward**
  - Deputy Director – Public Safety Leadership
- **Amy Yerkes**
  - Associate Dean of Academic Affairs
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## The Five Hopkins Schools That Offer Undergraduate Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Faculty (Fall 2001)</th>
<th>Undergraduates (Fall 2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krieger School of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whiting School of Engineering (WSE)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSE Part-time Programs in Engineering and Applied Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Institute</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B

List Of Presentations To The Johns Hopkins Community

*Krieger School Of Arts And Sciences (KSAS)*
*& Whiting School Of Engineering (WSE)*

Meetings with Faculty

**KSAS Department Chairs**
Friday, March 14, 2 pm
Shriver Hall Board Room

**WSE Department Chairs**
ABET Chairs, and Undergraduate Coordinators
Thursday, February 20, 8:30 am
NEB 121

**Homewood Academic Council**
Wednesday, February 19, 3:30 pm
Shriver Board Room

**WSE Faculty Assembly**
Friday, April 4, 3 pm
Shriver Hall Clipper Room

**Homewood Faculty Assembly**
Tuesday, March 4, 3 pm
Arellano Theatre

Meetings with Students

**Homewood Student Council**
Tuesday, February 4, 7:30 pm
Shriver Hall Board Room

**Society of Women Engineers (SWE), HOMES (Homewood Organization of Minorities in Engineering and Science), Tau Beta Pi, and Student Reps to WSE Curriculum Committee**
Friday, February 14, 11 am
121 NEB

**Graduate Representative Organization (GRO)**
Monday, February 24, 4 pm
Levering Hall, Great Hall

**Resident Assistants**
Tuesday, March 25, 5 pm
AMR Multi-purpose Room

**Post-baccalaureate Pre-Medical Students**
Monday, March 31, 5 pm
Garland Hall, Room 275
## Krieger School Of Arts And Sciences (KSAS) & Whiting School Of Engineering (WSE)

### Meetings with Staff

**Homewood Student Affairs/Enrollment & Academic Services Directors**
- Friday, January 31, 9 am
- Levering Hall, Great Hall

**Office of Academic Advising Staff**
- Wednesday, March 12, 9:30 am
- 324 Garland Hall

### Open Meeting

**Homewood Town Meeting**
- Thursday, February 20, 5 pm
- AMR Multi-purpose Room

### Peabody Institute

**Meetings with Faculty**

**Academic Council**
- Thursday, March 6, 2 pm
- Director’s Conference Room

**NASM Self-Study Committee**
- Friday, March 14, 12 noon
- Marbury Room of the Friedman Library

**Undergraduate Committee**
- Tuesday, March 18, 12:15 pm
- Marbury Room of the Friedman Library

### Meetings with Students

**Resident Assistants, Student Government and Student Reps to Special Committee for Student Relations**
- Wednesday, March 5, 5 pm
- 206 Conservatory

### School Of Professional Studies In Business And Education

**Meetings with Faculty**

**Academic Policy Committee**
- Thursday, February 13, 9:30 am
- Shaffer Hall 200

**Meetings with Students**

**Alpha Sigma Lambda**
- Wednesday, February 5, 5:30 pm
- Shaffer Hall 200

### School Of Nursing

**Meetings with Faculty**

**Faculty Senate**
- Tuesday, March 11, 12:30 pm
- 217 SON

**Meetings with Students**

**Class advisors, Student Reps to Curriculum Committee, and Student Reps to Admissions Committee**
- Monday, March 10, 3:30 pm
- 215 SON
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Other University-Wide Constituencies

Council of Deans
Tuesday, March 11, 9:45 am
President’s Conference Room

Diversity Leadership Council
Wednesday, February 12, 12 noon
Levering Hall, Great Hall

JHU Alumni Council Executive Committee
Saturday, March 1, 1:30 pm
Hodson Hall

JHU Parent’s Association Representatives
Tuesday, March 18, 6 pm
Garland Hall, President’s Conference Room
APPENDIX C

