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Chapter 1 – Executive Summary

Introduction

The planning and preparation of this 2009 Periodic Review Report provided an excellent—and strategic—opportunity for Johns Hopkins University to reflect meaningfully upon its current status and future aspirations as a world leader in higher education. While the core mission of Johns Hopkins has remained whole and strong during the intervening period since its 2004 decennial evaluation, its leadership, organization, academic programs, facilities and finances continue to evolve in a planned and deliberate manner as both opportunity and necessity dictate. Adaptation and change at Johns Hopkins University will certainly continue well into the future, and using this particular opportunity to carefully examine the dynamics and impact of critical institutional issues through the now refocused lens of the Periodic Review Report has proven both stimulating and transformative.

What has remained constant throughout our 18-month Periodic Review Report planning process is Johns Hopkins’ long and distinguished history as a highly decentralized institution, one that reserves to its academic divisions extraordinary independence in faculty governance, curricula, admissions, budgetary operations, and resource allocation and planning. Therefore, it is important to emphasize at the outset that this report also reaffirms the truly remarkable extent to which Johns Hopkins’ heritage of excellence derives from a single overarching mission that is realized, in large measure, through the endurance of a unique internal logic we commonly refer to as “decentralization.” This theme will repeat itself throughout our report. As noted early in our 1993 Middle States Commission on Higher Education evaluation team’s report:

In establishing the research model, Hopkins radically changed the notion of the academic “community.” The traditional collegiate institution of colonial and even post-Civil War times was the creation of an extant unified community, usually a specific denomination establishing its college for fellow believers. Curriculum followed the conditions of community creation with the dominance of Biblical learning and classical authors. Hopkins offered a radically different mode for community: community followed academic discipline, not the other way around. Given the natural dispersion of disciplines, the unitary community of the old time college vanished. Modern day Johns Hopkins expresses everywhere and all the time the motto, mystique, or mantra: decentralization.

Decentralization’s role at Johns Hopkins, our current organizational structure and the methodology that was employed to prepare this report are described in somewhat greater detail in Appendix 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3, respectively.

The Johns Hopkins University

The history of Johns Hopkins is a history of ideas. Since Hopkins opened its doors as America’s first research university in 1876, great thinkers have been drawn here. From the minds of professors, students and graduates have come ideas that have changed the practice of medicine, nursing and disease prevention, the world of literature, the process of engineering, the direction of science, the methods of business and the sounds of music.
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The mission of The Johns Hopkins University is to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.

*If we would maintain a university, great freedom must be allowed both to teachers and scholars. This involves freedom of methods to be employed by the instructors on the one hand, and on the other, freedom of courses to be selected by the students.*

—Daniel Coit Gilman (first JHU president, Inaugural Address, February 22, 1876)

At his inauguration as Johns Hopkins University’s first president in 1876, Daniel Coit Gilman laid out a vision for a new kind of university. “What are we aiming at?” he asked. “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.”

Building from scratch, rather than taking over an existing institution, freed Gilman to create something entirely new in the United States. He established a research university, dedicated not just to advancing students’ knowledge but also to advancing the state of human knowledge generally, through research and scholarship. The realization of Gilman’s philosophy at Hopkins, and at other institutions that later attracted Hopkins-trained scholars, revolutionized higher education in America, leading to the research university system as it exists today.

Gilman dismissed the notion that teaching and research are separate endeavors; he believed that success in one depended on success in the other. “The best teachers are usually those who are free, competent and willing to make original researches in the library and the laboratory,” Gilman said. “The best investigators are usually those who have also the responsibility of instruction, gaining thus the incitement of colleagues, the encouragement of pupils, the observation of the public.”

The university is named for its initial benefactor, Baltimore merchant Johns Hopkins, whose $7 million bequest—the largest U.S. philanthropic gift to that time—was divided evenly to finance the establishment of the university and The Johns Hopkins Hospital.

Johns Hopkins University became a member institution of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in 1921, and has been continuously reaccredited since that time. Johns Hopkins is a private, not-for-profit, research-extensive university whose current classification by the Commission is as a single institution at multiple sites and instructional locations.

Today, the university enrolls 20,149 full-time and part-time students in certificate and diploma programs as well as bachelor’s, master’s, first professional and doctoral degree programs on three major campuses in Baltimore, one in Washington, D.C., one in Montgomery County, Maryland, and at academic facilities in Nanjing, China, and Bologna, Italy. Johns Hopkins has offered courses and programs for part-time students since its earliest years, and actually established a formal division to administer continuing education in 1909. Today, part-time students—primarily master’s degree candidates—account for more than 40 percent of Johns Hopkins enrollment.

Students come to Johns Hopkins to continue a rich tradition of engaging in active thinking; here, they are not passive learners but involved participants in a process of investigation that challenges them to set their sights high and gives them the knowledge to ascend those new heights. Johns Hopkins boasts a wide spectrum of its academic strengths in such fields as art history, biological
and natural sciences, biomedical engineering, creative writing, English, history, economics, international studies, medicine, music, neuroscience, nursing, physics and astronomy, political theory, public health, public policy and the Romance languages. The opportunity to be involved in important research is one of the distinguishing characteristics of an undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins. Thirty-two Nobel Prize winners have been affiliated with the university as alumni or present or former faculty members.

In all, the university has nine academic divisions:

Based at the headquarters—Homewood—campus in northern Baltimore, the:

- Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
- G.W.C. Whiting School of Engineering
- School of Education

Based at downtown Baltimore, the:

- Carey Business School

Based at East Baltimore, the:

- School of Medicine
- Bloomberg School of Public Health
- School of Nursing

Located on Mount Vernon Place in downtown Baltimore, the:

- Peabody Institute

Located in Washington, D.C., the:

- Paul H. Nitze School of International Studies

The Applied Physics Laboratory is a division of the university co-equal to the nine schools but with a non-academic core mission. The Applied Physics Laboratory, located between Baltimore and Washington, is noted for contributions to national security, space exploration and other civilian research and development. It has developed more than 100 biomedical devices, many in collaboration with the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions located in East Baltimore, and its principal professional staff have a major role in the Whiting School of Engineering’s teaching and delivery of graduate, part-time education programs for engineering professionals.

The university employs about 25,000 people in full-time, part-time and temporary positions. The Johns Hopkins Institutions—that is, the university and the Johns Hopkins Health System, a separate corporation—together constitute the state’s largest private employer. Our current MSCHE Institutional Profile provides additional valuable information (Appendix 2).

**Major Institutional Changes and Developments**

The principal changes and developments that have occurred since our 2004 decennial evaluation are provided next in the following areas: the university leadership, academic divisions, fund raising, university planning and selected major initiatives.
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University Leadership

Ronald J. Daniels, former provost and chief academic officer of the University of Pennsylvania, was appointed to serve as the 14th president of The Johns Hopkins University, beginning March 1, 2009. Daniels is recognized as a strategic thinker, known for articulating and implementing bold and visionary academic ideas and initiatives. He has a record of academic entrepreneurship and commitment to building excellence in both the basic sciences and multidisciplinary research centers and institutes. In 2009 he was elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Daniels succeeds William R. Brody, who stepped down after more than nearly 12 years as leader of America’s first, and in terms of research dollars its largest, research-extensive university. Brody, who originally had planned to depart December 31, 2008, remained president through February 2009.

Kristina M. Johnson was appointed provost and senior vice president of academic affairs of The Johns Hopkins University on September 1, 2007. An electrical engineer with 40 patents and co-founder of several startup companies, she was the university’s 12th provost and the first woman to hold the university’s second-ranking position. Johnson had previously served since 1999 as dean of Duke University’s Pratt School of Engineering. On March 12, 2009, President Barack Obama announced his nomination of Provost Johnson to be undersecretary of the U.S. Department of Energy. In 2007 she was awarded the Fritz Medal, widely considered the highest award in engineering.

Scott Zeger, vice provost for research and professor of biostatistics at the Bloomberg School of Public Health, was appointed acting provost and senior vice president for academic affairs of The Johns Hopkins University by President Ronald Daniels, effective March 13, 2009.

Jonathan Bagger, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor and former chairperson of the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, was appointed vice provost for graduate and postdoctoral programs and special projects, effective March 1, 2008.

Michela Gallagher, Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of psychology and neuroscience and former chairperson of the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences at the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, was appointed vice provost for academic affairs, effective March 1, 2008.

Stephen Dunham, a partner in and former chairman of the global law firm Morrison & Foerster LLP and former chief attorney at the University of Minnesota, was appointed to serve as vice president and general counsel in December 2005.

Michael C. Eicher became vice president for development and alumni relations at Johns Hopkins on September 1, 2006. He has overall responsibility for attracting private financial support for the university and Johns Hopkins Medicine and for strengthening Johns Hopkins’ relationships with alumni and other supporters.

Michael Strine, formerly chief financial officer of New Castle County in Delaware and a graduate of Johns Hopkins, was appointed executive director of financial planning and analysis at The Johns Hopkins University in April 2008. He prepares and monitors the university’s budget of nearly $3.5 billion and, in collaboration with the administration and the deans and directors of Johns Hopkins divisions, prepares the annual five-year financial plan. In November 2008, he was elevated to the newly created position of vice president for finance. Jim McGill, senior vice president for finance and administration, has restructured the finance office as part of a plan to streamline university
administration and focus on such issues as cost-cutting, efficiency and effectiveness, and realigning the enterprise financial and administrative software system (SAP).

**Arthur Roos**, formerly the treasurer at Case Western University in Cleveland, was appointed treasurer to oversee the university’s debt, banking and cash relations in September 2006.

**Philip Tahey**, who has specialized in financial reporting for colleges and universities in a 25-year career in accounting and consulting, joined Johns Hopkins University as controller in September 2005. The university has begun a process to recruit a new controller to replace Tahey, who committed to three years in that post when he joined the university.

**Kathryn J. Crecelius**, who managed investments for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was appointed to the newly created position of chief investment officer at The Johns Hopkins University in August 2005.

**Academic Divisions**

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences cultivates excellence in select areas in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences. **Adam Falk**, a physicist and the school’s former dean of faculty, was appointed to serve as dean of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, effective February 1, 2006. A $73 million renovation of 92-year-old Gilman Hall, the university’s flagship building and home to the Krieger School’s humanities departments, began in summer 2007. Seminar rooms, teaching spaces and common areas will unite students, researchers and faculty, fostering interdisciplinary collaboration. When it is complete, the renewed Gilman Hall will be the first “green building” at the Homewood campus.

**Steven David**, professor and director of the Political Science Department’s international studies program, was appointed vice dean for centers and programs in 2005 and continues serving in this capacity. **David Bell**, the Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities, assumed the role of dean of faculty in 2007. **Frederick Puddester**, formerly the university’s chief budget officer, was appointed senior associate dean for finance and administration in 2007. **Sylvia Eggleston Wehr** was appointed associate dean of external affairs in 2007, having served for many years in a similar capacity at the Bloomberg School of Public Health. **Gregory Ball**, professor of psychological and brain sciences, was appointed dean of research and graduate education in 2008. **Sarah Steinberg**, previously associate dean of Advanced Academic Programs at the Krieger School, was appointed senior associate dean for graduate professional programs and technology integration in 2009.

Between 2004 and 2008, **Christopher Celenza**, German and romance languages and literatures; **Andrew Cherlin**, sociology; **Jane Dailey**, history; **Eckhart Förster**, philosophy; **Louis Galambos**, history; and **Christopher Sogge**, mathematics, were named Guggenheim Fellows. In 2009, the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, which has fewer than 300 tenured and tenure-track faculty members, won as many Guggenheims as all but one other university in the United States, including five in the humanities and social sciences. The following six Krieger School faculty were named Guggenheim Fellows in 2009: **Amanda Anderson**, English; **Richard Halpern**, English; **Veena Das**, anthropology; **Barbara Landau**, cognitive science; **Theodore Lewis**, near eastern studies; **Robert Moffitt**, economics. Between 2004 and 2009, **Charles Bennett**, physics and astronomy; **Ronald Daniels**, political science; **Jane Guyer**, anthropology; **John Irwin**, English; **Barbara Landau**, cognitive science; **Peter Olsson**, earth and planetary sciences; **Adam Reiss**, physics and astronomy;
and Michael Williams, philosophy, were elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Elected to the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 2008 were Jonathan Bagger, physics and astronomy and Barbara Landau, cognitive science. In 2009, Adam Riess, physics and astronomy, was named a MacArthur Fellow.

In December 2006, the university announced that trustee emeritus William Polk Carey and the W. P. Carey Family Foundation had committed $50 million to help transform the strengths of a pre-existing regional business-education program into an eminent free-standing school. The Carey Business School strives to reinvent business education to produce leaders armed with both specialized business skills and cross-disciplinary knowledge. Currently serving the Baltimore-Washington region with a network of several teaching sites, the school incorporates what was formerly the Graduate Business Division of the, now closed, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. Yash P. Gupta, an innovative educator who recently served as dean of the University of Southern California’s Marshall School of Business, was appointed in January 2008 to serve as the inaugural dean of the new Carey Business School at Johns Hopkins University.

The following key appointments were made by dean Yash Gupta between 2007 and 2009. Phillip Phan, formerly the Warren H. Bruggeman and Pauline Urban Bruggeman Distinguished Professor of Management at the Lally School of Management and Technology, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, was appointed vice dean for faculty and research. Dipankar Chakravarti, formerly the Ortloff Professor of Business, professor of marketing and faculty director of the program in international management, Leeds School of Business, University of Colorado, was appointed vice dean for programs in 2009. Pamela Cranston, formerly vice provost for academic affairs and international programs and interim dean, was appointed vice dean for operations. James Zeller, formerly vice provost for academic budgets and planning, was appointed associate dean for finance and administration. Sally O’Brien, formerly director of development, Bloomberg School of Public Health, was appointed associated dean for development and external affairs. Anne McCarthy, formerly dean of the Merrick School of Business, University of Baltimore, was appointed associate dean for professional programs. Toni Ungaretti, formerly associated dean and co-director, graduate division of business, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, was appointed assistant dean and director of the office of learning. In 2007, Phil Phan was elected the Robert Bosch Public Policy Fellow of the American Academy in Berlin, Germany and New York, USA.

At the same time, the trustees of the university also created the School of Education, from what was formerly known as the Graduate Education Division of the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education. Originally founded in 1909 as the College Courses for Teachers, the new school builds upon nearly 100 years of preparing educators to make a difference in the lives of children. The school awards more than 500 master’s degrees in education annually, the most conferred by any Maryland institution. It is based in the recently renovated Seton Court facility adjacent to the Homewood campus. Classes are offered at Homewood, Columbia and Montgomery County teaching sites. Ralph Fessler, the inaugural dean of the Johns Hopkins University School of Education and a state and national leader in teacher education, will retire at the end of the 2009–2010 academic year.

Faculty, students and graduates of the Whiting School of Engineering are leaders in innovation, conducting pioneering research and creating new technologies that improve people’s lives and address the ever-changing demands of modern society. Nicholas Jones, a former chair of the school’s Department of Civil Engineering, returned to Johns Hopkins as the fourth dean of the Whiting School of
Engineering, effective August 2004. The new 79,000-square-foot Computational Science and Engineering Building on Decker Quadrangle opened in summer 2007. The facility supports multidisciplinary and collaborative research, like the Cardiovascular Research Grid, which allows cardiovascular researchers worldwide to easily exchange data and expertise on heart-related illnesses.

In 2006, Robert Dalrymple, civil engineering, and Frederick Jelinik, electrical and computer engineering, were elected to the National Academy of Sciences. James West, electrical and computer engineering, received the National Medal of Technology in 2006. In 2007, William Brody, electrical and computer engineering, was elected to the National Academy of Engineering. In 2008, Kristina Johnson, electrical and computer engineering, was awarded the Fritz Medal, the first female to receive the honor.

The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies is a leading graduate school of international affairs, educating students for professional careers in government, business, journalism, international law and nonprofit organizations. A series of events in October 2005 marked the 60th anniversary of SAIS. Effective summer of 2009, Myron Kunka has been appointed senior associate dean for finance and administration by Dean Jessica Einhorn. Kunka, a veteran U.S. Department of Defense administrator, has participated in or led U.S. delegations to Arms Control Treaty talks with Russia and states of the former Soviet Union. During the 2008–2009 academic year, SAIS is examining the critical role of water throughout the world. The “Year of Water” brings the SAIS community together to explore global warming issues as they relate to economics and commerce, agriculture, the environment, new technologies, development and poverty, security, public health, and conflict and cooperation. One of five Johns Hopkins faculty to be named a Guggenheim Fellow in 2005 was Piero Gleijeses, a professor of American foreign policy.

In 2006, Fouad Adjami, middle east studies, received the National Humanities Medal.

The School of Medicine provides international leadership in the education of physicians and medical scientists, in biomedical research and in the application of medical knowledge to sustain health. The S. Anne and C. Michael Armstrong Medical Education Building is now under construction and will provide 100,000 square feet of instructional space complete with digital imaging technology. The new building, coupled with the redesign of the curriculum, ushers in a new approach to medical education that will integrate learning programs, blend clinical and basic science learning experiences and introduce more small-group work. The School of Medicine is also implementing a master plan to replace aging facilities on the East Baltimore medical campus and develop an adjacent life sciences park. The $1.2 billion redevelopment plan will provide a new home for the Johns Hopkins Children’s Center and a new cardiovascular and critical care tower for adults, as well as support facilities.

In 2004, Arnall Patz, ophthalmology, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom and Benjamin Carson, pediatric neurosurgery, was so honored in 2008. In 2006, Carol Grieder, oncology, was received the Lasker Medal Research Award. Lisa Cooper, medicine, was named a MacArthur Fellow in 2007 as was Peter Provonost, anesthesiology and critical care medicine, in 2008. Between 2004 and 2009, Peter Devreotes, physiology and pharmacology; Richard Huganir, cellular and molecular medicine; and Gregg Semenza, medical genetics, were elected members of the National Academy of Sciences. The School of Medicine has a total of 45 faculty who are fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a total of 25 faculty who are members of the Institute of Medicine.
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The School of Nursing provides leadership to improve health care and advance the nursing profession through education, research, practice and service. This year the school is celebrating its 25th anniversary of the founding of the baccalaureate program and the 120th year of nursing education at Johns Hopkins. An ambitious expansion of facilities for the school, set to unfold over the next decade, will double existing classroom, laboratory and office space. In February 2009, Pamela Jeffries was appointed associate dean for academic affairs by Dean Martha Hill.

Patricia Abbott, health systems and outcomes, was elected to the American College of Medical Informatics in 2004. The same year, Miyong Kim, health systems and outcomes; Daniel Sheridan, community public health nursing; and Leslie Mancuso, community public health nursing, were named fellows of the American Academy of Nursing. Fannie Gaston-Johansson, acute and chronic care, was inducted in 2005 into the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences of Goteborg, Sweden, the first nurse voted into the organization. Anne Belcher, acute and chronic care, in 2007, was selected as a fellow in the National League of Nursing Academy of Nursing Education. In 2008, dean Martha Hill was elected to the Institute of Medicine’s governing council through 2010. Kathi White, health systems and outcomes, and Julie Stanik-Hutt, acute and chronic care, were inducted as fellows in the American Academy of Nursing in 2009.