CUE Membership Roster

Paula Burger (Chair), Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs and Acting Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Sandra Angell, Associate Dean for Student Affairs, School of Nursing
Gregory Ball, Professor, Psychological and Brain Sciences, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Susan Boswell, Dean of Student Life, Homewood Schools
Adriene Breckenridge, Sr. Academic Advisor, Office of Academic Advising
Amy Brokl, Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Michael Carroll, Alumnus, Whiting School of Engineering
Wen-Shan Chen, Student, Peabody Institute
Andrew Cherlin, Professor and Chair, Sociology, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Robert Cloney, Student, School of Professional Studies in Business & Education
William Conley, Dean of Enrollment Services, Homewood Schools
Chris Cunico, Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Candice Dalrymple, Associate Dean & Director, Center for Educational Resources, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Steven David, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Political Science, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Michael David, Student, Whiting School of Engineering
Andrew Douglas, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Whiting School of Engineering
Amanda Dusold, Student, Peabody Institute
James Eiszner, Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Manish Gala, Student, Whiting School of Engineering
Ray Gillian, Assistant Provost & Director, Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action Programs
Bayla Goldenberg, Student, School of Nursing
Siba Grovogui, Associate Professor, Political Science, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Bruce Hamilton, Professor, Economics, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Audrey Henderson, Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Dana Jones, Student, School of Nursing
Wolfgang Justen, Dean, Peabody Conservatory
Ravi Kavasery, Student, Whiting School of Engineering
Rao Kosaraju, Professor, Computer Science, Whiting School of Engineering
April Land, Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Robert Lawrence, Associate Dean for Professional Education and Programs, Bloomberg School of Public Health
S. William Leslie, Professor, History of Science, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Anuj Mittal, JHU Alumnus
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Charles Reyner, Student, Whiting School of Engineering
Matthew Roller, Associate Professor, Classics Department, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences (on leave fall 2002)
Champlin Sheridan, Chairman, Sheridan Press, Alumnus and JHU Trustee
Artin Shoukas, Professor, Biomedical Engineering, School of Medicine
Walter Stephens, Professor and Vice Chair, Romance Languages, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Adena W. Testa, Attorney, Alumna and JHU Trustee
Antoinette Ungaretti, Assistant Dean and Director of Undergraduate Programs, School of Professional Studies in Business & Education
Dominic Wiker, Director, Baltimore Main Streets, JHU Alumnus
Meredith Williams, Professor of Philosophy, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
Lea Ybarra, Executive Director and Associate Dean, Center for Talented Youth

Staff to the Commission:
Pamela Cranston, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Barb Helmuth, Assistant to Dr. Paula Burger
Debi Rager, Scribe
APPENDIX D

Working Groups – Scopes Of Work

Tentative working groups outlined the following preliminary scopes of work. As the formal groups took shape, the work plans for several were refined and brought into alignment with realistic assessments of time, effort and data available.

I. ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE: TEACHING AND LEARNING

CHAIR:
Dr. Gregory Ball, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

PART A: UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

PURPOSE:
The purpose of our subcommittee is to examine how the five Hopkins schools assess, support, reward and strive for excellence in undergraduate teaching.

NEED TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM:
Undergraduate education is a core mission of the institution. Teaching is perhaps the most critical factor in undergraduate education. Our goal needs to be that we teach at the highest level.

ISSUES & QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

How do we currently assess, support, and reward undergraduate teaching?
Are these assessment, support, and reward structures effective and sufficient?
If these structures are effective and sufficient, how can we maintain them?
If these structures are ineffective and/or insufficient, how can we enhance them?
How is excellence in teaching fostered?

UNIVERSITY DATA NEEDED TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES:

General Information (for each School):
Number of instructors by rank (including part-time faculty and Teaching Assistants)
Teaching responsibility of each instructor
Class size distributions
Assessment Information (for each School):
How we currently assess teaching (course evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.)
  How we close the loop: teaching assessment → teaching improvement
Support Information (for each School):
How instructors are recruited
How new instructors are trained to teach
How current instructors are apprised of new and effective pedagogy
Reward Information (for each School):
How effective teaching is rewarded (salary, P&T)
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POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS:

There are no known groups, committees, projects or initiatives that have targeted undergraduate teaching. (If we add curriculum to our mission, we would be overlapping with curriculum committees - presumably one in every department of the school.)

COMPARISONS/OUTSIDE RESOURCES:

We hope to obtain much of the above data for small, private research institutions such as the non-Ivy COFHE institutions (MIT, Northwestern, Tufts, Rice, Swarthmore, Wesleyan, Wash. U. of St. Louis, Duke, et al). It is unlikely that we’d receive reward information, however. COFHE may have already collected some of this data from our peers.

TENTATIVE WORK PLAN:

The first step is to see how we assess, support, and reward undergraduate teaching. This is the data-gathering task outlined above. The second and third steps will be done in tandem. To determine whether our current structures are sufficient, we will conduct our own analyses as well as survey students, faculty members, and administrators through questionnaires and/or interviews and focus groups. At the same time, we can ask participants how to maintain (if found sufficient) or improve (if found insufficient) these processes. Another way to do this is to consider the same data from our peers.

RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS:

The Subcommittee on Undergraduate Teaching would need to have the support of an institutional research person who could get comparative institution data and the support of each of the five undergraduate degree granting divisions to research and report on their procedures and data. For questionnaires, we would need financial remuneration for costs incurred, data-entry assistance, and cooperation from the Schools for questionnaire distribution and collection. For interviews/focus groups (which might be less costly than questionnaires) we would require time from a number of Hopkins community members representing a wide spectrum of participants (from students to faculty and other instructors). We would need to hire a graduate assistant to conduct any interviews and organize the data.

ADDITIONAL ISSUE TO BE CONSIDERED:

Should this group consider knowledge base/skills and curriculum issues?

If we ask whether our students are learning, what we want them to learn (ABET criteria for the WSE, for example), we cannot link this issue to teaching without also considering the curriculum. For example, we cannot consider whether we teach quantitative skills well without examining the quantitative coursework in engineering classes. We note that teaching is very different from curriculum.