The Peabody Institute of The Johns Hopkins University, located in the historic and cultural hub of Baltimore, is one of the nation’s major sources of professionally trained musicians. Through its constituent divisions, the degree-granting Conservatory music school and the community-based Preparatory music and dance school, the Institute trains musicians and dancers from every age and at every level, from small children to seasoned professionals, from dedicated amateurs to winners of international competitions. The Peabody Institute celebrated the completion of a $26.8 million renovation in April 2004. Pianist and composer Jeffrey Sharkey, former dean of the Cleveland Institute of Music, was named director of the Peabody Institute in September 2006. On July 1, 2008, Mellasenah Morris was appointed by Sharkey as dean of the Peabody Conservatory and deputy director of the Peabody Institute. Formerly, professor of piano and director of the School of Music at The Ohio State University, Morris received her BM, MM and DMA from the Peabody Institute of The Johns Hopkins University.

Leon Fleisher, piano, received the Kennedy Center Honors Award in 2007.

The Bloomberg School of Public Health is a leading international authority on public health, dedicated to keeping millions around the world safe by pioneering new research, deploying its knowledge and expertise in the field, and educating tomorrow’s scientists and practitioners. Michael J. Klag, an expert on the epidemiology and prevention of heart and kidney disease who earned his master of public health degree from Johns Hopkins, was appointed to serve as dean on September 1, 2005. James Yager continues to serve as senior associate dean, and in 2009, Dean Michael Klag appointed Stephen Teret to the new position of associate dean for faculty and education and Thomas Burke to the position of associate dean for public health practice and training.

M. Gregg Bloche, adjunct associate professor of health policy and management, was one of five Johns Hopkins faculty to be named a Guggenheim Fellow in 2005. Diane Griffin, molecular microbiology and immunology, was elected a member of the National Academic of Science in 2004. That same year, J. Marie Hardwick, molecular microbiology and immunology, was named a fellow in the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Between 2004 and 2009, the following faculty were inducted into the Institute of Medicine: Nobel Laureate Peter Agre, molecular
microbiology and immunology; Robert Blum, Population, Family and Reproductive Health; Ronald Brookmeyer, biostatistics; Frederick Burke, refugee and disaster response; Kay Dickerson, epidemiology; Ruth Faden, health policy and management; Lynn Goldman, environmental health sciences; Diane Griffin, molecular microbiology and immunology; Nancy Kass, health policy and management; Kenrad Nelson, epidemiology, and Scott Zeger, biostatistics.

**Fund Raising**

In 2000, Johns Hopkins again made fund-raising history as the first American university to conduct back-to-back $1 billion-plus campaigns. The Johns Hopkins Initiative, launched in the 1990s with an original goal of $900 million, concluded June 30, 2000, with an impressive $1.52 billion raised for the university and The Johns Hopkins Hospital/Health System. The impact of the initiative was far-reaching. Generous commitments from over 100,000 donors resulted in support to numerous research and academic efforts, 460 new named scholarships and graduate fellowships, 130 new endowed professorships, two endowed deanships, 11 new buildings and facilities, major renovations to seven existing buildings, as well as technology and laboratory upgrades in other buildings.

The Knowledge for the World campaign began July 1, 2000, the very next day after the university completed The Johns Hopkins Initiative. The initial Knowledge for the World goal was $2 billion by June 30, 2007. After the $2 billion mark was exceeded in 2006, the Board of Trustees increased the goal to $3.2 billion and extended the completion date to December 2008 to focus more specifically on funding critical capital needs. Campaign commitments from more than 250,000 donors totaled over $3.74 billion at the official close of the campaign on December 31, 2008.

Gifts to the Knowledge for the World campaign have advanced the exceptional education, research, patient care and public service initiatives for which Johns Hopkins is known worldwide. The following is a sampling of the benefits and outcomes produced by philanthropic investment in six areas throughout the university and The Johns Hopkins Hospital/Health System as of June 30, 2008.

**Student Aid** – $301 million (8 percent of the total)

The university’s ability to provide financial aid comparable to that offered by peer institutions is critical to our ability to enroll both undergraduate and graduate students. Gifts during the Knowledge for the World campaign have established new student aid endowments and increased existing ones. One example is the Baltimore Scholars Program, fully funded scholarships designated for Baltimore City public high school graduates who are admitted to Johns Hopkins as undergraduates.

**Faculty Support** – $236.7 million (6.3 percent of the total)

The excellence of Johns Hopkins rests on our ability to attract and retain outstanding professors who are leaders in their fields—individuals who teach and mentor students; are actively engaged in scholarship and discovery; and apply their expertise to the practice of their disciplines. Endowments are essential in providing our academic leaders and distinguished faculty the resources to support their own work and to create centers of excellence in their areas of interest. To date, more than 80 new named professorships and one named deanship have been created during the Knowledge for the World campaign.
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Facilities – $680.4 million (18.2 percent of the total)

The Knowledge for the World campaign has fueled an unprecedented physical transformation of the Johns Hopkins campuses. Thanks to philanthropic investments, we are replacing aging and outmoded infrastructure with new facilities that will ensure Johns Hopkins’ continued leadership in research, education, patient care and service to the community. For example, during the campaign, donors have:

- established the Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, Johns Hopkins Malaria Institute, Johns Hopkins Heart Institute, Institute for Cell Engineering, and the Genetics and Public Policy Center.
- supported a physical transformation of the Peabody Institute campus, construction of Johns Hopkins Medicine clinical and research buildings, a new School of Medicine teaching building, and a new Homewood admissions and visitors center, residence hall, and computational science and engineering building.

Program Support – $1,010.7 million (27 percent of the total)

The Knowledge for the World campaign has enabled Johns Hopkins to expand efforts and launch new programs, institutes and centers that benefit students, patients and the public—bringing knowledge to the world. Notable are the creation of the Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center and the Carey Business School.

Research Support – $1,270.4 million (34 percent of the total)

Campaign giving has greatly advanced discovery throughout Johns Hopkins—establishing centers and institutes that foster collaboration and accelerate research in key areas, advancing promising lines of inquiry among faculty throughout the university, launching the careers of talented faculty and ensuring that students at all levels are engaged in research.

Unrestricted/Undesignated Support – $241.9 million (6.5 percent of the total)

Unrestricted or undesignated support is critical as the “nuts and bolts” funding for the university by allowing the president and leadership team to support ongoing and new projects to keep academic, research and service efforts running smoothly.

The Johns Hopkins Knowledge for the World campaign ended in December 2008 with total commitments of $3.741 billion, creating 92 professorships, generating 550 new scholarships and graduate fellowships, and modernizing teaching, research and patient care facilities at Johns Hopkins campuses at home and beyond. The capital campaign provides a good example of how Johns Hopkins links academic and financial planning. The goal of the campaign is to better position Johns Hopkins, within an increasingly complex and globalized society, to teach, discover and put knowledge to work for humanity. The campaign priorities are directly aligned with institutional priorities for student learning and institutional effectiveness, such as support for student financial aid, faculty, facilities, research and academic programs.
University Planning

Johns Hopkins completed its last strategic plan in 1994, when William Brody, then professor and chair of radiology in the School of Medicine and later president of the university, chaired the Committee for the 21st Century. That plan helped to advance the university’s global influence, its building program that has nearly doubled Johns Hopkins’ teaching and research space, and two development campaigns that raised more than $5.25 billion.

By any measure, that plan has served the university well. Yet the world is now a different place. The nature of university research and education is in transition. Important questions are at the boundaries of traditional disciplines or at the core or new, emerging disciplines. In the sciences, multidisciplinary teams from around the world address major questions, often directed by committees or funding agencies. The extent and complexity of information demand improved tools for inquiring, managing and using data. Many peer universities have organized themselves to invest new funds in cross-disciplinary initiatives. These circumstances raise a question: What steps must Johns Hopkins take in the coming decade to remain a pre-eminent university?

In preparation for the next phase of the university’s development, in May 2008, President Brody and Provost Johnson initiated a planning process called Framework for the Future. Its goals were to take stock of the current state of the university, to identify new crosscutting opportunities and the ways and means to expand collaboration and to lay the groundwork for strategic thinking for President Ronald Daniels, who would begin his administration in March 2009. Greater details are provided about this major planning initiative in Chapter 3.

Selected Major Initiatives

The university opened Charles Commons, a new residential-dining-retail complex located across the street from the Homewood campus in Charles Village, in September 2006. The 350,000-square-foot development provides a home for 618 undergraduate students, a dining facility and the university bookstore.

On January 1, 2007, the university replaced its financial and administrative systems with SAP, an enterprise resource planning suite of applications. This was a joint activity with the Johns Hopkins Health System and encompassed virtually all of the enterprise finance, accounts payable, purchasing, sponsored research administration, human resources and payroll functions.

The primary reasons for the implementation were to provide a common operational platform for the university and the health system, increase administration staff productivity, improve service to users and maximize compliance with external regulations. The shared platform also provides the opportunity for increased institutional effectiveness through the streamlining of processes, elimination of duplicate functions and potential consolidation. While the desire to reduce costs was not a primary driver, savings are being realized through shared processing centers, e-commerce and collaborative purchasing agreements, and improved internal controls on purchasing.

Because of the complexity of the enterprise and the broad scope of the implementation, the planning and implementation of the project took several years. It involved the project team and users throughout the enterprise. In addition, both a trustee advisory committee and a faculty advisory committee were active during implementation.
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There were a number of challenges including managing the project scope, staying within budget, making timely decisions, achieving faculty and administrative buy-in, building interfaces, assuring data security, developing working and management reports, and adequately testing the system before go-live. In addition, because of the high number of system users, training was a challenge. Other key issues that received attention were communication with the broad Johns Hopkins community, system documentation and knowledge transfer from the project consultants to the Johns Hopkins staff. The enterprise is now preparing for an upgrade of the core application suite and extended functionality.

In summer 2004, Johns Hopkins launched the Baltimore Scholars Program, providing full tuition for Baltimore City public high school students accepted into the university’s undergraduate programs. The Baltimore Scholars is a particularly important initiative that gives the city’s most capable students an opportunity to stay near home and study at Johns Hopkins. The program has resulted in a significant increase in the number of city school graduates applying and a record number of Baltimore city students enrolling.

In April 2008, Johns Hopkins announced the Mosaic Initiative to provide $6.25 million over the next five years in matching funds for departments seeking to improve diversity, including hiring and retaining outstanding women and underrepresented minority scholars for faculty positions. The goal of the project, developed by Provost Kristina Johnson, is to attract a mosaic of rising faculty stars interested in becoming part of the intellectual life of Johns Hopkins University. The university hopes to attract 25 to 30 new faculty over the next five years.

**Periodic Review Report Highlights**

Chapter 1 – Executive Summary

This chapter provides important context and orientation to Johns Hopkins University’s mission, its organizational ethos, and academic and administrative enterprises; its evolution over the past five years in terms of major institutional changes and developments; its planned approach to preparing this report; and an overview of each report chapter in narrative form. In view of Johns Hopkins’ institutional breadth, depth and complexity, additional essential information has been provided about institutional mission and environment, organization structure, and report development methodology in three separate appendices (16.1, 16.2 and 16.3).

Chapter 2 – Institutional Response to Recommendations

No formal recommendations were forthcoming in the 2004 final report of the decennial evaluation team representing the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. However, in the absence of having such recommendations to respond to officially, Johns Hopkins wishes to take the opportunity to comment on a number of helpful suggestions for improvement that were made by the evaluation team—and to provide updates on key internal recommendations of our own making—in the area of undergraduate education. While the text of the chapter focuses specifically on: (1) enhancing participation and effectiveness of student teaching evaluation; (2) greater visibility for the Ethics Board; (3) revision of the weekly course schedule; (4) increased attention to diversity; (5) continued efforts to strengthen partnerships with the city of Baltimore; (6) student life enhancements; (7) and communication with campus constituents, an appendix also provides coverage of 24 additional items of great importance to Johns Hopkins. The CUE Report has not sat idly on the shelf; considerable progress has been made in implementing many of these recommendations. While there is cause for pride in what has been accomplished, there is also recognition that more remains to be done.
Chapter 3 – Challenges and Opportunities

Chapter 3 examines Johns Hopkins’ current condition and the road ahead over the next five years. It describes the university’s strengths in fulfilling its mission, current and anticipated challenges, and promising new opportunities. The presentation in Chapter 3 has drawn on each school’s analysis of its standing with respect to accomplishments, challenges and opportunities. It also reflects the work of a recent university-wide planning process that engaged the faculty, staff and administration. The Provost’s Framework for the Future began with the formation of three working groups in May 2008 and delivered its report to the president in March 2009. Through the combination of divisional self-studies and across divisional reports of the working groups, areas of particularly high priority have been identified to meet the needs of research, discovery and education, undergraduate financial aid and graduate stipends, faculty recruitment and compensation. This process has also helped to identify areas of common problems across schools and a greater shared understanding of the challenges and opportunities facing individual divisions. In the current economic climate, the university has opportunities to build on initial success in consolidating services and reducing costs across the divisions. Leadership from University Administration and the academic divisions are working together to identify revenue and cost moves that will generate resources that can be reprogrammed to strengthen the academic enterprise. Finally, the Discovery working group in the planning of the Framework for the Future identified crosscutting initiatives in research, scholarship and education that offer further strategic opportunities for the university. These areas of emerging potential for excellence are also highlighted in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4 – Enrollment and Financial Trends and Projections

Chapter 4 provides an in-depth analysis of enrollment and financial trends and projections over the next five years, and a description of the basic assumptions underlying both. Affirmed through these analyses are continued strong enrollment levels and quality, and a positive financial condition for the foreseeable future.

Chapter 5 – Assessment Processes and Plans

In view of the new focus of 2009 Periodic Review Reports and given Johns Hopkins’ high degree of decentralization, an inquiry was made on January 8, 2007, with Commission vice president Dr. Barbara Loftus about whether one or more chapters of our report could be produced as an aggregation of individual reports from our nine schools. An affirmative response to this question enabled us to craft Chapter 5 in this fashion, something not otherwise easily achieved. As noted in Appendix 16.3, extensive clarification of Commission expectations surrounding assessment was a prominent, early, ongoing focus of Periodic Review Report Committee deliberations. One highly valuable outcome of such dialogue and discussion was group consensus surrounding the development of a 47-point, self-administered assessment checklist. The same instrument served as a report writing template for the chapter—admittedly the longest and most comprehensive component of the entire report. Assessment plans and processes for each of Johns Hopkins’ nine schools are presented and discussed. At the end of each school statement, an overview of supporting evidence is provided as a guide to the extensive and, in many cases, highly confidential appendix documentation for reviewers’ eyes only. Following the paradigm noted in Figure 1, what has been shared in extraordinary detail in this chapter for each school, is a concise, candid and contemporaneous account of assessment plans, practices, outcomes, linkages to resource allocation and institutional advancement, achievements, aspirations and future challenges.
Chapter 6 – Planning and Budgeting Processes

This chapter discusses how separate planning, evaluation and resource allocation processes of the academic divisions at separate sites build into an integrated institution-wide plan for achieving the collective and separately articulated missions of Johns Hopkins University. The responsibility for assessing student learning and integrated resource planning to support the same is placed at the most appropriate institutional level given the highly decentralized culture at Johns Hopkins. Deans, divisional business officers, school assessment coordinators and other leaders are charged with oversight and leadership of a school’s assessment of student learning and collaborating with faculty and staff to foster “a culture of evidence” including appropriate measures and indicators for planning, budgeting, assessment and effectiveness. A Standing University Committee on Assessment, reporting to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs serves, university-wide, as a consultant and authority on outcomes assessment effectiveness. Resource planning deadlines are timed to coincide with the ongoing calendar by which the provost works with deans to use academic strategic plans and information within the budget processes that follow to match goals to resources. Resource allocation, itself the result of a thoughtful process of self-examination, is a decentralized, bottoms-up process with each school, center or institute individually developing their budgets within general university guidelines. It is important to understand that the individual operating units are the primary generators of funding mainly through instruction, research, clinical service and philanthropy. The overwhelming majority (roughly 96 percent) of the funds remain with the operating unit that generated them, with only a small portion reallocated to the cost of running the central administration. Central administration ensures coordinated and consolidated planning, fund raising, and program and capital development through a process jointly led by the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs and the senior vice president for finance and administration. This process results in aligning the divisional statements of mission and efforts toward student learning outcomes, institutional effectiveness and program assessment into a comprehensive, coherent and resourced plan for achieving Johns Hopkins University’s overarching and supportive missions “to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.”

Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence

Appendix 2  Institutional Profile
Appendix 16.1 A General Institutional Description
Appendix 16.2 Principal Administrative Officers and Deans (organization chart)
Appendix 16.3 Methodology
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Johns Hopkins University was last reviewed for decennial reaccreditation in the spring of 2004 by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Following the submission of documentation for review and a site visit during March 21–24, the accreditation of the university was reaffirmed, without qualification, by Commission action on June 23, 2004.

The university made a strategic decision to focus its self-study report for the accreditation review on a selected topic of great interest and pressing concern to Johns Hopkins (and, one might note, many other research universities): The Challenge of Improving Undergraduate Education in a Research Intensive Environment. The core of the self-study document submitted on behalf of the university was the Report of a Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE), a committee appointed by the university president and composed of students, faculty and administrators representing all five of the university’s academic divisions that offered undergraduate degree programs. The charge to the commission was to identify the core values that should characterize the Johns Hopkins undergraduate experience and to develop recommendations for specific actions that would improve the quality of undergraduate education, both inside and outside the classroom. The commission organized its study into four working groups: academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life. A yearlong study resulted in the formulation of 34 recommendations encompassing all aspects of undergraduate life (Appendix 17.1).

Since completion of the university’s self-study report, considerable progress has been made in implementing the 34 recommendations of the commission. Because of the high degree of administrative decentralization, the primary responsibility for implementation of the recommendations has rested with the schools, but there have been periodic, comprehensive reports to the senior administration and even to the Committee on Academic Affairs of the Board of Trustees, on the status of implementation. Most recently, a five-year summary, which is attached to this report as Appendix 17.2, has been prepared under the leadership of the vice provost and dean of undergraduate education. This document reviews every CUE recommendation in the context of each academic division, though not all recommendations are equally relevant to the specific school constituencies, given different missions, student demographics, etc.

While there were no formal recommendations on which reaffirmation of accreditation was made contingent, the Evaluation Team reacted to the self-study report by offering a number of helpful suggestions for improvement. The summary comments below highlight those aspects of the CUE/self-study report and its recommendations that attracted particular attention from the Evaluation Team, many of which are especially relevant to the undergraduate programs at Homewood. Additional suggestions were provided also to the individual schools, and progress on these is detailed in Appendix 17.2.

Increase Participation and Effectiveness of Student Teaching Evaluations

The dean of enrollment and academic services has led an effort to enhance student participation in the teacher course evaluation system, and we are pleased to report that, on the Homewood campus, the instrument is distributed to 84 percent of the courses, with a student participation rate of 64 percent. Another review of the process was undertaken in late fall 2008 with resulting additional communications to students and faculty, underlining the importance of this process. Steps have been taken to streamline the posting of course evaluation results and student comments. The Academic
Council has also regularized the consideration of teacher course evaluations in the review of candidates for promotion and tenure. Secondary analysis of the teacher course evaluations is being used to encourage departments to make improvements where specific areas deviate from the overall high norms that are common to the vast majority of courses taught at Hopkins.

**Provide Greater Visibility for the Ethics Board**

Working with the directors of undergraduate studies in the academic departments, the administrators responsible for the disciplinary process in cases of academic dishonesty have enhanced communications with faculty and made presentations to departments to ensure faculty understand that reported incidents are investigated. A memorandum is regularly distributed to faculty reminding them to state unequivocally at the beginning of each semester their stance on this matter. A mandatory session during freshman orientation addresses this issue by reviewing the policy and outlining consequences for violation of standards of academic integrity. Notwithstanding these actions, this matter requires continuing attention. A renewed effort is currently under way, including means to address issues that arise with students having readier access to electronic devices.

**Revise the Weekly Course Schedule**

The CUE report urged that consideration be given to revising the weekly course schedule, and this, more than any other recommendation, occasioned significant campus controversy among faculty and students. After considerable opportunity for hearing from concerned constituents, the deans of the schools of Engineering and Arts and Sciences decided, effective spring 2008, to institute a new schedule, closer to the more conventional M-W-F/T-Th schedule followed on most university campuses. It is the opinion of administrators that the new calendar has brought with it advantages in terms of reducing scheduling conflicts, making more efficient use of classroom facilities and spreading out activities in salubrious ways. Staff in advising and counseling offices believe that they see evidence of a reduction in stress. Student and faculty opinion is more mixed with many regretting the loss of consecutive days uninterrupted by class periods that heretofore facilitated time away from the campus.

**Increase Attention to Diversity**

The Evaluation Team made a number of observations on steps needed to increase the diversity of the campus, and the university has indeed made this a priority area in a variety of important ways.

- Although progress in recruiting a racially diverse and gender-balanced faculty and student body has been mixed, as noted in the recent Framework for the Future report, the schools have continued to make diversity a key element in faculty and student recruitment, and each year the schools report centrally on their records. The recent Mosaic Initiative by the Provost’s Office commits central resources to support divisional opportunities to make diverse faculty appointments.

- While limited financial aid depresses the ability of each of the divisions to compete for students, a Baltimore Scholars program has been implemented in response to a CUE recommendation. This program has increased significantly the number of Baltimore students applying to Hopkins, with the important corollary outcome of enhancing diversity. Under the Baltimore Scholars program, currently 69 students are attending Hopkins with full-tuition scholarships; two-thirds of these students are underrepresented minorities. Moreover, the offices responsible for undergraduate admissions continue
to devote special effort to recruiting underrepresented students, and the results on the Homewood campus, for example, show significant progress in the growth of minority applications.

- With respect to programming and mentoring support for minority students, the position of director of multicultural affairs has been re-established at the level of associate dean, and a tenured member of the faculty has been appointed to that role.
- A plan has been developed for a multicultural center, and a fund-raising campaign has been initiated to renovate the selected facility. So that programming can begin in earnest, an interim center has been created with space for several multicultural groups that have heretofore not had dedicated space.
- Additional diversity training initiatives have been implemented, with special freshman orientation programming introduced in the fall of 2007 and a new mandatory training program on developing cultural competence piloted in 2008.

Continue Efforts to Strengthen Partnerships with the City

Johns Hopkins has a large number of initiatives under way to strengthen partnerships with the city, including a major, comprehensive community redevelopment effort under way in the area surrounding the East Baltimore medical campus. The partnership to revitalize the Charles Village area has stalled in the face of economic difficulties of a private sector partner, but the university’s construction of Charles Commons constitutes a major step forward, and the university’s bookstore has brought new life to the neighborhood. Significant projects involve the city schools, and there is a robust effort to strengthen civic engagement and service learning involving a number of faculty and student groups. Moreover, a new freshman intersession program, B-More, has been established as an innovative curricular and student life initiative to introduce first-year students to the many ways in which Baltimore is a rich learning laboratory for students with a variety of academic interests.

Hopkins students have long served the Baltimore community as volunteers in many capacities, such as the long-run Tutorial Project. This year, we have initiated a Program in Social and Political Activism to teach our students practical skills to effect change and contribute to society. This program will both involve nonprofit leaders in Baltimore and help Johns Hopkins contribute more effectively to the city.

Enhance Student Life

The Evaluation Team suggested that while larger-scale initiatives, including those in residential life, were studied, administrators should turn their attention to some other matters that might bring more immediate gains. Campus food service has been upgraded and later-night options are available, both for first-year students on the board plan and for upperclassmen who can take advantage of the Charles Street Market and late-night food at Nolan’s. The latter facility and other amenity space in Charles Commons have made a significant difference in the level of programming on campus, as has the appointment of a new campus programming coordinator who is helping create a more lively social life. Additionally, a new lounge has been created in Levering Union, and the student activity space in the Mattin Center that supports diverse student groups has been renovated.
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**Improve Communications with Campus Constituencies**

Communications is an ongoing issue, given the degree of decentralization across various spheres of campus life and the increasingly challenging task of getting the attention of busy faculty and students. But progress has been made by means of more regularized communication with student government and the creation of a Dean’s Student Advisory Committee, as well as the establishment of several other advisory groups (Appendix 17.3), focus groups with campus residents, exit interviews with seniors and an active survey research program. The campuswide “Today’s Announcements” has become a reliable vehicle for communicating with campus constituencies, and the Office of Student Life has undertaken more active use of the weekly student paper, the News-Letter, for communicating important information about student programs and services. LCD screens have been installed in key locations so that students can be alerted to announcements and see notices of programs and events.

If there are areas of disappointment in what collectively has been accomplished since the university’s self-study, they relate primarily to the inability to raise significantly the level of financial aid for undergraduate students (an area given less attention in CUE than was perhaps warranted at the time) and the fact that resources have not been identified to complete the substantial investment in residential and student life facilities that has been begun and is needed to transform the student experience. Nonetheless, considerable progress has been made in improving the quality of the undergraduate experience across the spheres cited above, and in many others that are detailed in the appendices, such as enhanced support for study abroad, increased resources for career advising and strengthened faculty ownership of undergraduate programs, indeed on almost all of the 34 particular recommendations, as greater recruiting strength and higher student satisfaction attest.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**

- Appendix 17.1 Report of the Commission on Undergraduate Education
- Appendix 17.2 Implementation of CUE Recommendations
- Appendix 17.3 Student Advisory Boards
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Chapter 3 examines Johns Hopkins’ current condition and the road ahead over the next five years. It describes the university’s strengths in fulfilling its mission, current and anticipated challenges, and promising new opportunities. The materials presented in this chapter serve two purposes.

- Analyze the university’s chief accomplishments and existing strengths as a leading educational institution.
- Identify the most important challenges and opportunities facing the university over the next five years.

Johns Hopkins is a highly decentralized institution, with distinct and geographically separated academic divisions. The academic divisions of the university benefit from their collective reputations for excellence. They face both shared and unique problems that will impact academic programs, teaching and research, student services, faculty and staff, financial and other resources, external relations, and administration, as highlighted in this chapter.

Two current strategic planning efforts are being led by the provost and the senior vice president for finance and administration. In preparation for the next phase in the university’s history, a new planning process, called Framework for the Future, was initiated in May 2008. This university-wide process has engaged the university community to consider what Johns Hopkins needs to do to maintain its leadership in research, discovery and education, while continuing to apply knowledge for the benefit of global society. The Framework for the Future report will also help to establish goals for the next capital campaign. The most recent capital campaign (Knowledge for the World, goal $3.2 billion) closed December 31, 2008. The university is additionally taking steps through financial planning to make Johns Hopkins more effective in consolidating and reducing administrative costs, hoping to free resources for the academic programs. The current five-year financial plan for the university, Plan 2009, established priorities on diversifying the faculty, increasing financial aid for both undergraduate and graduate students, and targeting investments to interdisciplinary programs.

Recognizing that the university operates as a largely decentralized system in which schools and other divisions are free to determine their own strategic directions, goals, size, sources of revenues and assessments, the objectives of the Framework for the Future planning process with specific relevance to the PRR include:

- Finding opportunities to support academic excellence across multiple divisions such that the “whole is greater than the sum of the parts,” thereby enhancing the strategic plans of the individual divisions and strengthening Johns Hopkins University.
- Identifying common problems that affect the quality of the university and that can only be addressed by collaborative action across the divisions, with the divisional leaders and central administration working together to take collective responsibility for their solution;
- Developing a shared understanding of the challenges facing the individual divisions.

To achieve the objectives of the Framework for the Future, the provost formed three university-wide strategic working groups (WGs): People, Discovery, and Ways and Means. Each WG had a faculty chair and two co-chairs, and 20 to 30 members (faculty, administrators, students) appointed by the
provost with consultation from the divisional and administrative leaders. Appendix 18.1 provides membership lists of the WGs. A Provost Steering Committee, chaired by the provost and composed of the senior divisional and administrative leadership, served as a sounding board and review for the plans and recommendations of the three WGs. The Framework for the Future is envisioned in the context of the existing strengths and character of the university.

As part of the Framework for the Future planning process, each academic division prepared a strategic review of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT). These divisional studies addressed more than 350 issues including undergraduate and graduate education, part-time programs, interdisciplinary programs, international activities, libraries, information technology, faculty and staff, student services, finance, fund raising, research and technology transfer, compliance, external relations and facilities. The Office of Institutional Research compiled and analyzed the content of these SWOT studies, indexing the issues discussed to topics in higher education and the criteria for accreditation. The topics most often mentioned were finance, development, faculty, research and academic reputation. The most positive themes, with more strengths and opportunities than weaknesses and threats, were undergraduate education and alumni. Areas of greatest concern were academic competitors and compliance. The SWOT statements illustrate the traditional strengths of Johns Hopkins in research and discovery, as well as developing concerns about faculty recruitment and student aid. This chapter of the Periodic Review Report (PRR) draws heavily from these analyses of the divisional SWOT statements.

Accomplishments

"Academic reputation, research activity, undergraduate education, graduate education"

The Johns Hopkins University is a privately endowed, coeducational institution based in Baltimore, Maryland. Its mission is “to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.” The university operates largely as a decentralized fleet of divisions, which are free to independently determine their own strategic directions, goals, size and sources of revenue. University Administration organizes, supports and delivers core services including the president’s and provost’s offices, the board of trustees, financial systems and development programs.

The Johns Hopkins University, founded in Baltimore in 1876, was the first modern research university in the United States, emphasizing research and the advancement of knowledge along with teaching of students. Its establishment began a revolution in U.S. higher education. Today the university’s academic divisions are the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences (KSAS), the Whiting School of Engineering (WSE) and the School of Education (SOE), on or near the Homewood campus in Baltimore; the Carey Business School located in downtown Baltimore; the Peabody Institute, a music conservatory in the historic Mt. Vernon area of Baltimore; the School of Medicine (SOM), the Bloomberg School of Public Health (SPH) and the School of Nursing (SON) in East Baltimore; and the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) in Washington, D.C. The School of Medicine is part of Johns Hopkins Medicine, an organization that also includes the Johns Hopkins Health System (Johns Hopkins Hospital, Howard County Hospital, Bayview Medical Center, Johns Hopkins Community Physicians, Johns Hopkins Health Care and Johns Hopkins Home Care).
There are 11 divisions within the university—nine degree-granting schools, the Applied Physics Laboratory (APL) and the Sheridan Libraries—as well as six or more academic or professional practice organizations known as the Academic and Cultural Centers. The university’s annual expenditures totaled $3.67 billion in 2008, $2.78 billion in the schools and academic units and $0.89 billion at APL. The university has ~3,500 faculty and 9,800 full-time staff. Seven of the schools (all but SOM and SPH) share a business model and culture that are centered around undergraduate, master’s or PhD education with roughly 60 percent to 70 percent of their annual revenues derived from “internal sources” such as tuition, endowment and investment income, annual giving, and Maryland state education aid calculated according to the so-called Sellinger formula. The SOM and SPH have a different business model than the other schools; they depend on external funding for roughly 85 percent of their annual expenditures. In the SOM, sponsored research and clinical revenues, in equal proportion, are the major sources. In the SPH, sponsored research is the only major external source.

The Applied Physics Laboratory (APL), a non-degree-granting division of Johns Hopkins University, is a not-for-profit center for engineering, research and development. As a formally designated University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) and one of only 11 strategic Department of Defense research centers, APL provides technical advice in selected areas of national security. Employees at APL work on programs that protect our homeland and advance the nation’s vision in research and space science, at an annual funding level of nearly $900 million. The Laboratory has been a major asset to the nation since it was organized to help the war effort in 1942, four months after Pearl Harbor. The university is taking steps to manage APL through creation of a limited liability company (LLC). The director of APL will report to a Board of Managers. The university will be the sole member of the LLC.

The university has national recognition and international scope, with academic centers in Nanjing, China, and Bologna, Italy, and faculty collaborations around the world. One of the smallest, by design, of America’s great research universities, Johns Hopkins provides faculty and students of the highest caliber with the freedom, resources and challenge to excel in advanced study and original research. Year after year, through scores of international and national honors, members of the Hopkins faculty are recognized as leaders in research, teaching and patient care.

Johns Hopkins has been ranked No. 1 in research funding for 29 years. Nearly 90 percent of research and development expenditures in FY 2007 came from federal funds. The School of Medicine has received more research grants and contracts from NIH than any other medical school in the United States for 16 consecutive years. The Bloomberg School of Public Health receives 20 percent of all federal research funds awarded to the 40 accredited schools of public health in the United States.

The schools of Medicine, Public Health and Nursing, located together in East Baltimore, make up the second largest medical campus in the United States, after Harvard. This campus is also home to The Johns Hopkins Hospital, which has been ranked the No.1 hospital in the United States for the past 18 years by U.S. News & World Report. In 2008, the same magazine ranked the three health schools—SOM, SPH and SON—as second, first and fourth, respectively, among their peers.

The Peabody Institute is the oldest conservatory in the United States. It has a preparatory school, and its conservatory is ranked in the top tier of professional schools and departments of music.
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The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies, or SAIS, has three campus or instructional locations, one in Nanjing, one in Bologna and one in Washington, D.C. It is world-renowned for its master’s degree in international studies.


The university is also highly ranked by *U.S. News & World Report* in academic specialties including fields in Medicine (AIDS #2, Drug and Alcohol Abuse #3, Geriatrics #1, Internal Medicine #2, Pediatrics #4 and Women’s Health #5), Nursing (Community and Public Health #2, Nursing Service Administration #7) and Biological Sciences (Biochemistry and Biophysics #8, Cell Biology #7, Genetics #8, Immunology #5).

In the most recent measure of faculty scholarly productivity released by Academic Analytics (2007), 30 graduate programs at Johns Hopkins were ranked among the top 10 programs in the field. The faculty scholarly productivity index is based on the number of faculty in a given program, the number of books and journal articles they have written, the number of times other scholars have cited them, and the awards, honors and research grant funding they have received. The highest rated programs at Johns Hopkins in this study were the Health Professions #1, Epidemiology #2, Biostatistics #2, Physics #2, International Affairs #2, Pharmacology #3, Public Health #3, European Studies #3, Cognitive Science #4, Human Development and Family Studies #4, Environmental Health #4, Italian Language and Literature #4, Spanish Language and Literature #4, Cell Biology #5, Biomedical Engineering #5, French Language and Literature #5 and Chemical Sciences #5.

In support of the activities of the faculty, the nine academic divisions and professional education offices of Johns Hopkins offer a wide and rich variety of instructional support and student assessment capabilities. Assessment activity is targeted to the needs of each division’s respective students and faculty and to the demands of the relevant disciplines or professional fields. Some divisions have a longer history or a larger critical mass of activity than others; detail on the activities of the JHU centers to support teaching and learning are available in Appendix 18.2.

In addition to specific educational programs in each school, a number of crosscutting programs in research and education exist at the university involving two or more schools/divisions that leverage excellence across the institution. Examples include the Department of Biomedical Engineering, Graduate Training Program in Clinical Investigation, Berman Institute for Bioethics, the Population Center and the Brain Science Institute.

There are also many examples of effective administrative collaborations among the divisions that serve the academic mission, producing solutions to shared problems without full merger or substantially centralized powers. Network and Telecommunications Services, for example, is an effective
collaboration of all divisions that is responsible for e-mail and directory services, the Hopkins Web infrastructure, network security and related activities. In addition, through its data curation program, the Sheridan Libraries provides digital collections, services and infrastructure to support research, learning and long-term preservation. These academic computing functions are utilized by faculty and students across the university via the Sheridan Libraries. Of particular relevance to the PRR, a newly formed Standing Committee on Assessment, based in the Provost’s Office, represents all schools, with liaisons to the cluster of centers supporting teaching and learning in the divisions. The work of this committee will promote an institution-wide culture of instructional evaluation and student assessment so that divisional successes and best practices can be better shared across the university.

The university enrolled 20,149 full-time and part-time students in fall 2008, an increase of 5.5 percent over the last five years. The undergraduate enrollment has grown slightly faster over this time period, 6.6 percent increase compared to 5.1 percent change in graduate enrollment since fall 2003. Johns Hopkins conferred 1,548 bachelor’s degrees, 4,002 master’s degrees and 547 doctoral degrees in May 2008. This represents a significant increase over the number of degrees granted five years earlier (13.5 percent increase in bachelor’s degrees, 19.8 percent increase in master’s degrees and 14.0 percent increase in doctoral degrees). Since its founding, Johns Hopkins has offered courses for part-time students and established a formal division of continuing education in 1909. Today, part-time students—primarily master’s degree candidates—are 40 percent of total enrollment and 65 percent of degree recipients. Compared to peer institutions, Johns Hopkins has an unusually high proportion of graduate enrollment, 72 percent of total enrollment in fall 2008.

Admission to the academic programs is highly selective and the curriculum challenges the brightest students. Undergraduate applications in Arts and Sciences and Engineering have increased 48 percent over the last five years. The undergraduate program has long been guided by the principle that gifted minds are best taught by full-time faculty who are as committed to inquiry and investigation as they are to teaching. In seminars and laboratories, and in the field, undergraduate students work side by side with faculty engaged in pioneering research and scholarship, who talk about their work in progress, the discoveries they are making and knowledge not yet found in any textbook. Students have ready access to faculty, with a favorable student to faculty ratio of 10 to 1. The average undergraduate class enrolls fewer than 30 students. For the entering class in fall 2002, 81.3 percent graduated in four years, 90.7 percent in six years. Many students (38 percent) begin graduate study immediately after they receive their bachelor’s degree. In senior exit interviews, students express satisfaction with their undergraduate experience and particularly value the richness of their education. Roughly one in three undergraduate alumni (32.4 percent) contributes to the annual fund.

Johns Hopkins comprises the most talented group of deans and directors, faculty, students and staff in its history. The university aspires to attract the best undergraduate and professional students by providing them a unique, world-class educational experience, including opportunities to conduct research with productive faculty, within an intimate and inspiring environment. The university employs nearly 25,000 people in full-time and part-time positions. It is one of Maryland’s five largest private employers. The Johns Hopkins Institutions—the university and the Johns Hopkins Health System, a separate corporation—together constitute the state’s largest private employer. Altogether, Johns Hopkins plays a significant role in Maryland and the surrounding region by educating students, advancing achievements in the life sciences, creating jobs, fostering entrepreneurship and assisting local communities.
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Challenges

The economic environment; meeting the needs of research, discovery and education; research funding; clinical revenue; undergraduate financial aid and graduate stipends; faculty recruitment and compensation; aging facilities; and part-time enrollment

The dramatic shift in the national economy that began in September 2008 has widespread implications for the university, for students and families, and for state and federal support for higher education. The recession heightens the need to make prudent choices in allocating our resources. The university is encouraging initiatives to collaborate and extend value, at the same time that it considers ways to reduce costs. This period of financial uncertainty raises three issues of special concern to the university—declines in the markets, the rising cost of and changing access to debt, and the potential impact on philanthropy. Fortunately, Johns Hopkins entered this period in a strong financial position, with market strength in admissions, stable enrollment, and a successful fund-raising campaign recently concluded. The university continues to review and assess its academic programs and financial health in this new light.