For any subcommittee to look at curriculum, it would be necessary to add the following items to the above list:

- General Information (for each School):
  - What do we expect our graduates to have (specific knowledge bases, skills, etc.)?
  - Requirements for every School and major!
  - Syllabi for every course.
- Assessment Information (for each School):
  - Examples of tests, homework assignments, papers, etc. for every course.
PART B: MENTORED AND SMALL GROUP LEARNING

PURPOSE:

A key ingredient in undergraduate education is the sustained and active engagement in an intellectual problem, research project, or critical inquiry under a professor’s supervision. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, but the most familiar are the small seminar, the collaborative laboratory project, and the individual thesis. All Hopkins schools offer these traditional kinds of small group learning in some form. The purpose of our subcommittee is to determine just what kinds of small group learning are available to our undergraduates, to assess the adequacy of what is currently on offer, and to make recommendations (if necessary) for ways to enhance, modify or supplement current practice.

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS:

The central issues are the following:

What kinds of small group learning, and how many, are currently in place in Hopkins five undergraduate programs?
Recognizing that subject matter and goals differ among the schools, what kinds of small group learning are appropriate to each school?
Are there ways in which the traditional forms of small group learning (seminar, laboratory research, and individual thesis) could be enhanced, supplemented or even changed more substantially? We need to identify and assess new pedagogical strategies that are being developed, including the following: student run collaborative projects, different pedagogy for the discussion seminar, use of the internet and ethernet, interactive teaching programs.
What should be the relation between introductory level lecture courses and small group learning? This concerns not only the relation between the lectures and discussion sections of a single lecture course, but also the relation between these introductory or core lecture courses to small group learning. This issue will involve not only a fresh look at the value of lecture courses but also consideration of radical alternatives to introductory lecture courses in some areas, e.g., substituting interactive computer-based learning for lecture courses.

With respect to these four issues, the subcommittee must be sensitive to the differences among the schools and among departments within schools in its evaluation and recommendations. We do not expect to arrive at a uniform set of recommendations.

UNIVERSITY DATA NEEDED:

We need the following information from each of the five schools:

Over the last five years, what is the total number of undergraduate courses given, how many of these were small courses (enrollment under 20), and what is the percentage of small courses to total number of courses?
We need this information to be broken down by department along with the faculty size of each department (indicating the number of regular faculty members and the number of adjunct faculty, term contract lecturers, etc. exclusive of Teaching Assistants).
Over the last five years, how many tutorials, student run collaborative projects, and/or theses has each department (or school, if that is the appropriate unit) given? The data should be presented by year.
Over the last five years, how many students were enrolled in some form of small group learning? It would be useful to have this information broken down not only by school, but also by semester.

This data is crucial if we are to evaluate just what problems Hopkins actually faces. An initial crude set of data on the number of small classes given with the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences reveals a high percentage of small classes (with the exception of a couple of departments, notably, Biology and Psychology).

**COMPARATIVE DATE WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS:**

We need data about strategies for undergraduate education that peer institutions are pursuing.

What kinds of small group learning are used at peer institutions (including Brown, Chicago, Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Yale) as well as a selected number of elite liberal arts colleges (e.g., Swarthmore, Wesleyan, Williams)?

What is the evidence of the success of innovative teaching strategies?

New strategies for undergraduate education, both pedagogical and technical, that we will be considering for Hopkins have been introduced at other institutions. We need to know what these strategies are, and even more importantly how successful they are in enhancing the undergraduate’s learning experience.

**POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS:**

It might prove useful to draw on the resources of the following CUE subcommittees:

- **Student Life Subcommittee:** One possibility for small group learning would be to introduce residential seminars or colloquia.
- **Undergraduate Teaching:** Recommendations concerning small group learning would have implications for what role the Center for Educational Resources might play at Hopkins

**TENTATIVE WORK PLAN:**

It is too soon to specify a timetable for the work to be done, but the logic of the problem is clear enough.

Collect data on current practice at Hopkins and assess what the problems actually are at each of the schools.
Collect data from other institutions in order to maximize the range of possible strategies that Hopkins might introduce in its undergraduate education.
Report on our hypotheses as to the problems each school faces and make tentative suggestions for addressing those problems.

**2. ADVISING AND CAREER SUPPORT**

**CHAIR:**
Ms. Sandra Angell, Associate Dean for Academic and Student Support, School of Nursing
PURPOSE:

This sub-group would evaluate the mechanisms, both formal and informal, existing within the University for student academic advising and career development. Academic advising and career development are separate but intertwined phenomena worthy of evaluation to maximize faculty, staff and alumni resources that could contribute to informed decision-making about “end-game” issues among undergraduate students.

NEED TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM:

Homewood undergraduate students, especially those whose goals for post-graduate work or study are uncertain, express the desire for academic advisors who take a holistic approach to advising, i.e., who can discuss potential careers outside their own area of specialization. Students report the lack of a formal structure for academic advising and few opportunities to participate in mentored relationships in some large academic departments. All schools represented on this committee (AS &E, Nursing, Peabody) recognize a need for evaluation of academic advisor preparation and support.