Johns Hopkins has always been distinguished by a faculty committed to making a difference beyond the confines of academia. We live in a moment of history in which the knowledge and skills represented here are more essential than ever. There are global challenges—economic, environmental and political—whose solutions depend on the discovery and application of new knowledge and on a new generation of critical thinkers. Because many of the challenges we face are crosscutting, so too must be our strategies for addressing them. Our decentralized organization, disciplinary cultural differences and varying degrees of resources and priorities across divisions must not unduly constrain university-wide collaborations in research and education and in bringing the benefits of discovery to the world.

Johns Hopkins is highly dependent upon federal research funding. As such, it has an inherent vulnerability to changes in public policy that affect the volume of research funding, impose new constraints on research, change areas of emphasis in research and increase competition for research funds.

Following a period of robust growth between 1998 and 2003, when the National Institutes of Health budget doubled in size, federal funding for the NIH has been held flat and has lost additional value to inflation. The shift in NIH funding is changing the nature of health care research. It affects the competition for federal funding, the dependence on alternative sources of revenue, the career paths of young investigators and the pace of medical progress. The federal government has also restricted recovery of facilities and administrative (F&A) costs, further challenging institutions that depend on federal research support. Despite these pressures, research across the university continued to grow. Total grants and contracts were a record $2 billion in FY 2008. The economic stimulus legislation provides opportunities for additional growth from the federal government.

Eight of every 10 Johns Hopkins faculty work on problems of human health. Increased competition for research funding threatens a key source of income for the schools of Medicine and Public Health, in particular. Clinical practice revenue is also dependent on government funding. Although the School of Medicine enjoys a positive operating margin today, the potential for government budget cuts remains a concern. The profitability of the clinical program depends in part on Medicare reimbursement rates. With an aging population and other stresses on government budgets, the university must prepare for continued pressure on reimbursement rates.
Challenges existed in student aid before the latest downturn in the national economy. Many of the academic divisions are highly tuition dependent for revenue and have small endowments for student aid. To maintain affordability, the university carefully monitors and limits increases in sticker price for both undergraduate and graduate programs. National policymakers have focused increased attention on the rising cost of undergraduate education. The federal government will soon begin to publish watch lists of the most expensive schools. However, tuition does not cover the full cost of education. Although it is difficult to estimate at Johns Hopkins, analysis at liberal arts schools indicates undergraduate tuition may cover less than 70 percent of the cost of education.

Peer institutions recently implemented new aid policies to replace student loans with institutional grants and limit the cumulative student debt at graduation. These competitors have much larger endowments for student aid. Direct competitors in Arts and Sciences have per capita endowments for undergraduate student aid that range from two to 12 times the size of Johns Hopkins’. Similarly, for Engineering, per capita endowments for undergraduate student aid at peer institutions range from two to seven times the size of Johns Hopkins’. Very few peer institutions have smaller endowments for undergraduate student aid. Many of the same concerns exist for graduate aid. Graduate stipends have fallen behind those of peer institutions in some disciplines by as much as $8,000. Per capita endowment for graduate aid at peer institutions is up to six times the funding available in the schools of Engineering and Arts and Sciences at Johns Hopkins. Medical schools are also considering new aid strategies to reduce student debt and maintain diversity.

A grand challenge in the current environment, therefore, is to obtain sufficient revenues to generate consistent net positive operating margins. Tuition does not cover the full cost of education, and there is limited endowed support for student aid. Sponsors do not adequately reimburse the university on research awards. The federal government restricts reimbursement for administrative overhead and limits research salaries. Private sponsors often set indirect costs below adequate levels. Philanthropy remains a critical piece of the financial equation.

The university faces continuing challenges to recruit and retain superb faculty. The School of Medicine has historically paid well below the median salary of AAMC peer institutions. By comparison with other peer institutions, faculty salaries across the university are similarly low. Most divisions are also concerned about escalating startup costs for research labs and equipment.

Thus, there are major challenges that are shared in common across the schools and divisions that include competitive faculty salaries and startup funding for research and scholarship, financial aid for students and competitive stipends for graduate students. Given the multiple challenges described above, the university must make the protection and enhancement of faculty and student quality across divisions a priority. In addressing these challenges, the university is studying whether these priorities are best addressed at the divisional level, as is currently the case, or whether it makes sense to provide more support through the central administration, so that greater resources can be devoted more rapidly to areas of particular crisis or promise.

At the same time, it should be noted that the financial strength of the divisions of the university has varied over time, with several in good financial positions and others not. For example, in the past the School of Nursing and the Johns Hopkins University Press faced financial challenges. These units now generate annual surpluses. The key to financial strength at Johns Hopkins is that each division has an achievable plan to address financial challenges when they arise. The divisions differ markedly in their reliance on particular revenue sources and thus face different challenges. The School of
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Medicine and the Bloomberg School of Public Health must protect the positions they occupy as the leading recipients of sponsored research funding. The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering derive the bulk of their revenue from tuition, but research funding is also an important component of their budgets.

The nature of university research and education is also in transition. Important questions are at the boundaries of traditional disciplines or at the core of new, emerging disciplines. In the sciences, multidisciplinary teams from around the world address major questions, often directed by a government agency. The ability to collaborate across divisions and disciplines can be a challenge for a decentralized institution, an issue that the Framework for the Future was asked to address.

While we have a relatively small amount of deferred maintenance compared to peers, any aging of the physical plant brings deferred maintenance costs and the need to modernize teaching and research facilities. The School of Medicine is constructing a new education building to accommodate modern teaching methods. A planned addition to the School of Nursing is driven in part by student demand. Arts and Sciences is planning undergraduate laboratory facilities to support a new approach to premedical education. These capital projects increase fixed costs at a time when there are additional financial pressures and increased sensitivity to rising tuition.

Part-time programs are an important element of both the academic mission and financial base of the university. Part-time enrollments have been declining over the last five years, dropping from 8,760 in fall 2003 to 8,011 in fall 2008 and from 45.9 percent to 39.8 percent of total enrollment. To date the 8.6 percent drop in part-time enrollments has been more than offset by an increase in full-time enrollments. Over the last five years, the full-time enrollment increased from 10,337 in 2003 to 12,138 in 2008, an increase of 17.4 percent. The university will continue to monitor enrollment in the part-time programs for any changes in student demand and employer reimbursement related to the economic downturn.

Opportunities

Research funding, health care facilities, the importance of philanthropy, financial management, academic program

Faced with stagnant federal funding and increased competition for grants, the university is turning to new sources of research funding. Federal funding for research expenditures has dropped from 89 percent of total expenditures in FY 2001 to 83.5 percent in FY 2007. Private funds have made up part of the difference, providing an increasing share of research expenditures, up from 9.5 percent in FY 2001 to 12.7 percent in FY 2007. However, annual growth in support from private foundations has slowed to less than 3 percent between FY 2006 and FY 2007. The university is also using subcontracts to help offset reduced federal funding. At the same time there has been a shift toward grants for research centers. These awards are typically larger and often involve several institutions. Although this strategy may lead to greater fluctuations in funding and make it difficult for young investigators who have yet to establish a track record, Johns Hopkins is in a position to leverage the excellence of its top researchers to anchor such undertakings at the institution. The university is also in a good position to integrate resources across divisions to gain greater strength in emerging areas for new funding opportunities.
The School of Medicine seizes a major opportunity with the completion of new and renovated clinical facilities, built in conjunction with the Johns Hopkins Health System. The Johns Hopkins Hospital broke ground in June 2006 for its $1.2 billion redevelopment plan. The project will replace crowded and outdated facilities with a children’s hospital tower that will become the new home of the Johns Hopkins Children’s Center, and a cardiovascular and critical care tower for adults, as well as support facilities. Construction of the S. Anne and C. Michael Armstrong Medical Education Building will provide 100,000 square feet of instructional space complete with digital imaging technology. The new building coupled with the redesign of the curriculum ushers in a new approach to medical education that will integrate learning programs, blend clinical and basic science learning experiences and introduce more small-group work. These improvements are critical to maintaining the reputation of Hopkins as an international leader in the education of physicians and medical scientists, in biomedical research and in the application of medical knowledge to sustain health. Hopkins remains unsurpassed at turning laboratory discoveries into patient treatments. The School of Medicine also continues to pursue regional and international affiliations where appropriate to its mission.

Philanthropy remains essential to the fiscal integrity of the university. Although endowment payout and expendable gifts are a smaller component of the revenue stream than at peer schools, they are nonetheless critical to the financial health of the university. The Framework for the Future, in seeking further opportunities where the institution could excel, can set the stage for greater success in development targets for philanthropic activities.

The university has strong oversight systems with systematic monitoring of planning, evaluation, finance, financial performance and risk. The recent implementation of two enterprise-wide information systems for financial and student information provide new opportunities to track and analyze management data never before available. SAP’s enterprise system holds financial, human resources, research and supply chain information. The new student information system, ISIS, contains zones that are customized for each academic division. The university still needs to develop an enterprise-wide data warehouse for student information with sophisticated reporting and modeling tools. Additional university-wide opportunities exist for the institution’s commitment to assessment of learning outcomes. This effort will benefit from the work of a standing University Committee on Assessment, to oversee outcomes and to share results and evidence from the activities implemented within the schools and divisions. In so doing, the university has established an institutional commitment to assessment practices, spanning both undergraduate curriculum and a diverse range of graduate and professional educational programs.

The university also has opportunities to build on initial success in consolidating services and reducing costs across the divisions. Several shared administrative service centers were established during the SAP implementation. Leadership from University Administration and the academic divisions are working together to identify revenue and cost moves that will generate resources that can be reprogrammed to the academic enterprise.

The goal for the Discovery working group (WG) was to identify crosscutting initiatives in research, scholarship and education that offer further strategic opportunities for the university. The Discovery WG reviewed 74 proposals submitted by the faculty university-wide in response to a request for proposals. Seed grants were provided to a subset of 11 proposals involving two or more schools and divisions (for the list of funded Discovery proposals, see Appendix 18.3). There are major opportunities for the discovery and application of new knowledge, and for new academic programs, that cut
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across our traditional divisions. Examples include brain and behavioral science, stem cell and regenerative biology, information science and technology, energy and environmental science, population science, space science, social policy, the performing and visual arts, and others. Three of these are highlighted, as proposed through the Framework Discovery process.

Sustainable Environment and Global Health

Johns Hopkins University has the capacity to achieve a unique position in global health, building on its excellence in public health, medicine and nursing and expanding in the area of environmental science and sustainability. Climate change and sustainability are particularly pressing concerns for global society today and a priority for the university as indicated by President Brody’s appointment in 2007 of a Climate Task Force. The work of the task force has called for JHU to dedicate its strengths in science, technology, public health and public policy to address climate change and its health impacts on a global level. A number of the schools have responded with new initiatives. The university has three departments across three schools dedicated to this topic: Earth and Planetary Sciences in KSAS, Geography and Environmental Engineering in WSE and Environmental Health Sciences in SPH. In addition, the Center for Global Health was established in 2007 by the three East Baltimore schools. The Center for a Livable Future has worked for more than a decade to promote policies that protect health, the global environment and the ability to sustain life for future generations. Given the resources of relevant faculty across schools and divisions, there is potential to distinguish Johns Hopkins by further coordinating research, education and development activities in global health and the environment.

Discovery in Complex Systems

Scientists today seek new knowledge in an information-intensive environment. As noted in a recent editorial in Nature titled “Community Cleverness Required,” “researchers need to adapt their institutions and practices in response to torrents of new data—and need to complement smart science with smart searching.” Johns Hopkins University can meet this challenge by leveraging its computational facilities and informatics expertise. Faculty in many disciplines use new technologies that create large datasets, but most do not have the full skill set needed to decipher the complicated output. A cross-department and cross-campus initiative in informatics and novel data analytic approaches will help to disseminate skills and foster collaborations, bringing Hopkins to a pre-eminent position in many of its research activities, such as individualized medicine, studies of the brain, environmental science and many more.

Science in Space

Johns Hopkins University has the opportunity to become the pre-eminent academic institution in the field of space studies. Space science is already an area of excellence, one that gives high visibility to the university. Observations in space will shed light on environmental processes happening on Earth, enhancing stewardship of our planet. Solving the biomedical challenges of manned space flight could help patients here at home. Johns Hopkins is well-positioned to lead in this field of national importance. A Johns Hopkins Space Science Institute could bring together key constituencies across divisions and departments within the university, including Physics and Astronomy, Earth and Planetary Sciences, and the Applied Physics Laboratory. This institute could connect to closely aligned organizations such as the Space Telescope Science Institute and programs at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, to create a pre-eminent consortium for research and discovery, while attracting and educat-
ing the next generations of leaders in the field. Research would include astrophysics, cosmology and planetary science, as well as studies of planet Earth, to monitor climate and environmental change, increasing the breadth of JHU global health initiatives. Likewise, since space itself is a complex system, this research would be tied to Discovery in Complex Systems through computational projects like the National Virtual Observatory and its successors.

The Provost Steering Committee will evaluate the success of the RFP-Discovery process through progress reports from the funded projects. To meet the challenge of decentralization in fostering and supporting university-wide programs, the university is also considering the creation an Academic Initiatives Review Group (AIRG) to review and critique proposals from faculty groups for university-wide academic initiatives. The AIRG would comprise representatives of leaders from the university faculty and administration who would assist faculty by refining their proposals and helping them identify funding sources. It would continue the work of the Framework for the Future Discovery Group on an ongoing basis by stimulating interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary problem solving to achieve academic innovation and to attract the most talented faculty and students to the institution.

In summary, the university has studied the challenges and opportunities that face the institution in the coming years. Recommendations generated by the working groups of the Framework for the Future (included in the Appendix 18.4) are under consideration by University Administration as it transitions to new leadership.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**

Appendix 18.1 Composition of Working Groups
Appendix 18.2 Teaching and Learning Support Centers
Appendix 18.3 Funded Discovery Proposals – Three-Year Grants
Appendix 18.4 Recommendations from the Framework for the Future Working Groups
Chapter 4: Enrollment and Financial Trends and Projections

This section provides an analysis of enrollment and financial projections for the next five years at The Johns Hopkins University, as well as the assumptions upon which those projections are constructed. The university is in very sound condition with respect to enrollment levels, enrollment quality and finances. The data indicate that this positive condition will continue for the foreseeable future.

**Enrollment Trends and Projections**

Total student enrollment has grown just under 2 percent per year on average over the last decade. The university’s projected growth in total enrollment in the years ahead is to remain stable. Headcount enrollment for fall 2008 totaled 20,149, an all-time high though a negligible increase from fall 2007. The data in Table 1 show enrollment history for the last decade and projections through fall 2012.

Although the overall growth in enrollment is and projects to be relatively steady, there are shifts occurring in the underlying base of enrollments. Over the last decade, the share of full-time undergraduates has grown from 24 percent to 25.7 percent and the share of full-time graduate students has grown from 17.3 percent to 21.8 percent.

While the divisions do not budget fall enrollment specifically, they do use estimates to drive projections of tuition revenues and financial aid costs in the five-year plan. Fall enrollment data are ordinarily a good indicator of tuition revenue attainment. Given the current economic uncertainty, however, divisions are using caution in extrapolating year-end tuition revenues and financial aid costs from fall results.

Full-time undergraduate enrollment at the School of Arts and Sciences increased 3.7 percent from fall 2007, while full-time graduate enrollment declined 3.3 percent. Over a five-year horizon, undergraduate enrollment increased 13.1 percent. The expansion was anticipated as part of the overall plan to finance improvements in undergraduate amenities and the undergraduate experience. Efforts have been made to target the increased enrollment to areas of study with unused capacity. Notably, too, there was an 11.4 percent increase in part-time program enrollment. Overall, fall 2008 headcount enrollment at the School of Arts and Sciences grew 4.8 percent.

Both full-time undergraduate and graduate enrollment at the School of Engineering increased from 2007. Part-time enrollment, however, was down 4.1 percent due to unexpected declines in enrollment in the graduate program. Overall, fall 2008 headcount enrollment at the School of Engineering grew 0.3 percent.

In FY 2008, the School of Professional Studies separated into two independent divisions, the Carey Business School and the School of Education. For purposes of this report, the numbers are shown together to make comparisons to prior years. Enrollment in the School of Education is up 9 percent while enrollment in the Carey Business School is down 20.5 percent. Although some of this figure is due to a planned decline in the undergraduate program, most is due to lower enrollment in the graduate program due to the variable start times of student cohorts. The division anticipates that the annual decline will be less than 10 percent.
### Table 1

**Johns Hopkins University**  
Enrollment History and Projections  
1999–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total University</th>
<th>FY99</th>
<th>FY00</th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY02</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (full-time)</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>4,592</td>
<td>4,633</td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>5,317</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (part-time)</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Special</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (Full-time)</td>
<td>3,098</td>
<td>3,378</td>
<td>3,529</td>
<td>3,571</td>
<td>3,814</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>4,711</td>
<td>4,643</td>
<td>4,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (Part-time)</td>
<td>6,339</td>
<td>6,800</td>
<td>6,762</td>
<td>6,403</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>6,878</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>7,003</td>
<td>7,077</td>
<td>7,059</td>
<td>7,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Special (Full-time)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Special (Part-Time)</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree Special Students</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Ph.D. Program</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Doctoral</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>1,268</td>
<td>1,533</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>1,676</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>1,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University</td>
<td>17,893</td>
<td>19,105</td>
<td>19,094</td>
<td>19,337</td>
<td>19,041</td>
<td>19,920</td>
<td>19,613</td>
<td>20,595</td>
<td>21,188</td>
<td>20,838</td>
<td>21,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In FY 2009, the School of Medicine had an enrollment growth of 3.7 percent, while Public Health had a decline in enrollment growths of 0.6 percent. Nursing experienced enrollment growth of 6.7 percent, with all of the increase in the graduate program.

U.S. student enrollment at both the Bologna and Nanjing centers was up. There was a major increase in Nanjing of 82 percent due to the planned growth of the master’s degree program. Enrollment grew 7.2 percent at the School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C.

At the Peabody Institute, undergraduate enrollment was up 4.1 percent, while graduate enrollment decreased 7.9 percent. Overall, enrollment at Peabody decreased 2.3 percent, as was anticipated in the FY 2009 budget.

The deans have the responsibility to recommend tuition levels that do not handicap the school’s ability to enroll and graduate a diverse and talented student body (Table 2). Data in numerous areas suggest that recent tuition rate increases have not impacted the quality of the student body.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Johns Hopkins University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment – Total University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-year Plan Assumptions – Plan 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Plan 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY08 FY09 FY10 FY11 FY12 FY13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (full-time)</td>
<td>5,317 5,453 5,542 5,574 5,615 5,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (part-time)</td>
<td>168 109 125 135 150 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Special</td>
<td>105 2 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (Full-time)</td>
<td>4,666 4,661 4,712 4,827 4,929 4,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (Part-time)</td>
<td>7,953 8,381 8,566 8,837 9,050 9,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Special (Full-time)</td>
<td>188 190 192 194 197 199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Special (Part-time)</td>
<td>251 243 243 243 243 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>482 480 480 480 480 480</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Ph.D. Program</td>
<td>768 791 815 839 865 891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Doctoral</td>
<td>1,689 1,730 1,773 1,818 1,863 1,910</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total – Fall Enrollment</td>
<td>21,587 22,040 22,450 22,949 23,394 23,660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer – Undergraduate*</td>
<td>2,115 2,116 2,133 2,133 2,133 2,197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University</td>
<td>23,702 24,153 24,583 25,082 25,527 25,857</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*School of Arts and Sciences

The Board of Trustees established a set of guiding principles and practices to be followed in setting the tuition rate each year. These principles include enrolling and graduating a diverse and talented student body, setting a tuition rate taking into consideration the costs of providing financial aid, main-
taining existing programs and infrastructure, and funding new initiatives to ensure a competitive and state-of-the-art academic environment.

The Homewood deans have embraced these principles and use the following guidelines in recommending an annual tuition rate to the trustees.

1. Tuition is set by cost of providing education.
2. The tuition-setting process should be designed to set a rate that is defensible in terms of supporting programs but also sensitive to market position.
3. Financial aid is a mechanism to secure access.
4. Financial aid goals are:
   a. Need-blind admissions process
   b. Meet full need of all admitted applicants and current students
   c. Reduce burden on lower- and middle-income families
   d. Do all this in support of ethnic and economic diversity in student body

At the Homewood Schools, total applicants are up significantly for the third consecutive year. In 2008, applications were up 1,160 and totaled 16,011. The acceptance rate increased slightly (from 24.2 percent to 25.4 percent) but remains below 2006 levels. Yield declined slightly to 30.4 percent over the past year and has remained in the 30 percent to 33 percent range over the past five years. The freshman retention rate (97 percent) and graduation rates remain high.

The percentage of females in the full-time undergraduate population continues to increase and now represents almost 48 percent of the total student population. Also, the number of underrepresented minorities increased from 617 to 670 this year and now accounts for 14.2 percent of the student body.

Finally, over the past several years, the academic quality of the student body has remained high. The average high school GPA of entering freshmen has remained around 3.7, and 84 percent of the freshmen ranked in the top 10 percent of their high school class. Combined SAT scores have also remained high—about 1,500 at the 75th percentile and 1,300 at the 25th percentile.

The tuition-setting process is designed to ensure that adequate funds are allocated each year to meet the increased need for financial aid associated with the increase in tuition. The amount of financial aid allocated each year is measured by the discount rate. The deans made a commitment to increase the discount rate (the fraction of tuition revenue returned to financial aid budget) over time. Despite significant financial pressures caused by reduction in state aid and other revenue sources, undergraduate financial aid must be preserved. However, in the current financial situation we cannot commit at this time to further increases to the discount rate of 24 percent for FY 2010. As the budgets for next year are constructed, the schools will look for opportunities, if possible, to increase the allocation to financial aid.

A need-blind admissions policy, which governs some of our peer schools, requires the admissions office to make all decisions independent of the ultimate impact on the financial aid budget. By contrast, Hopkins operates with a fixed financial aid budget in any given year. Meeting that budget requires that a small number of admissions decisions be made with ability to pay in mind. Working with a fixed budget during a falling economy, when more families are needy and needy families have
more need, will require us to concentrate our financial aid resources on fewer and needier students. The divisions do not expect these constraints to materially impact the demographics or quality of our student body.

Recognizing the economic pressure on our students and their families, the university has raised tuition for full-time undergraduates by only 3.8 percent next fall, the smallest percentage growth in over 30 years. All four schools, keenly aware of added financial pressure on students and families in a time of recession, have cut their budgets in many areas while increasing undergraduate financial aid, the schools’ deans said. As a whole, the university has frozen hiring and will impose a year-long salary freeze starting July 1. University executive officers, including divisional deans and vice presidents, are voluntarily reducing compensation by 5 percent on July 1; much of the savings will be directed to undergraduate financial aid.

Financial Overview

Resources at Johns Hopkins University are directly aligned with its tripartite mission of research, academics and clinical practice. The budget and long-term financial plan considers the revenue, spending, operating margins and debt of the divisions in light of the risks and challenges facing each division in achieving its stated objectives.

As shown in Graph 1, the budgeted revenues for FY 2009 total nearly $3.7 billion, after discounting tuition by the anticipated amount of student financial aid ($174.5 million or 29.5 percent of gross tuition). FY 2009 sponsored revenues are projected to be 56 percent of the total, down from 60 percent a few years ago. Clinical and related services account for 21 percent of FY 2009 revenue, with instructional activity (net tuition, fees, housing, food service, Maryland state aid, etc.) representing 14 percent. The balance, roughly 9 percent, comes from a mix of other sources including investment income and gifts.
Table 3 below contains the incumbent five-year budget and plan for the university. This plan was reviewed and ratified by the Finance Committee and the full board of the university’s Board of Trustees. Significant changes in the university’s financial conditions are anticipated over the next five years. The university is in the process of developing a revised five-year plan but expects significant, though highly “divisionalized” (meaning that the changing fiscal context affects each division in very different ways, with some growing while others are under stress), changes to the prior estimates of revenue mix and expenditure levels.

The projected operating budget for each year of the five-year plan horizon will be balanced and rely on conservative projections on key drivers impacting costs, such as utility rates, salary and benefits cost increases, and research recovery rates (see Table 3). The projections assume no significant changes in the rate of growth in federal or state appropriations for research or student aid operations, with an annual percentage of growth of between 2 percent and 3 percent for revenues and state aid growth based only on growth in enrollment. As you can see from Graph 2 below, instruction and research, student services, auxiliary services and libraries (those expenditure categories most related to student learning) make up approximately one-quarter of total university expenditures.

Table 3

Johns Hopkins University
Five-year Financial Plan 2009–2013
Major Planning Assumptions
(Revenues in $1,000’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual FY07</th>
<th>Budget FY08</th>
<th>Projected FY08</th>
<th>Plan 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Rate – Homewood Undergraduates (1)</td>
<td>33,900</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>35,900</td>
<td>37,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees Revenue</td>
<td>520,711</td>
<td>548,973</td>
<td>551,167</td>
<td>592,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland State Aid Total Grant</td>
<td>21,009</td>
<td>24,599</td>
<td>23,488</td>
<td>24,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized Research Revenues</td>
<td>449,179</td>
<td>480,053</td>
<td>471,502</td>
<td>482,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsored Activity Revenues</td>
<td>153,440</td>
<td>162,543</td>
<td>157,298</td>
<td>153,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Facilities and Admin Recoveries</td>
<td>245,392</td>
<td>264,441</td>
<td>248,426</td>
<td>254,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) For planning purposes, the university assumes tuition will grow at the rate of the Higher Education Price Index for FY 2011 and beyond.
Table 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>Budget FY08</th>
<th>Projected FY08</th>
<th>Plan 2009 FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual FY07</td>
<td>63.5%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off Campus Organized</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Rate</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Payout</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase/(Decrease) in unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Payout</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>753,086</td>
<td>814,000</td>
<td>832,000</td>
<td>884,000</td>
<td>933,000</td>
<td>960,000</td>
<td>988,000</td>
<td>1,030,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee rate</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to University</td>
<td>12,904</td>
<td>13,818</td>
<td>14,138</td>
<td>14,988</td>
<td>15,785</td>
<td>16,235</td>
<td>16,722</td>
<td>17,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary Increase Guidelines</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Benefit Rates</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>76,702</td>
<td>71,317</td>
<td>71,317</td>
<td>71,400</td>
<td>73,128</td>
<td>72,871</td>
<td>70,296</td>
<td>72,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth from prior year</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>(3.5%)</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graph 2

[Image of a pie chart for FY 2009 Expense]
The university sets salary guidelines each year based on an assessment of economic factors, market forces and available resources. The salary guideline for FY 2009 was 3.0 percent for continuing employees, not including promotions, special retention situations and equity adjustments. Going forward, it is likely that most divisions will be providing smaller and more strategically allocated increases annually. The deans have flexibility to adjust salary budgets to deal with special situations within their overall budget availability.

The university continues to make selected strategic investments in facilities and systems to meet the needs of faculty and students. The total cost of the five-year capital plan (about $1.0 billion) is similar to that of prior years. The capital plan called for expenditures in excess of $1 billion for FY 2009 through FY 2013. Most of that spending is currently under way so the university does not anticipate significant changes in the capital plan for FY 2010 to FY 2014.

While the dollar amount in the capital plan is roughly the same as that of Plan 2008, the capital plan for 2009 includes a shifting mix of projects and sources of funding. The plan includes no new major capital project but instead focuses more on renovation and renewal of existing facilities. Instructional space and student services facilities continue to figure prominently in the plan with a major renovation of space for academic programs, a new education building for the School of Medicine, planned upgrades to undergraduate laboratory facilities and the scheduled construction of a substantial library addition to create a “learning commons” that addresses the needs for student seating, work areas and information access.

Table 4 displays the history of tuition and mandatory fees at The Johns Hopkins University for undergraduate and graduate students at each school for both full- and part-time students. The projected increases in tuition revenue reflect increased enrollments as well as higher tuition rates. The Homewood full-time undergraduate tuition rate for the 2009–2010 academic year is $39,135 a 3.8 percent increase from the prior year. This increase reflects the need to generate revenue to make critical investments in faculty and student services and maintain commitments to financial aid. The tuition rate was set after considering the recommendations of the ad hoc Joint Subcommittee on Homewood Undergraduate Tuition that includes trustees and university leadership. Rates of growth for FY 2011 through FY 2014 are projected at 3.9 percent. Tuition rates for other undergraduate, graduate, doctoral and part-time programs are established for each division and increase, with few exceptions, between 3.9 percent and 5 percent.
# Table 4

## Total University

### Ten Year History of Tuition Rates

#### FY2000–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and School</th>
<th>FY00</th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY02</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UNIVERSITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Year History of Tuition Rates: FY2000 - FY2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Full-time Tuition Rates</strong></td>
<td>FY00</td>
<td>FY01</td>
<td>FY02</td>
<td>FY03</td>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>FY09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and G.W.C. Whiting School of Engineering:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate and Graduate</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$24,930</td>
<td>$26,210</td>
<td>$27,390</td>
<td>$28,730</td>
<td>$30,140</td>
<td>$31,620</td>
<td>$33,900</td>
<td>$35,900</td>
<td>$37,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peabody Institute:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$22,700</td>
<td>$23,700</td>
<td>$24,750</td>
<td>$25,850</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$27,800</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td>$31,300</td>
<td>$33,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul H. Nitze S.A.I.S.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D., all are non-resident</td>
<td>$2,366</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
<td>$2,320</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,873</td>
<td>$3,014</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>$2,950</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
<td>$3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident, graduate, non-doctoral</td>
<td>$21,800</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>$23,200</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$27,800</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td>$31,300</td>
<td>$33,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident, graduate, non-doctoral</td>
<td>$2,180</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td>$2,321</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$2,873</td>
<td>$3,014</td>
<td>$2,780</td>
<td>$2,950</td>
<td>$3,130</td>
<td>$3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bologna Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$21,800</td>
<td>$22,400</td>
<td>$23,200</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$27,800</td>
<td>$31,300</td>
<td>$37,091</td>
<td>$40,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nanjing Center:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-degree program</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,300</td>
<td>$8,600</td>
<td>$8,900</td>
<td>$9,200</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>$19,660</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$10,100</td>
<td>$11,400</td>
<td>$19,660</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bloomberg School of Public Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.P.H. (5 terms)</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$24,600</td>
<td>$25,880</td>
<td>$33,805</td>
<td>$35,280</td>
<td>$37,020</td>
<td>$38,700</td>
<td>$41,220</td>
<td>$43,680</td>
<td>$46,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$24,600</td>
<td>$25,880</td>
<td>$27,045</td>
<td>$28,224</td>
<td>$29,616</td>
<td>$30,960</td>
<td>$32,976</td>
<td>$34,944</td>
<td>$36,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Nursing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>$17,250</td>
<td>$18,115</td>
<td>$19,021</td>
<td>$19,780</td>
<td>$20,775</td>
<td>$22,224</td>
<td>$23,874</td>
<td>$28,290</td>
<td>$30,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>$17,250</td>
<td>$20,115</td>
<td>$21,121</td>
<td>$21,960</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>$24,216</td>
<td>$25,440</td>
<td>$28,056</td>
<td>$29,688</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN/MPH</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$24,600</td>
<td>$25,880</td>
<td>$27,045</td>
<td>$28,224</td>
<td>$29,376</td>
<td>$30,960</td>
<td>$32,976</td>
<td>$34,944</td>
<td>$36,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNSc</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,750</td>
<td>$16,380</td>
<td>$17,199</td>
<td>$18,059</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Medicine:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical - first year</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$28,100</td>
<td>$29,200</td>
<td>$30,200</td>
<td>$31,200</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- second year</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$29,000</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- third year</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$28,100</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fourth year</td>
<td>$22,800</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$29,800</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$36,500</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>$23,660</td>
<td>$24,700</td>
<td>$25,880</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$28,200</td>
<td>$29,500</td>
<td>$30,800</td>
<td>$32,200</td>
<td>$34,100</td>
<td>$36,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral students</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time Programs Tuition Rates</th>
<th>FY00</th>
<th>FY01</th>
<th>FY02</th>
<th>FY03</th>
<th>FY04</th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zanvyl Krieger School of Arts and Sciences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (1)</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>$1,495</td>
<td>$1,605</td>
<td>$1,685</td>
<td>$1,770</td>
<td>$1,830</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$1,995</td>
<td>$2,020</td>
<td>$2,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other (formerly Sciences) (1)</td>
<td>$1,595</td>
<td>$1,675</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td>$1,980</td>
<td>$2,075</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td>$2,270</td>
<td>$2,415</td>
<td>$2,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA (1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$1,265</td>
<td>$1,420</td>
<td>$1,490</td>
<td>$1,530</td>
<td>$1,570</td>
<td>$1,649</td>
<td>$1,670</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (2)</td>
<td>$430</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$515</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$556</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W.C. Whiting School of Engineering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (2)</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$520</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$560</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$570</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (1)</td>
<td>$1,780</td>
<td>$1,830</td>
<td>$1,875</td>
<td>$1,930</td>
<td>$2,025</td>
<td>$2,125</td>
<td>$2,225</td>
<td>$2,325</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
<td>$2,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Leadership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$367</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$430</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal arts (2)</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal, arts, Washington, D.C. (2)</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies (2)</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (2)</td>
<td>$305</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$378</td>
<td>$405</td>
<td>$428</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Washington, D.C. (2)</td>
<td>$325</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$405</td>
<td>$428</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Doctoral (2)</td>
<td>$789</td>
<td>$820</td>
<td>$863</td>
<td>$923</td>
<td>$958</td>
<td>$1,005</td>
<td>$1,054</td>
<td>$1,130</td>
<td>$1,197</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Leadership</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$422</td>
<td>$489</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$525</td>
<td>$545</td>
<td>$575</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Leadership Accelerated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$620</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carey Business School:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business (2)</td>
<td>$335</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$355</td>
<td>$365</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C. (2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$390</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$410</td>
<td>$425</td>
<td>$446</td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Homewood &amp; Downtown Center</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$395</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$435</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$605</td>
<td>$680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Columbia (2)</td>
<td>$405</td>
<td>$415</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>$435</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$480</td>
<td>$505</td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$605</td>
<td>$680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Montgomery (2)</td>
<td>$430</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$656</td>
<td>$689</td>
<td>$735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, Wash., D.C. (2)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>$485</td>
<td>$530</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$625</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$735</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Institute:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major study 1 hour</td>
<td>$9,573</td>
<td>$10,013</td>
<td>$10,540</td>
<td>$11,004</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$12,015</td>
<td>$12,550</td>
<td>$13,180</td>
<td>$13,971</td>
<td>$14,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major study 1/2 hour</td>
<td>$4,786</td>
<td>$5,007</td>
<td>$5,512</td>
<td>$5,755</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,270</td>
<td>$6,550</td>
<td>$6,880</td>
<td>$7,293</td>
<td>$7,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (2)</td>
<td>$580</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$680</td>
<td>$710</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$890</td>
<td>$940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAIS (1):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time (3)</td>
<td>$2,725</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
<td>$3,313</td>
<td>$3,475</td>
<td>$3,688</td>
<td>$3,913</td>
<td>$4,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer (1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,340</td>
<td>$2,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (2)</td>
<td>$719</td>
<td>$755</td>
<td>$793</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$866</td>
<td>$926</td>
<td>$991</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
<td>$1,221</td>
<td>$1,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (2)</td>
<td>$986</td>
<td>$1,367</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
<td>$1,502</td>
<td>$1,568</td>
<td>$1,645</td>
<td>$1,757</td>
<td>$1,832</td>
<td>$1,941</td>
<td>$2,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg School of Public Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.P.H. (2)</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$513</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$687</td>
<td>$728</td>
<td>$770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other (2)</td>
<td>$493</td>
<td>$513</td>
<td>$540</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>$588</td>
<td>$617</td>
<td>$645</td>
<td>$687</td>
<td>$728</td>
<td>$770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Per course  (2) Per credit hour  (3) Less than 12 hours
Chapter 4 – Enrollment and Financial Trends and Projections

Research is a defining activity at Johns Hopkins, generates significant revenue and takes place throughout the university. It is anchored in fiscal terms by the schools of Medicine and Public Health and APL, which together account for 90 percent of all sponsored research dollars. Most research is carried out on behalf of government sponsors, but increasingly the university is engaged in privately sponsored research and subcontract arrangements. This trend is important as most nongovernmental activity carries little or no F&A recoveries.

Each of the university’s missions is characterized by insufficient revenues to generate consistent net operating margins. Sponsors do not adequately reimburse the university on research awards. The federal government caps administrative overhead and sets other caps, including salary limits. Further, private sponsors often set indirect costs below adequate levels. On the academic side, tuition does not cover the full costs of education. While difficult to estimate at Hopkins, analysis at liberal arts schools indicates tuition may cover less than 70 percent of education costs. Finally, clinical practice margins are dependent on government funding. Although the School of Medicine enjoys an operating margin today, the potential for government budget cuts remains a concern.

As the primary missions of the university do not generate operating margins, philanthropy is essential to maintaining its fiscal integrity. The Knowledge for the World campaign to date raised more than $3.7 billion from more than 224,000 donors, including more than $460 million for student financial aid and endowments for over 78 new faculty chairs.

Although a smaller component of the revenue stream at Johns Hopkins than at many peer schools, endowment payout adds more than $123 million to operating revenues. Expendable gifts also provide nearly $140 million annually to operating margins. These amounts are important to the financial health and mission of the university.

The university’s fiscal health is also reflected in its endowment. In addition to funds received for both restricted and unrestricted endowments, a diversified investment strategy overseen by the chief investment officer and the Investment Subcommittee of the Johns Hopkins University Board of Trustees has produced investment returns that outperform national benchmarks. Table 5 shows the ending market value of the university’s pooled endowment fund. Although the change in the ending market value of the pooled endowment each fiscal year is determined by many factors (the most important being the investment return), this table shows that contributions added to the fund have offset much of the endowment draw required to fund operations and helped to maintain the endowment’s real value over time.