Career counseling services are more developed in some schools (A&S) than others (Nursing and Peabody; SPSBEE not represented). Schools lacking formal career counseling centers cite insufficient financial resources for these services. All schools represented expressed the need for better communication about existing resources.

Students requested more involvement of alumni in providing opportunities for internships, mentoring and job networking. There appear to be opportunities for better cross-fertilization for career potential among the schools – i.e., international studies majors at A&S with SAIS, nursing majors with public health, musicians with computer science, etc.

ISSUES & QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

What is academic advising? Does it need to be redefined to better meet the needs of undergraduates? How are academic advisor assigned, how are they prepared for this role and how are they evaluated? Is there any reward for being a good advisor? What is the student’s responsibility in the academic advising process and how is that communicated?

What are the formal services in place for academic advising (some schools have offices for advising; most do not)? How do these offices work with the academic advisors?

Career counseling offices and services should be evaluated to determine what is currently available and how services are communicated to students. A broader sampling of students should be asked what services would be helpful to them in making career decisions. The distinction between career counseling and job placement must be made and a decision made about the scope of any future services to provide the latter. Are there opportunities for schools to share services? How do we better tap the rich resources of our alumni?

UNIVERSITY DATA NEEDED TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES:

An evaluation of current resources and practices for both academic advising and career development among the undergraduate divisions is necessary. Data about percentages of students who continue directly to graduate school would be helpful along with information about what other graduates do (very difficult to collect). An evaluation of alumni activities in the area of career development is needed. There
is a subcommittee of the Alumni Council on this topic. Some schools have divisional alumni offices as well. In all cases, examples of successful programs and best practices should be shared.

POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS:

Academic deans responsible for academic advising in all schools; student focus groups in all schools; collaboration with recent alumni (? mailing), Campus Ministries, Offices of Academic Advising and Career Counseling where they exist or interviews with persons responsible for those functions in other schools.

COMPARISONS/OUTSIDE RESOURCES:

Search for successful examples of academic advising and career development in other institutions or among our faculty, staff and students who have experienced successful practices in other institutions.

TENTATIVE WORK PLAN:

Gain approval for this subgroup issue as part of the larger self-study. Determine what data needs to be collected, how, when and by whom.

RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS:

Any mailing to alumni would be expensive. Could we access HopkinsNet to gain information from alumni? Student membership in this committee will decrease with graduation. New student members need to be added.

3. DIVERSIFIED UNDERGRADUATE COMMUNITY

CHAIR:
Dr. Robert Lawrence, Edyth Schoenrich Professor of Preventive Medicine and Associate Dean for Professional Education Programs, Bloomberg School of Public Health

PART A: RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY

PURPOSE:

To explore in what ways Johns Hopkins current diversity profile, structural diversity (student, faculty and staff), curriculum and student life enhances or hinders the quality of the collegiate experience for Johns Hopkins undergraduates.

NEED TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM:

In an article entitled “The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education, “ authors Jeffrey Milem and Kenji HaKuta in their opening paragraph state: “Many colleges and universities share a common belief, born of experience, that diversity in their student bodies, faculties, and staff is important for them to fulfill their primary mission providing a quality education.” The article continues by stating …Affirmation of the value of diversity is also evident in the following statement endorsed by the presidents of 62 research universities (including eight Ivy League institutions and more than 30 public research universities):
We speak first and foremost as educators. We believe that our students benefit significantly from education that takes place within a diverse setting. In the course of their University education, our students encounter and learn from others who have backgrounds and characteristics very different from their own. As we seek to prepare students for life in the 21st century, the educational value of such encounters will become more important, not less, than in the past.

A very substantial portion of our curriculum is enhanced by the discourse made possible by the heterogeneous backgrounds of our students. Equally, a significant part of education in our institutions takes place outside the classroom, in extracurricular activities where students learn how to work together, as well as to compete, how to exercise leadership, as well as to build consensus. If our institutional capacity to bring together a genuinely diverse group of students is removed—or severely reduced—then the quality and texture of the education we provide will be significantly diminished (Association of American Universities, “On the Importance of Diversity in University Admissions,” The New York Times, 24 April 1997, p. A27).

**PROJECT SCOPE:**

The committee will determine the level of diversity in the faculty, staff and students, the diversity in the curriculum, ethnic minority students’ perception of their Hopkins experience, and how diversity is incorporated in the non-classroom experiences of undergraduates.

The following questions will be addressed:

Do we have adequate diversity in the student body to enhance the classroom discussions?
Does the non-classroom Hopkins experience enhance or hinder the opportunity for diverse students to interact?
Is the faculty sufficiently diverse to provide the undergraduate with exposure to different ideas?
Are Hopkins undergraduates exposed to faculty mentoring from diverse backgrounds?
What are the experiences of ethnic minority students?
Is the curriculum diverse? Do students have opportunities to explore other cultures and ways of thinking and assessing information?
Do our graduates have a full understanding of and appreciation for diversity?
Are our graduates capable of leading and managing a diverse workforce?