Institutional Profile information is located in Appendix 2. Appendices 3 and 4 contain audited financial statements for FY 2007 and FY 2008, with accompanying independent auditor’s reports. Our 2008–2009 operating and capital financial plans are contained in Appendix 5. IPEDS Financial Survey information is included in Appendix 6.
## Table 5
### Total University Endowment Balances
#### Ten Year History FY 1998–2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/08</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/09</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/10</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/11</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/12</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/13</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/14</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/15</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/16</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/17</th>
<th>Market Value 06/30/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University-wide</td>
<td>$42,310</td>
<td>$56,858</td>
<td>$66,317</td>
<td>$62,744</td>
<td>$55,765</td>
<td>$53,993</td>
<td>$61,988</td>
<td>$63,035</td>
<td>$67,433</td>
<td>$79,529</td>
<td>$73,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homewood Student Affairs</td>
<td>46,940</td>
<td>$54,069</td>
<td>67,267</td>
<td>69,687</td>
<td>64,781</td>
<td>66,172</td>
<td>77,488</td>
<td>85,356</td>
<td>100,487</td>
<td>123,327</td>
<td>127,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>266,741</td>
<td>$302,072</td>
<td>345,446</td>
<td>324,332</td>
<td>293,764</td>
<td>287,813</td>
<td>332,952</td>
<td>344,225</td>
<td>369,912</td>
<td>427,249</td>
<td>410,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>47,770</td>
<td>$51,551</td>
<td>69,742</td>
<td>67,255</td>
<td>64,368</td>
<td>65,337</td>
<td>71,487</td>
<td>76,066</td>
<td>83,892</td>
<td>98,713</td>
<td>97,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Studies</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td>$5,287</td>
<td>6,183</td>
<td>6,795</td>
<td>6,960</td>
<td>6,326</td>
<td>7,111</td>
<td>7,539</td>
<td>8,134</td>
<td>9,704</td>
<td>9,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic and Cultural Ctrs.</td>
<td>15,857</td>
<td>$10,882</td>
<td>11,794</td>
<td>17,783</td>
<td>17,178</td>
<td>18,086</td>
<td>21,486</td>
<td>25,927</td>
<td>30,075</td>
<td>35,157</td>
<td>35,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheridan Libraries</td>
<td>26,148</td>
<td>$38,542</td>
<td>46,588</td>
<td>48,217</td>
<td>44,190</td>
<td>54,527</td>
<td>56,449</td>
<td>61,056</td>
<td>71,694</td>
<td>88,993</td>
<td>54,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Institute</td>
<td>53,961</td>
<td>$58,776</td>
<td>62,429</td>
<td>62,433</td>
<td>58,603</td>
<td>62,448</td>
<td>73,267</td>
<td>75,333</td>
<td>80,640</td>
<td>93,311</td>
<td>88,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Adv. Intl. Studies</td>
<td>64,680</td>
<td>$69,035</td>
<td>79,898</td>
<td>76,890</td>
<td>73,452</td>
<td>73,025</td>
<td>82,383</td>
<td>88,411</td>
<td>97,887</td>
<td>116,520</td>
<td>111,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bologna Center</td>
<td>6,736</td>
<td>$7,440</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>8,348</td>
<td>7,718</td>
<td>8,829</td>
<td>10,145</td>
<td>13,242</td>
<td>17,145</td>
<td>17,040</td>
<td>13,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanjing Center</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>$3,080</td>
<td>3,586</td>
<td>4,015</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td>4,267</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>4,609</td>
<td>4,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>86,786</td>
<td>$107,067</td>
<td>133,807</td>
<td>146,167</td>
<td>142,216</td>
<td>142,410</td>
<td>178,301</td>
<td>183,398</td>
<td>214,359</td>
<td>251,104</td>
<td>247,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>22,749</td>
<td>$24,024</td>
<td>29,256</td>
<td>29,534</td>
<td>27,609</td>
<td>27,888</td>
<td>32,056</td>
<td>35,074</td>
<td>39,134</td>
<td>46,602</td>
<td>45,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine (1)</td>
<td>622,884</td>
<td>$670,129</td>
<td>786,374</td>
<td>769,977</td>
<td>723,009</td>
<td>729,137</td>
<td>837,858</td>
<td>873,298</td>
<td>962,128</td>
<td>1,146,918</td>
<td>1,112,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Physics Laboratory</td>
<td>62,182</td>
<td>$53,961</td>
<td>71,318</td>
<td>66,189</td>
<td>59,554</td>
<td>57,475</td>
<td>63,914</td>
<td>64,122</td>
<td>68,295</td>
<td>78,418</td>
<td>74,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total University** $1,373,155 $1,520,795 $1,787,752 $1,760,356 $1,642,962 $1,646,897 $1,909,337 $1,995,585 $2,202,350 $2,600,115 $2,524,574 $1,984,951

(1) Includes endowments benefiting JHH of $58,363 at 12/31/08.

## Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence

- **Appendix 2**: Institutional Profile
- **Appendix 3**: 2006–2007 Audited Financial Statements and Management Letters
- **Appendix 4**: 2007–2008 Audited Financial Statements and Management Letters
- **Appendix 5**: 2008–2009 Operating and Capital Financial Plan
- **Appendix 6**: 2006–2008 IPEDS Financial Survey Information
Chapter 5 – Assessment Processes and Plans

Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences considers itself the heart of The Johns Hopkins University in that it embraces the set of academic disciplines around which the institution’s intellectual traditions were created in 1876. Since that time, the Krieger School’s mission has been to educate, and not to train, in order to realize the values that have been at the core of the university since its founding, values well expressed by inaugural President Daniel Coit Gilman: “The object of the University is to develop character…its purport is not so much to impart knowledge to the pupils, as to whet the appetite, exhibit methods, develop powers, strengthen judgment, and invigorate the intellectual and moral forces.” This view of education characterizes the objectives of both undergraduate and graduate education. The mission of education is linked in fundamental ways to the other core activity of the school, research. Moreover, this integral relationship between teaching and research, and education and discovery, imparts a distinctive quality to the Hopkins experience. It is against this mission that the Krieger School measures its own institutional effectiveness through a series of regular self-studies and program reviews.

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is organized around 22 academic departments, 10 in the humanities, four in the social sciences and eight in the natural sciences. In addition, the departments house other centers and programs. In total, 269 tenured or tenure-track faculty hold appointments in these departments and exercise collective academic responsibility for the quality of the academic programs offered at the undergraduate level (38 majors and 33 minors) and graduate level (Appendix 20.1). Moreover, under the supervision of these full-time faculty members, the school engages a number of adjunct faculty, many with expertise as practitioners, and delivers an array of part-time master’s degree programs aimed at the local workforce. The school currently offers 12 master’s degrees within seven distinct programs. At the Homewood campus, the Krieger School enrolls 3,339 full-time undergraduate students and 997 graduate students. The approximately 2,000 part-time students in the Advanced Academic Programs take courses in several locations around the region.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences of The Johns Hopkins University embraces fully the core mission of the university: to foster independent and original research, to educate students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.

The mission of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is discovery—the creation of new knowledge through research and scholarship, and the education of our students, undergraduate and graduate alike, through immersion in this collaborative process. The school’s unique character above all derives from its commitment to choose carefully what is worth pursuing and to do so without compromise.

This imperative applies to work at every level, including undergraduate education, graduate education, scholarly research and outreach to the broader community. The Krieger School strives to be the
finest small research-oriented school of arts and sciences in the country, with a body of faculty and students who are, person for person, second to none. The school seeks to instill in its students the highest standards of intellectual achievement and an abiding commitment to self-initiated learning and discovery. Scholarship of the highest quality is at the core of all the work done in the school. For a division of arts and sciences with fewer than 300 tenure-track professors, the accomplishments and stature of Krieger faculty are noteworthy. As measured by contribution to scholarship and education, the programs of the school have an impact that transcends their small size.

The well-being of the school requires above all else strong academic departments, deeply engaged students, vibrant interactions across disciplines and between faculty and students, and committed alumni who feel lasting and deep connections to the school. As a matter of policy, the school’s assessment plan measures all these things, including recruitment strength and student quality, academic program quality and effectiveness, quality of student services, student learning outcomes, alumni satisfaction and fund-raising success, and, of course, the quality of faculty appointments and promotions according to the most rigorous standards.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

The Krieger School’s assessment plan for institutional effectiveness works according to the following general model that involves measuring success against institutional mission by assessing key performance data to measure how well the school has met its principal goals and objectives; planning and prioritizing for the next strategic planning and assessment period; implementing recommendations that are designed to improve the school through hiring plans for faculty along with program and facility enhancements; and monitoring and evaluating metrics that are clearly articulated. These features of the planning and assessment cycle are reflected in Figure 2:
More specifically, the assessment plan measures the school’s effectiveness against core missions using a variety of methodologies. A cornerstone is the review of the research productivity of its faculty by monitoring external grants and contracts and the review of the quality of faculty scholarship by such measures as publication records, citation indices for publications and peer recognition as reflected in the earning of prestigious prizes and other honors. For example, a recent analysis of Academic Analytics, using a new Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index, offers a useful perspective by not penalizing for small size of departments and instead measuring intrinsic quality. By these measures, the Krieger School has graduate programs ranked in eight of 24 fields and in six of these, Krieger programs rank in the top 10 (Appendix 20.2).

Annually, the dean of the school and the dean of the faculty meet with department chairs to assess faculty effort and performance, and these evaluations factor into decisions regarding compensation. More importantly, these evaluations inform decisions about promotion and tenure, the system through which scholarly excellence and teaching effectiveness are assured. Within the School of Arts and Sciences, each candidate for promotion or tenure is subject to a rigorous process including external reviews of the quality of research or scholarship and consideration of teacher course evaluations as well as university service. Appointments or promotions to the rank of associate or full professor require a review and recommendation by the Homewood Schools Academic Council, whose bylaws are in Appendix 20.3.

Faculty members are actively engaged in assessing the effectiveness of the school’s academic programs, primarily through the work of the Homewood Academic Council, which maintains responsibility for a rigorous program review process (Appendix 20.4). Each department and all other educational units prepare a self-study and undergo a thorough review every five years. The reviews are conducted by teams of faculty, according to a specific calendar and a template that addresses such issues as the intellectual foci of the department; scholarly distinction, as measured by various reputational indices including, where appropriate, quantitative data; success in graduate student recruitment and retention, using such information as program attrition, yield, students’ time to degree and placement; and undergraduate education activity including the quantity and quality of teaching in major programs. An overall appraisal of general departmental strengths and weaknesses and future directions completes this assessment, which is then the subject of discussion by the Academic Council at meetings in which the president and provost of the university participate.

The Krieger School has an effective teacher course evaluation process in place, and participation rates and coverage of courses are monitored annually, as are the assessment of individual faculty by department chairs and the dean of the faculty. The survey addresses a variety of issues related to the quality of certain aspects of the course such as the value of readings and lectures, the intellectual challenge of the course and the instructor’s teaching effectiveness (Appendix 20.5). Quantitative results and qualitative comments are made available online through the Registrar’s Web site. More recently, the Homewood Schools have undertaken an analysis to determine if the results of the course evaluation process could be made available more expeditiously and promoted more widely so that students could make better use of this resource. Consideration is also being given to the creation of summary analytics to allow comparisons across departments.

The overarching framework for the school’s assessment plan is a strategic plan that has consistently guided the school over the past seven years, providing continuity in priorities and clear focus to the school’s efforts (Appendix 20.6). This longer-term vision was developed for the Krieger School in
2002 by a faculty committee and resulted from serious consideration of the school’s strengths, weaknesses and opportunities. Among the key initiatives emphasized in this document were the importance of modest growth in selected departments, a recommitment to the humanities and a renewed focus on undergraduates. The plan also called for increasing the diversity of the faculty, and annually, the composition of the faculty and staff is reviewed as part of a comprehensive, university-wide assessment conducted under the auspices of the university’s Office of Institutional Equity, which ensures that all the schools continue to make progress on this important institutional goal (Appendix 20.7).

In terms of undergraduate education, the school has endorsed the report of the Commission on Undergraduate Education (see Chapter 2 and Appendix 17.1) as a strategic plan for enhancing institutional effectiveness in the provision of a quality experience for undergraduates, both inside and outside the classroom. Many of the recommendations of the CUE report have been implemented, and the priorities identified in the plan remain a remarkably good blueprint for continuous improvement of our educational programs. Over the past five years, the 34 recommendations of the CUE report have been reviewed and progress has been documented, along with the identification of areas needing ongoing or intensified attention (Appendix 17.2).

New priorities are mapped against these CUE recommendations. Specific goals for each academic year have been set, with the objective of tying particular improvements to the comprehensive themes of building community, finding more balance in student life and making education more personal. Another one of the fundamental themes in the CUE report was the imperative of becoming more intentional about undergraduate education, a theme also emphasized in the KSAS strategic plan. Toward that end, the dean of undergraduate education is to provide leadership to enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience on behalf of students enrolled in the Krieger and Whiting schools, which share responsibility for the student life programs that serve their students. The dean, in turn, has promoted a culture of assessment and critical self-evaluation. He has worked with the leadership of the various academic services and student life programs to articulate a set of educational outcomes, and each director is encouraged to devote resources to those programs that most advance these broad objectives (Appendix 20.8). These outcomes include such objectives as developing a global perspective, leadership skills, cultural competence and appreciation of others’ differences, and a strong sense of personal ethics and civility.

In evaluating the effectiveness of our student life programs, it is interesting to note that this locally generated list of educational outcomes runs closely parallel to those articulated (and recently revised) by the National Council for the Advancement of Standards Learning and Development Outcomes. Homewood Student Affairs is privileged to have two Johns Hopkins administrators serve as members of the board of directors of the National Association of Campus Activities. Annually, the Student Affairs units carry out assessment of their programs and services under the leadership of one of these individuals who is doctorally trained and has relevant expertise. He also conducts a survey of student leaders to measure the extent to which they view their skills as having been advanced by particular experiences (Appendix 20.9). In Homewood residential facilities, benchmarking and quality-of-life surveys are conducted annually. The Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI) tool is used to evaluate how campus residents feel about their resident advisors, residential programming and their particular environment. Benchmarks are established against a subset of peer institutions (Appendix 20.10).
A variety of other instruments are used to evaluate program effectiveness. Senior exit interviews were instituted four years ago to allow the school to assess student attitudes about the quality of the undergraduate program across the entire range of student experience. The goal in this assessment exercise is to have face-to-face interviews conducted by senior-level administrators with at least 10 percent of the graduating class each year. The results of these interviews are reviewed in a half-day meeting by all of the interviewers as a way of assessing progress in enhancing the undergraduate experience and obtaining feedback that can be used to adjust programs or improve service delivery (Appendix 20.11).

One of the key components of the assessment plan for institutional effectiveness is the school’s ability to take advantage of comparative data generated by the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE). The school regularly participates in a senior survey and proprietary benchmarking of financial aid and admissions data through COFHE. Participation in enrolled student surveys has been renewed to supplement what has been learned through the regular administration of the CIRP survey to incoming freshmen. Moreover, the Admitted Student Questionnaire is used to assess the Krieger School’s recruitment strength and to help plan for ways to attract to Johns Hopkins the very best students. The university’s Office of Institutional Research administers these surveys and analyzes results, while an enrollment research coordinator is available to conduct additional analyses and assessments of specific questions that address institutional effectiveness, such as monitoring retention and internal migration of students between the Homewood Schools.

In sum, the Krieger School’s assessment plan (summarized in table form in Appendix 20.12) is a comprehensive one that involves assessing academic programs, student services, faculty quality, student learning outcomes and student recruitment strength.

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

The Krieger School links planning to assessment and assessment results to resource allocation in fairly conventional ways. Under the general guidance of the school’s strategic plan, and as a result of the program review process (vetted through the faculty body of the Academic Council), departmental needs are measured against schoolwide priorities. The dean informs his decision making by considering these inputs and then consulting with his senior academic leadership team to finalize decisions about trade-offs. Investments are directed to those distinctive opportunities that can be leveraged with such resources or areas in need that are vital to core mission. Longer-term financial planning is facilitated by a five-year plan, which projects the school’s financial situation in the out years, based on assumptions about tuition revenues (due to enrollments and tuition rate increases), room and board rates, investment return, federal research and fund raising, including major gifts and annual giving.

Annual budget conferences are held with each department, and plans for faculty hires, graduate student enrollment and program initiatives are considered against the overall school priorities and the teaching needs required by the undergraduate programs. Chairs bear an important responsibility for implementing program priorities and sustaining quality through the effectiveness of faculty searches, once faculty lines are authorized. The overall financial condition of the school is regularly reviewed with the school leadership, including through presentations at regular meetings with the chairs, and also with the Advisory Board of the Krieger School. This latter group brings both outside perspective and expertise to bear on issues affecting the future of the school. Moreover, the board advocates for support of strategic priorities and considers how best to advance the school’s interests through advocacy or fund-raising initiatives.
Priorities are communicated regularly to the school’s development professionals so that fund raising can be guided, to the extent possible, by school needs as well as donor interests. Moreover, communication with wider constituencies is facilitated by close communication with the school’s public affairs professionals so that the school’s magazine, Web site and other communication vehicles underline the academic priorities to be advanced. The academic priorities identified in the strategic plan have shaped the school’s fund-raising priorities during an eight-year university-wide fund-raising campaign that has just been successfully concluded, with the Krieger School having reached more than 100 percent of its goal by raising $334 million (Appendix 20.13).

A discipline of space planning and resource allocation allows infrastructure and financial resources to align with the academic priorities through regular budget reviews. In fact, the current major renovation of Gilman Hall is a direct outgrowth of the strategic plan, which called for a renewed commitment to the humanities. Gilman will become a more fitting home to each of the humanities departments and facilitate renewed cross-disciplinary intellectual exchange, which has historically characterized the traditions in the humanities departments at Johns Hopkins. Another example is the plan to renovate the undergraduate teaching laboratories, which are heavily used and much in need of such renovation. Because of the importance of the academic programs that depend on these facilities to support some of the most popular majors and the large numbers of pre-medical students, this priority is a key one, though one that the current economic turmoil has likely caused to be postponed. There are other significant infrastructure needs mapped to key priorities, including new research space for biological sciences and neuroscience and new housing for freshmen. These are part of a longer-term capital plan for the school that will depend largely on expanding its resource base.

The decision calculus in resource allocation involves balancing the needs of both undergraduate and graduate education and advancing the school’s mission of discovery and scholarly excellence. Undergirding all these calculations is the commitment to quality and the awareness that the small size of the Krieger School requires careful choices and unswerving commitment to excellence. Because the tradition of entrepreneurialism is deeply rooted in the fabric of the Krieger School, there is also openness to new opportunities and an embrace of contemporary challenges. The creation of a new major in global environmental change and sustainability is a case in point, where resources will be directed to build on historical strength by deepening teaching and research expertise to meet today’s environmental crisis.

Finally, the program assessment and resource allocation process also allows consideration of overarching priorities. A case in point is the critical need for substantial increases in need-based financial aid for undergraduates and for significant augmentation of stipend levels for graduate students. The dean of the Krieger School has elevated this crosscutting need to the top of priorities for the school. Ample evidence in the assessment cycle confirms how vital student financial aid is to the quality of the school, and thus plans are being made to find resources that will support this mission-critical need.
Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview
In keeping with the Standards of Excellence promulgated by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences has developed an assessment policy that establishes the expectation that all departments offering major degree programs will regularly assess student learning outcomes. Faculty are responsible for articulating outcomes and developing appropriate measures specific to their programs, according to a template that addresses program mission, mechanisms to advance students toward the desired outcomes and feedback loops to ensure that the results enhance programs. At the graduate level, program committees routinely assess program quality and student success for the set of advanced, part-time academic programs offering master’s-level work, and a Graduate Board consisting of faculty members establishes expectations for students pursuing doctoral education in the arts and sciences.

This approach ensures that student learning outcomes assessment is incorporated into the regular governance processes of the school, which rely heavily on faculty responsibility for setting academic standards for both program quality and student learning.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy
The mission of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences emphasizes the education of students within a process that also promotes discovery, thus integrally linking teaching and research. The curriculum of the Krieger School is distinctive in that it puts heavy emphasis on the completion of a major so that students delve deeply into a given subject and thus have the capacity to do advanced-level work in the field of their interest. There are few overall additional curricular requirements, and these include a writing requirement and some distribution of course work in fields of knowledge beyond the field represented by the major program of study. With a minimum of 120 credit hours required for graduation, most students take an average of five courses and thus are left with a good deal of opportunity for choice of electives.

It is the judgment of the Arts and Sciences faculty that our approach to education puts a premium on motivation, intellectual curiosity and personal responsibility for the direction of one’s own education, in keeping with the original intentions and conception of the university’s founders and early leaders that the Hopkins education should be distinctive from the then-common collegiate model. Also fundamental to undergraduate education at Hopkins is the view that students learn best when they are sincerely interested in the subject matter, and when they can put knowledge to work addressing issues or creatively solving problems that matter to them. This strategy encourages intellectual independence, preparation for lifelong learning and, thus, the creation of habits of mind that stand students in good stead long after the particulars of what has been learned in courses have faded from memory.

KSAS offers undergraduates a wide range of options for completing a major, with 38 choices for major programs housed in departments and interdisciplinary academic programs. The quality of all these academic programs is ensured through active oversight of a schoolwide Curriculum Committee, on which serve four faculty members and four students. Their recommendations are made to the Homewood Academic Council, the governing faculty body (Appendix 20.14). All new curricular...
programs are the subject of Curriculum Committee action, with emphasis on academic rigor, coherence and the capacity to deliver a quality program with sufficient faculty resources to provide the best instruction.

Each department with an undergraduate major submits an assessment plan that describes the department mission, the major’s program objectives, mechanisms for advancing those objectives, expected student learning outcomes, measures for assessing whether the outcomes are achieved and a process for using these results to enhance program effectiveness (Appendix 20.15). The School of Arts and Sciences believes that “one size does not fit all.” Indeed, it would be antithetical to the very structure of the curriculum to dictate to faculty in the departments what it is that students should know or how we should find evidence of that. The assessment plans thus put a premium on outcomes that are formulated by faculty with disciplinary expertise. Departments are encouraged to design a plan that reflects the nature of the individual academic discipline and that respects the culture of learning appropriate to the given field of study. Sample department assessment plans are found in Appendix 20.16.

In most Krieger departments, the individual primarily responsible for the creation of an assessment plan is a senior faculty member serving as the director of undergraduate studies. In many cases, departments have also created assessment committees that work together to develop appropriate measures, gather and evaluate data, and make recommendations based on those data.

The process of assessment of student learning outcomes in the Krieger School is coordinated by the dean of undergraduate education. The dean works closely with departments to provide counsel as plans are developed, makes resources available (including a manual for department assessment committees) and monitors progress in implementation. Regular meetings of the directors of undergraduate studies are an important vehicle for sharing ideas and talking about findings.

The dean also evaluates the effectiveness of curricular programs that address schoolwide requirements, such as writing (Appendix 20.17). It is also the responsibility of the dean to maintain working knowledge of the formal requirements of the accrediting agencies, to be conversant with the literature on assessment and to facilitate the dissemination of this information to departments and programs. Moreover, she shares with faculty across disciplines best practices from other Hopkins divisions and from other universities. And, because some of the measures of student learning outcomes rely on data that is obtained through schoolwide processes using instruments that are centrally administered, the dean organizes such processes for maximum utility and efficiency.

Examples of the latter mechanism include the active survey research program that is administered by the dean for students in both the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering, as well as annual assessments conducted by such offices as the Career Center and the Office of Pre-professional Advising, which routinely monitor the outcomes for students entering the job market or applying to professional school (Appendix 20.18). It is a distinctive feature of The Johns Hopkins University that a particularly high number of students pursue advanced study in competitive graduate programs and in professional schools, especially medicine and law. Thus, the directors of a number of academic services, such as Pre-professional Advising, are actively involved in assessment and can contribute data to address various relevant learning outcomes, such as preparation for medical school as evidenced by scores on portions of the MCAT, admissions success rates, etc. (Appendix 20.19).
An important part of the educational program for students enrolled in degree programs at the Homewood campus takes place outside the formal academic departments. The residential program and the co-curricular program are designed to recognize the importance of maturation and the learning of life skills. Through various student life programs and services, specific learning outcomes are advanced. In fact, the Homewood Student Affairs division has undertaken an exercise to articulate a clear set of student learning outcomes by identifying 12 such goals (Appendix 20.8). These are intentionally stated simply and with an absence of educational jargon so that everyone at every level within Student Affairs can understand and be engaged with what we are trying to accomplish. Each of the respective student services and programs is asked to identify specific programs that advance these objectives and to develop measures to ensure that students are making progress. Beginning in 2007–2008, the Student Affairs units started devoting extended staff meetings to individual outcomes and inventorying the programmatic mechanisms through which individual offices were advancing those objectives. As an example, each Student Affairs unit reviewed its contributions in programs to help students develop greater cultural competence (Appendix 20.20). Gradually, the division hopes to concentrate its energies and resources on programs that most effectively advance the outcomes most important for student development. Thus a feedback loop will be established and tied to resource allocation so that the programs that most advance learning outcomes will be those that attract additional resources.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

During the 2004–2005 academic year, all major programs were reviewed in a special process (Appendix 20.21). Unlike the program reviews conducted by the Academic Council, these reviews focused entirely on the undergraduate program. The rationale for the structure of the major was explored, as were special individual learning and capstone experiences for students and the plan for the provision of advising, and special programming to strengthen community among majors. These reviews resulted in an analysis of strengths and weaknesses and suggestions to departments for steps that could be taken to enhance student learning. These analyses and plans have been a useful framework for evaluation of program effectiveness and student learning objectives.

As indicated above, the statement of program goals is faculty-driven and the statement of student learning outcomes is discipline-based. Each department addresses the question of what students in an individual major should be expected to be able to know, think, do or appreciate if they have completed that major course of study. Departments are encouraged to explore whether their professional associations have drafted model outcomes and, where they exist, to adapt them to the Hopkins program objectives. Next, each department is asked to consider the means by which students are guided toward those objectives. Obviously, the formal curriculum as reflected in course requirements for the major constitutes the primary means, but many departments have additional mechanisms such as internships, research projects, portfolios, oral examinations, etc. Most departments have organized this section of their assessment plan by developing a matrix that takes individual outcomes and links them to specific courses or educational experiences that advance those outcomes.

Among the measures that departments have selected as appropriate to their program are evaluation of research projects or senior theses, final papers in capstone courses, assessment of scores on Graduate Record, MCAT, LSAT or GMAT examinations, faculty assessment of writing portfolios, exit interviews according to rubrics that address student learning objectives, and placement in competitive graduate programs or professional schools, as well as in employment.
In addition to the work of departmental faculty and staff of relevant academic service offices, the assessment process relies on support from the university’s Office of Institutional Research. Additionally, the Center for Educational Resources (CER) for the Homewood Schools contributes to measuring student learning in a variety of educational projects that it designs and monitors. In fact, evaluation is incorporated into all of its projects. The CER has special expertise in using technology to advance learning objectives so that its experiments in enhancing course effectiveness are excellent laboratories for understanding how to improve learning outcomes.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

At the undergraduate level, departments are expected to review outcome measures to determine how well students are achieving the desired learning outcomes and to take the necessary steps to consider program changes that would address any concerns that result from the monitoring of learning outcomes. Several departments have created assessment committees; others have chosen to maintain collective responsibility by reviewing the assessment results as a committee of the whole. In either case, for each major program, the use of results is to be documented. On the basis of review of assessment data, departments and programs may consider such steps as changes to curricular requirements, enhancements of individual courses, the introduction of new courses and the development of capstone courses, etc.

The dean of undergraduate education monitors the department assessment plans and, together with the dean of the faculty, considers the extent to which program enhancements require resource commitments versus internal reallocation of funds. In an environment of constrained resources, the first preference is that departments consider ways to do better what they are doing or to redirect resources. Occasionally, of course, student demand is such that increased resources are essential to enhancing particular outcomes, as, for example, in fostering the development of the capacity to design an original research investigation that might be facilitated by the provision of additional small group experiences to students.

One example of linked assessment results and resource allocation is the provision of more professional staff support for majors in public health. As one of the largest majors, public health students can now be given more individualized attention in advising on course selection, etc.

At the graduate level, the dean of research and graduate education works closely with the Graduate Board to ensure that graduate programs carefully assess student learning. In PhD programs, of course, there are several institutionalized direct assessment methods that are the ultimate vehicle for assessing student learning. The written preliminary (comprehensive) examinations conducted by the departments for all graduate students aspiring to doctoral candidacy involve a thorough assessment of subject matter mastery. And the preparation of a dissertation proposal, the writing of the dissertation and the thesis defense are fundamental and direct means of ensuring the capacity of a student to formulate an original research question and to defend a hypothesis convincingly to faculty experts. The policies and procedures for assessment of learning outcomes for graduate students are outlined by the Graduate Board (Appendix 20.22). Together with the dean of the faculty, the dean of graduate education monitors such indices as time to degree, program attrition and placement of graduates of various programs to determine which programs are meeting expectations with respect to learning outcomes.
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Carey Business School Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Johns Hopkins Carey Business School (Carey), one of two new schools created in 2007 (Appendix 21.1.1), advances the university’s mission in the disciplines of business and management. To guide the development of its capacity and quality, Carey is engaged in an outcomes-oriented strategic planning process that aligns its new mission with the various functions, capabilities and deliverables of its academic and administrative units; measures and analyzes their progress; and utilizes the findings to make adjustments to optimize achievement of its mission.

Linked Missions, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Johns Hopkins University Carey Business School, a premier humanistic learning community, develops global business leaders and transforms organizations, communities and society through discovery, entrepreneurship and engagement.

The Carey mission addresses the university’s mission to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning. A premier humanistic learning community, Carey develops global business leaders, fosters independent and original research, and brings the benefits of discovery to the world. It transforms organizations, communities and society through discovery, entrepreneurship and engagement (Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment of School and University Mission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johns Hopkins Carey Business School</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a premier humanistic learning community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develops global business leaders and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transforms organizations, communities and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societies through discovery,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurship and engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carey achieves its mission through a planning process in which all units create a strategic plan (Appendix 21.1.2) with detailed goals, strategies, deliverables, timetables and metrics. These plans are used to guide progress. Each year the plans, strategies, deliverables and measurements are analyzed to identify critical factors that impact progress toward achievement of the mission. As a whole, these plans with their analysis are examined to guide decision making regarding the operation and resourcing of the unit. Changes to plans and resources as a result of this analysis are then implemented and evaluated to complete the dynamic evaluation loop and begin the process again.

A number of boards provide support and counsel to the dean and are critical to the ultimate development of the school (Appendix 21.1.3). The Board of Overseers consists of international business leaders who provide the dean with counsel at the highest levels. The Corporate Advisory Board and the program advisory boards provide a network of relationships designed to advance both Carey
and the partner businesses. The newly established Carey Academic Board, composed of full professors from Carey and other Hopkins schools, recommends policies and procedures for faculty and academic affairs through its work in three subcommittees: Academic Standards, Curriculum and Faculty Policy.

The dean and three vice deans that oversee programs, faculty, and operations lead Carey (Appendix 21.1.4). The newly established Carey Academic Board, composed of full professors from Carey and other Hopkins schools, recommends policies and procedures for faculty and academic affairs through its work in three subcommittees: Academic Standards, Curriculum, and Faculty Policy. A priority of the leadership was the establishment of admission standards to ensure the quality of the Carey student population.

Integral to the development of Carey are its internal and external partnerships. The strengths of these partnerships are leveraged to accelerate the school’s capacity to become a leader in global business education (Appendix 21.1.4). Examples of internal partnerships are the Business of Health Program dual degree offered with the School of Medicine, the Business of Nursing program offered in partnership with the School of Nursing and the new dual degree online MPH/MBA program soon to be offered in partnership with the Bloomberg School of Public Health.

The dean has engaged in an aggressive effort to develop and expand international partnerships to provide visibility and establish joint initiatives with global impact. Parallel to this development is the increase in the visibility and impact of the school in the local and broader business community. The Leaders & Legends lecture series and the Dean’s Lecture Series are examples that address critical issues impacting business and the broader community and showcase the efforts of Carey (Appendix 21.1.5).

Another critical factor in the advancement of Carey is the earning of professional accreditations from the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and from the Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Management Education (CAHME) for the Master of Business Administration (MBA) in medical services management, and reaccreditation from the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) for the Master of Science (MS) in Real Estate. To begin these processes, the Carey leadership team has been trained in AACSB accreditation and assessment processes, the application to begin the accreditation process is being prepared for CAHME, and the reaccreditation process and timetable for RICS are in process. Efforts to build capacity of Carey include efforts to assure alignment with the requirements of these accrediting bodies.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

From its founding in 2007, Carey has engaged in a strategic planning process to guide development and monitor progress of the school in achieving its mission. A conceptual framework for school effectiveness (Figure 4) was developed to provide a clear guide for the creation of each unit’s goals with corresponding strategic objectives and tactics to address them. The conceptual framework illustrates the dynamic nature of the assessment and improvement cycle. Each unit’s planning process includes ambitious goals with measurable strategies and deliverables that are annually reviewed, analyzed and modified to ensure progress toward achievement of the mission. Each unit continuously monitors its plan, assesses its progress and adjusts its strategies to ensure the effective mission-targeted development of Carey. An annual training experience prepares unit leaders to use the school
effectiveness conceptual framework to guide the creation of their unit plans and the implementation of the assessment process.

Annual reports, course evaluations, faculty hires, faculty workload profiles, research and scholarship production, stakeholder feedback, financial data, development reports, graduates’ employment, graduates’ salaries, partnerships and benchmarking with peer institutions guide development and provide both direct and indirect indicators of school effectiveness. Senior leadership analyzes this information in conjunction with data regarding recruitment, applications, enrollment, student experience, student performance, internship placements and graduates in order to plan for the allocation of resources to advance the mission.

Carey is engaged in a transformation process to create a business school that will be identified by its intellectual contributions, leadership and concern for humanity. Current efforts to build capacity and impact include an aggressive faculty recruitment effort (12 new hires in 2008) and the expansion of leadership through the hiring of an associate dean to oversee recruitment, admissions and placement; and two vice deans, one to oversee academic programs, the other to lead the faculty. A new Office of Professional Programs has made substantial progress in quality improvement through a concerted effort to increase class size, consolidate locations and reduce the number of course sections and adjunct instructors.

Other developments include substantial changes in capacity and enhanced services in the Office of Development and External Relations, the Office of Student Affairs and the Office of Recruitment,
Admissions and Career Services (led by a new associate dean). A new position of director of institutional research now oversees the collection and analysis of data to assist in accurate decision making. A vice dean oversees all operations of Carey.

Furthermore, Carey has invested in the acquisition of new technologies and prerequisite infrastructure. Blackboard 8.0, a robust course management system, enhances and expands previous technology course support with additional capabilities such as e-portfolio and institutional components. Digital Measures, a faculty performance and learning assessment system with additional course evaluation capabilities, provides a systematic approach to tracking faculty activity and making that information available for populating Web sites and monitoring faculty intellectual contributions. In addition, Hobsons, a recruitment management system, provides accurate monitoring of the prospect-to-admission process.

Moreover, the physical facilities of the school are being consolidated, improved and strategically centered in downtown Baltimore to create a community presence for the business school. All faculty offices were moved from four dispersed sites to a common space to provide opportunities for creative synergies. The Dean’s Office and administrative offices were also moved downtown to create a strategic presence.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

As a new school, Carey has begun to develop processes to gather data on performance of program units that will be used to determine allocation of resources. In addition, the dean identifies funds for major initiatives designed to advance the school. An example of this is the launch of a full-time MBA program, a critical component of the strategic plan, which is being substantially resourced.

Evaluation and assessment are embedded in the Carey budgeting process. For example, cost configuration can be traced through account numbers to determine the distribution of funds. Investments can be categorized by function (i.e., recruitment, instruction, etc.) and broken down by type (personnel, technology, facilities, etc.) with a corresponding cost grid. Plans include the development of a dashboard display of critical metrics to provide transparency and to allow for continuous monitoring of program health.

Flexibility is built into the system to provide resources for promising new programs and previously underresourced programs. Programs are required to demonstrate substantial development and impact. Also included in the planning process is the establishment of several research centers, each of which is expected to quickly generate exemplary scholarship and attract funding support to remain viable. Finally, the plan includes new ventures, such as partnerships, executive education and consulting, that will also have metrics to demonstrate both self-sufficiency and impact to justify support.

All faculty and staff as well as other stakeholders, such as students, alumni and strategic partners, are engaged in the planning process. The operational portion of the plan, including each unit’s goals, will be accessible to the Carey community on the Intranet. At the end of each academic year, the results of the evaluation of each unit will be posted and used to guide actions to improve performance as reflected in the school effectiveness conceptual framework. The results of these evaluations will guide changes in unit strategies and the allocation of resources.
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Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview

The new Johns Hopkins Carey Business School (Carey) values learning as reflected in its mission statement and its structure. Carey has established an Office of Learning with resources committed to develop, implement and evaluate an organized, systematic and sustainable process to assure and advance learning. The initial activities of the office were designed to establish a culture of learning and begin the collection of baseline data. Current efforts focus on the identification of schoolwide and program-specific student learning goals, the approval of the assurance of learning process and the establishment of processes, timelines and phases for the implementation of the system.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Carey mission as it relates to learning is unique in its application of the university mission to the disciplines of business and management, with an emphasis on preparing highly competent business professionals who feel a responsibility to societal needs (Figure 3).

The major goal of the Office of Learning is to develop an assurance of learning system, and to advance learning in the school by cultivating a culture of learning assurance. An assistant dean with a faculty appointment leads the office and serves as a member of the Dean’s Leadership Team. An instructional designer who holds a doctorate and an instructional technologist provide expertise to the development of policies and procedures to assist faculty in the assurance and advancement of learning. In addition, Carey has committed financial resources to support advancements in technology infrastructure and faculty training required to successfully address this goal.

The Office of Learning guides and coordinates the faculty’s efforts in regard to assessment of student learning and program improvement through a Learning Assurance and Advancement System, which is conceptualized in the Assurance of Learning Conceptual Framework (Appendix 21.2.1). The initial steps to begin the learning assurance and advancement process involved the collection of baseline data on current assessment practice among all the programs in the school. At present the faculty is engaged in the process of developing schoolwide and program-specific student learning goals aligned to the mission as indicated in the faculty meeting agendas (Appendix 21.2.2).

A retreat on learning (Appendix 21.2.3) for all full-time and part-time faculty served as the foundation experience for the development of a culture of assurance of learning. In this retreat a learning agenda was introduced with processes to assure learning and framed as a component of a scholarly agenda of inquiry focused on teaching and learning. The retreat introduced the faculty to and provided the framework for the Learning Assurance and Advancement System. The retreat recognized and celebrated outstanding teachers within the school. It also provided sessions on exemplary teaching practices and technologies from experts from within and external to the Carey school.