**UNIVERSITY DATA NEEDED TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE:**

- Enrollment data by gender / race
- Faculty and staff data by race and gender
- Number of diversity-related courses offered each semester / year
- Diversity-related programs

**POTENTIAL COLLABORATIONS:**

- Diversity Leadership Council
- African-American Studies Program Committee
- University Committee on the Status of Women
- Office of Multicultural Student Affairs
TENTATIVE WORK PLAN:

The Committee will review pertinent data, seek the advice of experts, assess the campus climate for ethnic minority students (survey – focus groups), and consult with campus officials to determine the current status and needs.

PART B: INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this group is to carry out the mandate of the Board of Trustees that charged CUE with expanding international opportunities for Hopkins undergraduates in the areas of curriculum, advising, and study abroad.

RECORD OF ARTS AND SCIENCES:

The Krieger School has the largest contingent of undergraduates who are engaged in international study both in the U.S. and abroad.

RE: CURRICULUM:

International Studies is the largest major at the Krieger School, surpassing even biology. It includes requirements in political science, economics, history and foreign language. In addition, non-International Studies majors take a wide variety of courses with international content across many disciplines including anthropology, sociology, literature and philosophy. Distinctive to the Krieger School are ties to the Schools of Public Health and the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies where undergraduates take courses with some formally enrolling in academic programs.

ADVISING:

The Krieger School has an Office of Study Abroad run by Ruth Aranow where advice on international study is provided. There is also a website.

STUDY ABROAD:

189 students studied abroad last year. This includes 78 in Hopkins Programs in France, Cuba, Ecuador, Italy and Germany. This is an increase from last year's total of 136 and represents about 25% of the junior class. Engineering had 13 students traveling abroad this year (an increase from 6 the previous year).

INFORMATION TO BE GATHERED:

The Committee agreed that the following information would be useful to learn: statistics from all schools re curriculum and study abroad; how schools deal with sending students to unstable areas; where students are going (both countries and schools); international courses re the environment; how study abroad programs are evaluated; how international courses can be encouraged across the curriculum, and what other universities do in these areas.
OUTCOMES:

To see whether the schools are making progress in international education we will look at the number of professors hired who teach in international areas compared to earlier periods, the amount of resources devoted to advising for study abroad; and the change in percentage of students enrolling in Hopkins study abroad programs.

4. STUDENT LIFE: INTEGRATING THE INTELLECTUAL AND SOCIAL LIVES OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

CHAIR:
Dr. S. William Leslie, Department of History of Science and Technology, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this sub-group is to examine ways the intellectual and social lives of undergraduate can be better integrated and make recommendations of activities, facilities and models that might best accomplish this for each undergraduate division.

NEED TO ADDRESS THE PROBLEM:

Homewood undergraduates report a feeling of disconnection between their academic and social lives, a feeling of fragmentation about their residential lives, and more generally a lack of sense of collective endeavor. They tie these feelings to several specific, concrete issues: a lack of contact with faculty mentors and teachers outside of purely academic settings; a structure of residential life that puts upperclassmen off campus and therefore detaches them from the social and intellectual life of the campus; the lack of a fully satisfactory gathering place (or places) for working and socializing; the lack of any events or rituals that are widely shared among undergraduates and that might serve as a touchstone of collective experience and identity. SPSBE recognizes problems of fragmentation that are based on issues that are unique to them, such as 6 campus locations and adults who balance full-time work with family and school. They report some success, however, with creating program cohorts to form many learning communities. Many of Peabody’s concerns revolve around the need to be more connected to Homewood services; a more closely aligned social connection would be desired as well. SON reports systemic space limitations, circumscribing students’ access and sociability; it also report security, transportation, and parking issues.

ISSUES AND QUESTIONS TO BE ADDRESSED:

For Homewood students, can broader and more robust contacts between faculty and undergraduate students be forged, especially in extra-academic settings? Can residential life be (re)structured in ways that bring upperclassmen back into the community, better integrate the four classes, and generally help to forge a sense of community and collective endeavor among at least some subgroups of undergraduates, or indeed across the entire student body? Can some or all of these desiderata be achieved or enhanced in other ways? Can appropriate venues for student gatherings be created? What can be done to create a feeling of collective endeavor across the student body as a whole? Can SPSBE’s successful model be generalized across the schools? Can more systemic connections between Peabody and Homewood be developed (i.e., enhanced shuttle service)? How can SON’s space and transportations issues be resolved (again, perhaps in part by expanded/enhanced shuttle service)?
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UNIVERSITY DATA NEEDED TO ADDRESS THESE ISSUES:

A broader and deeper understanding of students’ feelings about these issues - their sense of what works and what doesn’t, where problems lie and how they might be addressed - is entirely necessary. We believe that holding focus groups of undergraduates, selected to represent different living situations and divisions, would bring some clarity to these matters. Any data that has been collected by the various divisions may be of use; e.g., the CSEQ survey, which has recently been administered at Homewood.

POTENTIAL COLLABORATORS:

The issues considered by this subcommittee run up against the work being done by a variety of other entities within the University. The most obvious and important of these is Residential Life (if Dean Susan Boswell serves on this subcommittee, she could presumably serve as liaison, keeping both sides informed of the other’s brief). Any examination of residential life and of appropriate venues for student gathering would also impinge on the work of the Bookstore Committee, and/or the successor committee that will plan the remainder of the development that includes the bookstore; the consultants who are working on a master dining plan; perhaps also the Charles Village Improvement Association, if any concrete proposals include developing or acquiring property on the east side of Charles.

COMPARISONS/OUTSIDE RESOURCES:

For Homewood, examining in greater detail the structures of student life at universities like ours (private institutions with the great majority of undergraduates living either in University housing or renting through the local private housing market) would be edifying. Peer institutions might include Stanford, Penn, Chicago, Princeton, and Yale. For the other divisions, appropriate other divisions will vary.

TENTATIVE WORK PLAN:

Collect data/conduct focus groups; collect data from peer institutions; generate proposals.

OUTCOME ASSESSMENT:

Qualitative: We must monitor student satisfaction over an extended period. A survey, like the CSEQ, administered University-wide (with customizations for each divisions’ needs) must be developed.

Quantitative: Monitoring student usage and demand for any new facilities (e.g., restructured or newly constructed dorms, or a Student Union) would indicate their success or failure. Count and seek to increase the number of events involving informal student/faculty contact. Monitor usage on new or enhanced shuttle routes.
# APPENDIX 6: DOCUMENT RESOURCE FILES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Charge to the Homewood Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>By-Laws of the Homewood Schools Academic Council &amp; Meeting Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Academic Council Departmental Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>By-Laws of the Faculty Assembly <a href="http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/faculty_assembly/bylaws.html">http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/faculty_assembly/bylaws.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Memos from Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Invitations to Dept. Chairs/Summaries of Meetings with Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Tenure Policy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Ethics Board Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Resource Guide for Search Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>KSAS Tenure Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>KSAS Appointment and Promotion Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Academic Titles and Appointment and Promotion Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Annual Reports of KSAS Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Woodrow Wilson Undergraduate Research Fellowship Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>J. Brien Key Graduate Student Assistance Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Kenan Grants for Undergraduate Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Hopkins Undergraduate Research Journal (HURJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>KSAS Departmental Summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Request from KSAS Deans to Dept. Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>KSAS Senior Faculty Activity Reports (Awards &amp; Accomplishments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>KSAS Junior Faculty Activity Reports (Awards &amp; Accomplishments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>KSAS Academic Officer CVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>New Chair Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Appointment of Directors of Undergraduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>KSAS Faculty CVs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Budget Planning Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Enrollment Planning Memorandum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Enrollment Planning Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Review of Academic Council Committee Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Proposal for New Minor In Africana Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Template for Review of Graduate Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Academic Council Discussion of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>KSAS Faculty Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>KSAS Faculty Appointments by Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Review of Departments’ Internal Controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Strategic Planning Update for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Teaching Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Organization Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Dean’s Letters to Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Resource File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Homewood Student Affairs

### And
### Homewood Enrollment and Academic Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Resource File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Homewood Student Affairs
And
Homewood Enrollment and Academic Services
Document Resource File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>Homewood Campus Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>Freshman Selection Process Outline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505</td>
<td>Admissions Criteria Validity Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>Undergraduate Admissions Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
<td>Intersession Trips and Courses [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~careers/students/intersession.html">http://www.jhu.edu/~careers/students/intersession.html</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508</td>
<td>Career Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509</td>
<td>Office of Academic Advising [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/advising/">http://www.jhu.edu/advising/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>510</td>
<td>Advising Hopkins Students – Handbook for Hopkins Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>National Alumni Schools Committee (NASC) Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>Homewood/Peabody Double Degree Program Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>Office of International Student and Scholar Services [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~isss/">http://www.jhu.edu/~isss/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>Office of Pre-professional Advising [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~preprof/">http://www.jhu.edu/~preprof/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>AAMC Analysis of JHU Applicants to Medical Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>MERLIN &amp; ACE Course Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Office of the Registrar [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~registr/">http://www.jhu.edu/~registr/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>Student Financial Services [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~finaid">http://www.jhu.edu/~finaid</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
<td>Office of the Dean for Homewood Enrollment and Academic Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>Freshman Academic Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>Enrollment Report 2002-2003 (Majors and Degrees Awarded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>540</td>
<td>“Connections” – Newsletter to Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>555</td>
<td>Study Abroad Programs [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~advising/Programs.htm">http://www.jhu.edu/~advising/Programs.htm</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>558</td>
<td>Degree Audit Checklists for the KSAS [<a href="http://www.advising.jhu.edu/checklists.html">http://www.advising.jhu.edu/checklists.html</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Undergraduate Academic Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>569</td>
<td>Graduation Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Whiting School of Engineering
Document Resource File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>WSE Strategic Plan (Phase II) - Executive Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>WSE/Part-Time Engineering Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Assessment of Progress Towards the WSE Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>WSE Faculty Retreat Report (June 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>WSE External Review (Spring 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>WSE Five Year Budget (March 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>WSE/Part-Time Engineering Financial Plan (May 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>WSE Organizational Chart (Fall 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Homewood Student Ethics Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>WSE Faculty Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>WSE ABET Reports (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>WSE Alumni Survey Results (Spring 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>WSE College Student Experiences Questionnaire Results (Spring 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>WSE Course Evaluation Results Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Whiting School of Engineering Document Resource File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Teacher Course Evaluation Consultant Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>WSE Advising Survey Results (Spring 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Engineering 101 Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
<td>Homewood Undergraduate Academic Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Homewood TA Training Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae of all WSE full-time faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae of 10% of all WSE/PTE instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2049</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.bme.jhu.edu/undergrad/SeniorExitFormSample.htm">http://www.bme.jhu.edu/undergrad/SeniorExitFormSample.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2050</td>
<td>Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~cheme/undergraduates/BLANK%20EXIT%20INTERVIEW.doc">http://www.jhu.edu/~cheme/undergraduates/BLANK%20EXIT%20INTERVIEW.doc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2051</td>
<td>Civil Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.ce.jhu.edu/abet_survey.htm">http://www.ce.jhu.edu/abet_survey.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2052</td>
<td>Computer Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.ece.jhu.edu/~gglm/manuals/CE-exit-survey.htm">http://www.ece.jhu.edu/~gglm/manuals/CE-exit-survey.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2054</td>
<td>Electrical Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.ece.jhu.edu/~gglm/manuals/EE-exit-survey.htm">http://www.ece.jhu.edu/~gglm/manuals/EE-exit-survey.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2055</td>
<td>Mechanical Engineering Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.me.jhu.edu/UG%20Exit%20Interview%202003.pdf">http://www.me.jhu.edu/UG%20Exit%20Interview%202003.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2069</td>
<td>Mathematical Sciences Exit Survey: <a href="http://www.mts.jhu.edu/mts/information/retsurv.xls">http://www.mts.jhu.edu/mts/information/retsurv.xls</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2056</td>
<td>Materials Science and Engineering Exit Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School of Nursing Document Resource File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>School of Nursing Baccalaureate and Graduate Programs Catalog 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Academic Manual (2003-04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>School of Nursing mission statement <a href="http://www.son.jhmi.edu/welcome/factsheet.asp">http://www.son.jhmi.edu/welcome/factsheet.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>School of Nursing Annual Report 2002-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>709</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing State of the School 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711</td>
<td>School of Nursing Budget Submission &amp; Five Year Plan (FY 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712</td>
<td>School of Nursing Capital Campaign – “Who Will Care for Us?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>715</td>
<td>School of Nursing Faculty Manual 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>Organizational Chart for School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>717</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae of Administrative Officers (Dean’s Leadership Team)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722</td>
<td>Academic Policies, Academic Ethics <a href="http://www.son.jhmi.edu/academic_programs/policies.asp#Academic%20Ethics">http://www.son.jhmi.edu/academic_programs/policies.asp#Academic%20Ethics</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724</td>
<td><a href="http://www.son.jhmi.edu/finaid/Finaid.asp">http://www.son.jhmi.edu/finaid/Finaid.asp</a> Office of Student Financial Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### School of Nursing

#### Document Resource File

| 726 | School of Nursing Student Information Guide 2003-04 |
| 727 | <http://www.son.jhmi.edu/> School of Nursing Student Services |
| 728 | Curriculum Vitae/Biographic Sketches of Student Services Professionals-Dean’s Leadership Document File |
| 731 | School of Nursing Academic Council Minutes of May, 2003; Demonstrates role of School of Nursing Academic Council in Appointments and Promotions process |
| 733 | Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI) Assessment for Undergraduates: End of Program Questionnaire |
| 734 | JHU School of Nursing Fall Enrollment Report (September, 2003) |
| 735 | JHU School of Nursing Strategic Plan FY 2000-04 (June 1999) |
| 736 | JHU School of Nursing Values Statement |
| 737 | Essentials of Baccalaureate Education (American Association of College of Nursing) |
| 738 | JHU School of Nursing report from Task Force on Baccalaureate Curriculum Review and Revision (anticipated March 2004) |
| 739 | Educational Benchmarking, Inc.(EBI) results from 2003 |

### Peabody Institute

#### Document Resource File

| 900 | Peabody Capital Campaign |
| 901 | Student Handbook |
| 902 | Academic Catalog |
| 903 | Peabody Ensembles Calendar |
| 904 | Residence Hall Handbook |
| 905 | Peabody Prelude |
| 907 | The Johns Hopkins Peabody News |
| 908 | Peabody Conservatory Admissions Packet |
| 909 | The Peabody Rag |
| 910 | Self-Study for the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) |
| 911 | NASM Student Survey – Final Report |
| 912 | Peabody Change Initiative |
| 914 | Faculty Handbook |
| 915 | 2003-04 Budget |
| 917 | Sample Peabody Faculty Contract |
| 918 | Faculty Climate Survey |
| 919 | Faculty Evaluation and Compensation Committee |
| 920 | Academic Council |
| 921 | Master Schedule of Classes |
| 922 | Course Syllabi |

### School of Professional Studies in Business and Education

#### Document Resource File

<p>| 1229 | Contract Packets to Instructors |
| 1230 | UG Meetings and Events (Notes &amp; Agendas) |
| 1231 | PSL Meetings/Agendas |
| 1232 | Midterm Evaluations and Midterm Data Evaluation Report |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Resource File</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1233</td>
<td>Public Safety Leadership (PSL) Briefing Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1234</td>
<td>Marketing/Program Brochures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235</td>
<td>UG Admissions and Advising Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1236</td>
<td>UG Experience Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1237</td>
<td>Senior Project, examples and guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1239</td>
<td>Articulation Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>HR Documents &amp; Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1242</td>
<td>Course Schedule - Fall 03/Spring 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>SPSBE Baltimore Scholars’ Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1244</td>
<td>Cohort Schedule examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>Student Writing Evaluation Forms/Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1246</td>
<td>Faculty Development Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1247</td>
<td>UG Competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1248</td>
<td>ARTSYS website [<a href="http://artweb/usmd.edu/">http://artweb/usmd.edu/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1249</td>
<td>SPSBE Student Satisfaction Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Enrollment Management Services (EMS) Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1251</td>
<td>Resumes/CVs (full-time and part-time faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1252</td>
<td>Excellence in Teaching Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1253</td>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning website [<a href="http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/student/student_astc.cfm">http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/student/student_astc.cfm</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1254</td>
<td>Faculty Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1255</td>
<td>Middle States Commission on Higher Education Accreditation Standards Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1256</td>
<td>The Sheridan Libraries of Johns Hopkins University [<a href="http://webapps.jhu.edu/jhuniverse/libraries">http://webapps.jhu.edu/jhuniverse/libraries</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1257</td>
<td>School of Professional Studies in Business and Education Information Technology (IT) Support [<a href="http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/itss/labs">www.spsbe.jhu.edu/itss/labs</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1258</td>
<td>Blackboard [<a href="http://www.bb6.spsbe.jhu.edu">www.bb6.spsbe.jhu.edu</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1259</td>
<td>ETS Placement Tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1260</td>
<td>SPSBE Faculty Website [<a href="http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/facultyweb/">http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/facultyweb/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1261</td>
<td>EUMAX Grant Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1262</td>
<td>Office of Student Affairs / Career Services [<a href="http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/student/inst_employf1.cfm">http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/student/inst_employf1.cfm</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1263</td>
<td>SDI: SPSBE Data Warehouse [<a href="http://webapps.spsbe.jhu.edu/">http://webapps.spsbe.jhu.edu/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1264</td>
<td>SPSBE SPT Prospect Tracker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1265</td>
<td>Alpha Sigma Lambda (ASL) Honor Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1266</td>
<td>Odyssey Catalog – fall 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1267</td>
<td>Faculty Payroll Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1268</td>
<td>SPSBE Committee on Diversity and Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1269</td>
<td>Levering Food Court [<a href="http://www.jhu.edu/~hds/dine/hours.html">http://www.jhu.edu/~hds/dine/hours.html</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>SPSBE Office of Records and Registration [<a href="http://www.spsbe.jhu.edu/payment/">www.spsbe.jhu.edu/payment/</a>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271</td>
<td>MHEC Course Approval Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1272</td>
<td>Delta Sigma Pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Disability Services for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Gender/Minority Faculty Analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Performance Accountability Report – prepared for MICUA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601</td>
<td>Admitted Students Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>CIRP Freshman Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>COFHE Admissions Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>COFHE Early Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>COFHE Enrolled Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>COFHE Freshman Financial Aid/Admissions Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1608</td>
<td>COFHE Parent Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609</td>
<td>COFHE Senior Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610</td>
<td>COFHE Source of Undergraduate Grant Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>COFHE Tuition, Student Budgets, and Self-Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612</td>
<td>College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>College Student Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1614</td>
<td>MHEC Recent Graduate Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1615</td>
<td>Quality of Life Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616</td>
<td>Report of the Trustee Working Group on Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1617</td>
<td>COFHE Admissions Cost Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1755</td>
<td>Homewood campus Classroom Upgrade Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Provost’s Undergraduate Research Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>CUE Data Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2100</td>
<td>Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America’s Research Universities (1998 Boyer Report)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 7: MIDDLE STATES COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION STATEMENT

Johns Hopkins University is seeking:

† Reaffirmation of Accreditation † Initial Accreditation

The undersigned hereby certify that the institution meets all established eligibility requirements of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

† If applicable, exceptions are noted in the attached memorandum.

________________________________   _________________________
William R. Brody, President                       (Date)

________________________________   _________________________
Raymond A. Mason, Chairman                      (Date)
Board of Trustees