The Assurance of Learning Conceptual Framework demonstrates how the Learning Assurance and Advancement System is both aligned with the Carey mission and focused on the achievement of student learning outcomes, with clearly defined assessments and a process for using assessment results for program improvement. The system is designed to include formative evaluation and periodic summative evaluation of the system.
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The implementation of the Learning Assurance and Advancement System is operationalized through the Chart of the Assessment System (Appendix 21.2.4). Schoolwide and program-specific key student learning goals are aligned with the mission. For each goal, corresponding objectives (student learning outcomes) are measured with clearly articulated assessments and supported by specified educational experiences. The assurance of learning configuration for each program includes key assessments that are both internal and external to that program’s courses and also direct and indirect measures of student achievement. Scoring guides are being developed to score the assessments. Comparisons of program performance across semesters will be tracked and factored into the budgeting process each year.

Plans include the development of a dashboard or control chart to map key indicators of a program’s performance in such categories as admissions, enrollment, retention, graduation rates, initial job upon graduation and starting salary. This data will be analyzed by the faculty and school leadership and used to inform decisions regarding discipline content, educational experiences, format, personnel support and other resources required to maintain and advance the program or, conversely, the need to eliminate the program. The Learning Assurance and Advancement System has been developed to include and address the various requirements of the accrediting bodies—the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, the Association to Advance the Collegiate Schools of Business, the Royal Institution of Charter Surveyors and the Commission on the Accreditation of Health Management Education—of interest to Carey (Appendix 21.2.5).

**Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes**

Building on the foundation established in the retreat on learning, the next step to assure learning was the collection of baseline data on current assessment practices among all programs in the school. These data provided insight into the needs of the school with regard to the assessment process. In addition, a process to benchmark the assessment practices of other business schools helped refine the development of the assessment approach being implemented by Carey.

The Learning Assurance and Advancement System is based on commonly held program goals and specific program goals defined by the faculty and aligned with the Carey mission. The faculty community has been engaged in an iterative process to create a set of overarching program goals that will both align with the Carey mission and be recognized as the hallmark of a Carey graduate. In addition to the overarching goals, the faculty teams are creating additional specialized goals for their respective programs. Using a program view as opposed to a course perspective, the faculty program teams are developing clearly defined and measurable learning objectives for each goal, with a set of corresponding assessments and educational experiences designed to achieve that goal. Finally, for each assessment the faculty team will establish a scoring guide to judge the level of student achievement for each objective.

The Learning Assurance and Advancement System has been reviewed by faculty and school leadership. The new system is being incorporated into the development of the new flagship full-time MBA program scheduled to launch in fall 2010. A timetable for the incorporation of the assessment system into other programs is being established with priority given to programs seeking external accreditation. Digital Measures has been selected to provide technology support for tracking and analysis of the assessment system data.
Examples of current efforts to address student learning outcomes within programs include the MBA Fellows Program which is a project-based program built on learning outcomes that are addressed through performance assessment and a portfolio process. Also, the new Master of Business Administration in Organization Development (MBA/OD) program similarly includes an e-portfolio process to assess student learning. The MBA in the Life Sciences program, with educational experiences designed to reflect the biotechnology life cycle, includes a series of integrated educational experiences rather than a series of traditional three-credit courses. Moreover, Carey has established a pilot Assessment Center for the MBA/OD program to provide pre-/post-testing of students on selected psychometrics and discipline content to guide the learning process. Plans are to expand this to the full-time MBA that is scheduled to launch in 2010 (Appendix 21.2.6). Indirect assessments that will be incorporated into the Learning Assurance and Advancement System include feedback from internships, employers and alumni, as well as enrollment, application, retention and graduation rates, and Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) course evaluations (Appendix 21.2.7).

A biennial cycle for the extensive analysis of the assessment data for each program will be established to ensure a thorough review of each program at least twice before each accreditation review. In addition an evaluation cycle for the Learning Assurance and Advancement System will be developed and completed periodically.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

The Learning Assurance and Advancement System incorporates a cyclical review process in which both direct and indirect assessment results will be used as indicators of learning to monitor, develop and improve programs. At present, the direct evidence of student learning consists of performance evaluations of students in capstone courses for the MBA and Real Estate programs and in the project-based courses such as the Applied Research Project in the Marketing program, the International Consultancy in the MBA/OD program and the Competitive Advantage: Business + Design course offered in collaboration with the Maryland Institute College of Art (Appendix 21.2.8).

Indirect evidence consists of course grades, IDEA course evaluation results, feedback from partner clients in student research and project-based courses that include among others the courses previously mentioned. Student internships and reports of graduates’ promotions and career advancement provide additional anecdotal performance information. Admissions, enrollments, retention and graduation rates provide additional indirect measures. In fall 2008, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Major Field Test was offered as a pilot pre-test to the incoming MBA/OD students. Results of this process will determine whether or not ETS will be used as a pre- and post-test assessment indicator for any, several or all of the Carey programs.

Carey has acquired Digital Measures to track direct and indirect student learning assessment data. Assessment results will be collected routinely as an ongoing process by the faculty teams. Each year, the teams will review the results and send recommendations to the vice dean of programs and the associate dean of professional programs regarding student performance, program viability, program impact, content, structure, external resource opportunities and recommended adjustments in current structures and resource allocations. At the dean’s level, decisions will be made regarding program continuance, modification and/or resource allocation or reallocation. This process will inform the budget priorities for the next academic year. The learning assurance and advancement process is inclusive and transparent. Assessment results for all programs will be made available to the faculty. The dean will make this information available to school advisory groups as appropriate.
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The new Learning Assurance and Advancement System is a component of an agenda of inquiry on student learning and improvement. As a scholarly endeavor, the collection of data on student learning is a step in the process that involves asking questions about assurance of learning; measuring impact; collecting and using data related to those questions; recommending and implementing changes to content, structure and resource allocations; and repeating the process to determine the impact of the changes. The results of these changes will be measured to affirm their impact or suggest new directions on the path to continuous program improvement.

Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence
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Appendix 21.1.2 Example of a Strategic Plan
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School of Education
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

During its 100-year history, the School of Education (SOE) has undergone several changes in name and configuration. The most recent came in 2007, with the division of the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education into two separate entities: the Carey Business School and the School of Education. In its current form, the School of Education includes six academic units and three research and development centers (Appendix 22.1.1). Together, these divisions work to support and improve the education provided to K-12 students through high-quality graduate programs and applied research (Appendix 22.1.2). We advance these goals in partnership with other Johns Hopkins schools and organizations, public and private school systems, professional education associations and government agencies (Appendix 22.1.3).

Each year, the School of Education enrolls approximately 2,000 students and awards more than 500 master’s degrees. Because the number of graduate students in education is the largest served by any Maryland institution, commitment to quality and creativity must guide the design, development and delivery of outstanding programs and the evaluation of progress in achieving this commitment, as defined in the SOE’s strategic vision (Appendix 22.1.4). At this time, the SOE is engaging in a new strategic planning process to identify opportunities and niches that will allow the unit to be widely recognized for its strengths and contributions to the field as it grows in its identity as a school of education.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The School of Education has a leading role in providing innovative academic programs and applied research that measurably improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, especially in the most challenged urban schools. The SOE’s mission aligns with the mission of the university as a whole, and its activities support their shared core enterprises—education, research and application of knowledge to professional practice. This multitiered approach to achieving and sustaining excellence is reflected in the SOE’s mission statement: “The mission of the School of Education is to support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth and adults through teaching, research, program development, leadership and service.”

This mission forms the core of the SOE’s conceptual framework, which further includes the methods of delivery and candidate outcomes (Appendix 22.1.5). Candidate outcomes reflect the school’s underlying priorities and establish the expectation that graduates be knowledgeable in their respective content area/discipline, reflective practitioners who are committed to diversity, data-driven decision makers and integrators of applied technology. At base, these expectations and priorities speak to the school’s commitment to preparing a new generation of educators ready to meet the challenges of high academic standards, expanding technology and increasingly diverse student populations.

Fulfilling this commitment and furthering the school’s overall mission require ongoing, formative efforts to evaluate and refine its programs, operations and performance. To this end, the SOE has sought to maintain a flexible, responsive approach to assessing student and school needs. This approach is regulated by an evolving system for collecting, processing, reviewing and utilizing data. The SOE’s current approach to assessment of institutional effectiveness has emerged from extensive
collaboration aimed at supporting analysis of student performance and program quality, as represented in Figure 5 below.

**Figure 5**

While the SOE has made considerable progress in this area over the past five years, it views assessment as an evolutionary process, one that will continually improve and yield better ways to obtain and use information for institutional improvement. The school is seeking to sustain positive aspects of its approach to assessment (in particular, flexibility and responsiveness) while at the same time establishing a more coherent, systematic and centralized Unit Assessment System (UAS) for processing and reviewing data. The current data collection system has emerged from extensive collaboration among faculty, staff and administrators working together to integrate systems in ways that support analysis of student performance and program quality (Appendix 22.1.6).

The UAS data collection system described above is in alignment with MSCHE Standard 7 (Institutional Assessment). This system allows the SOE to meet the goals set forth in its mission statement and conceptual framework as well as professional, accreditation, state and national standards. Through the UAS, the SOE community can collect and analyze data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and program and school operations. In accordance with MSCHE requirements and Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal), this process is a key component of school planning and resource allocation, and assessment results are used to shape ongoing refinement of programs and services.

The Office of Teaching, Learning and Assessment (OTLA) is responsible for maintaining the UAS and works closely with the following units to evaluate and refine the system: the Office of the Dean, Accreditation Committee, academic departments, Center for Technology in Education, and
Professional Schools Administration (PSA). The PSA, which provides IT, enrollment management and other administrative services shared by the SOE and the Carey Business School, plays a critical role in the maintenance and evaluation of UAS technical infrastructure. The UAS is supported by a broad range of technologies, including Web-based data collection and reporting systems, data-processing and analytical software packages, and standard presentation/reporting software. This collaborative, coordinated and technology-supported assessment effort ensures that, in accordance with MSCHE Standard 7, there are clear interrelations between (a) goals at the institution, program, unit and course level and (b) assessments of how well those goals are met. It further ensures that assessment is systematic, sustained and regularly reviewed and adapted. By ensuring that comprehensive, interlinked, accurate and useful assessment mechanisms are in place and sustained, the school contributes to the wider institution’s capacity to evaluate and enhance overall effectiveness.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

In accordance with MSCHE Standard 7, the SOE relies on a comprehensive, integrated set of measures to assess school effectiveness. Assessment methods span a range of direct and indirect—as well as quantitative and qualitative—measures and, because truly effective assessment is multifaceted and ongoing, the SOE uses multiple measures to track the progress and development of individual candidates, cohorts of candidates, certification programs and school operations over time. All degree programs collect data on candidates and program/SOE operations at specified “decision points,” and the SOE employs qualitative and quantitative reports to generate data on program performance (Appendix 22.1.7). A host of measures are used to gather data from multiple sources, including candidates, alumni, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, school administrators and the professional community. Aggregated assessment results, coupled with formal and informal feedback from teachers and stakeholders, provide a sound foundation for analyzing the SOE’s overall effectiveness. An example of this use of data for unit decision making can be found in Appendix 22.1.8, a summary of unit-level decision points.

In undertaking assessment activities, the SOE works in close collaboration with the PSA to gather information on infrastructure, technical capacity and candidate enrollment. It also maintains a number of standing advisory committees, including the Regional Advisory Board (made up of local teacher education stakeholders, educational leaders and school alumni) and the National Advisory Council (made up of Johns Hopkins University trustees and national business and educational leaders). Data and reports stemming from these collaborative efforts inform decisions about course schedules, faculty workload, student recruitment, building capacity, technology investments and capital improvement efforts—as well as how best to invest in, build and refine the school and its programs. Appendix 22.1.9 and Appendix 22.1.10 illustrate this collaborative work process.

To ensure that this process is implemented with regularity and rigor, the SOE maintains a standard internal collection and reporting cycle for assessment at the candidate, program and school levels, using predefined and ad hoc reports (Appendix 22.1.11). It likewise maintains a standard external reporting cycle for Johns Hopkins University reports and those for external stakeholders. The dean and school leadership teams promote collaboration between and among department- and program-level faculty members to analyze candidate assessment data and with senior staff and department chairs to analyze operational data. Data reports are generated in multiple formats, and the OTLA works with academic departments and administrative offices to develop formats that meet their needs. See Appendix 22.1.12 for a summary of program-level data-driven changes for 2005–2008.
Previously, the evaluation of courses, programs and clinical experiences was conducted primarily at the department level under the direction of chairs and program-level faculty. While this approach allowed for substantial flexibility and responsiveness, it was lacking in centralization and cross-school coherency. After recommendations from a recent accreditation review with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in April 2008, the SOE established a more centrally coordinated, systematic data review process. The SOE is beginning to adopt a shared system for collecting, storing and reporting data, moving the assessment process forward while incorporating greater levels of coordination and oversight.

Under the new model described above, each academic department/program and administrative office will receive three reports: (a) an Assessment Data Report, with summary scores from the program/department’s core assessments and a summary report for the school; (b) an Operational Data Report, with inquiry data, enrollment data, demographic data and financial data for each program and a summary report for the school; and (c) a Faculty Assessment Data Report, with summary faculty evaluation scores (through the Individual Development and Education Assessment [IDEA] evaluation system) and an institutional summary report. The reports will be issued separately at the end of each semester, accompanied by a document that asks three guiding questions: 1) Based upon the data, what are we doing well? 2) Based upon the data, what are the areas that require additional improvement? 3) What are the action steps that we need to take to build upon our strengths and address our areas for improvement? Each department and office will be required to respond to the reports, and the responses will be processed through the Dean’s Office and maintained in a common electronic space for all unit stakeholders. This new, improved approach to dissemination and review will help to guide the strategic planning and continuous improvement process for departments, offices and the SOE as a whole.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

In alignment with MSCHE Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal), the SOE has a system in place for ongoing planning, budgeting and resource allocation based on its mission and conceptual framework. This system represents a systematic, coordinated and sustained effort that begins with clear articulation of SOE goals and priorities; encompasses formative, multitiered assessment efforts; and unfolds in accordance with the SOE’s overarching commitment to quality, creativity and responsiveness.

Because of Johns Hopkins University’s highly decentralized structure, the SOE holds primary responsibility for ensuring that planning and budgeting processes advance these overarching objectives. While this arrangement requires that departments assume a high level of administrative and fiscal accountability, it also fosters an environment of creativity and responsiveness across the institution. In this vein, the SOE is undertaking a comprehensive review of its governance structure, academic policies, faculty loads and responsibilities, and administrative procedures to determine whether revisions are needed following its establishment in 2007 as an independent school of education. The goal of this process is to ensure that the SOE remains responsive to the needs of its candidates and K-12 partners while also setting a solid foundation for continued growth and development.

Responsibility for overall administration of the SOE is vested in the dean, who reports directly to the provost. The dean provides strategic leadership for academic, partnership and development programs and serves as the school’s chief representative to the Johns Hopkins University Board of Trustees, the Maryland State Department of Education, and local and national education associations. The dean is supported in SOE administration by four academic department chairs, three center directors, five
associate deans and four assistant deans. In addition, the PSA provides support for the unit’s admissions, enrollment management, facilities and administrative technology activities.

Three standing committees, composed of faculty and senior academic leaders from across the unit, oversee and coordinate policies and procedures pertaining to programs, faculty and candidates (Appendix 22.1.13). The Academic Policy Committee (APC), which is chaired by a faculty member, is responsible for the review and approval of all academic programs and for the development and modification of academic policies and procedures. The Faculty Promotions Committee (FPC), which is chaired by a senior faculty member, reviews and approves the initial appointment of all faculty members beyond the rank of assistant professor and the promotion of all faculty members through the academic ranks. Policy recommendations from the APC and the FPC are forwarded through the dean to the Academic Council, which provides overall governance of school academic affairs. The Academic Council, which is chaired by the provost of Johns Hopkins University and includes the SOE’s academic and administrative leadership, meets four times each academic year to review and take action on the recommendations forwarded by the APC and the FPC.

The SOE also maintains seven standing committees charged with providing leadership in the areas of accreditation and assessment, faculty professional development, international programs, field and clinical experiences, faculty scholarship, diversity and civility, and the doctoral program. In addition, academic departments and SOE committees maintain a regular schedule of meetings to plan, implement and evaluate programs and partnership initiatives and to report on their activities at bimonthly, schoolwide faculty meetings. The dean, in turn, holds regular meetings with department chairs, center directors and the Dean’s Leadership Group to discuss university-wide initiatives, policy and program proposals, budgets and unitwide development efforts. Policies and procedures that govern SOE programs, faculty and candidates are detailed in the following documents: (a) the Academic Policy Manual, (b) the Academic Catalog, (c) the School of Education Faculty Loads and Responsibilities Handbook and (d) department-level and program-level handbooks.

Expanding the scope of collaborative, well-informed planning, the SOE has a long history of partnerships with local, regional and national education entities. These partnerships help inform program design, implementation and evaluation, as do the SOE’s faculty associates, who are experienced K-12 practitioners. Finally, the SOE has a number of advisory boards consisting of experienced educators and business leaders who assist in designing programs that address the needs of K-12 schools as well as specialized boards for various programs and centers.

Recognizing the critical role assessment plays in effective planning and budgeting processes, the SOE has invested considerable resources in the development of its UAS. In addition to establishing the OTLA (staffed by an assistant dean, a research coordinator, an instructional designer and a technical specialist), it invested nearly $150,000 in the Data Aggregation and Reporting Tool (DART) as part of the UAS. The SOE is committed to contributing $2 million to the HopkinsOne project in payments that started in FY 2007 and $1.5 million to the ISIS project in payments that started in FY 2006.

To realize the plans crafted through its coordinated, multitiered and responsive assessment process, the SOE relies on data-driven budgeting and resource allocation systems. Recent additions in this area include the opening of the Johns Hopkins University Education Building, the creation of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education and the incorporation of two research and development centers—the Center for Research and Reform in Education and the Center for Summer Learning—under the SOE’s administrative offices.
Chapter 5 – School of Education

School of Education Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview

In October 2008, following the April review, the SOE received recognition of its NCATE accreditation status that all required standards had been met (Appendix 22.2.1). A significant element of the NCATE review is evaluation of individual programs through their Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), conducted by a national team of peers with discipline-specific expertise. To meet SPA standards, each program must integrate six to eight comprehensive assessments within and across courses to gauge student achievement of learning outcomes. Program faculty are expected to engage in ongoing analysis of these data as a part of continuous program improvement processes. The 2008 SPA review experience stimulated a more intentional culture of collaboration and exchange around student learning outcomes and outcomes assessment in the SOE.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

As specified under MSCHE Standard 1 (Mission and Goals), clearly articulated written statements of key goals form the basis of all planning and budgeting processes. Through teaching, research, program development, leadership and service, and partnership programs, the SOE endeavors to support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth and adults. Fulfilling this commitment and furthering the SOE’s overall mission require ongoing, formative efforts to evaluate and refine its programs, operations and performance. To this end, the SOE is engaged in adjusting its Unit Assessment System (UAS) to the myriad environmental factors (e.g., refinements in assessment instruments, adoption of new technologies, personnel changes, organizational restructuring) that impact the assessment process.

The Accreditation Committee—composed of department chairs, selected faculty members, Center for Technology in Education (CTE) staff who support UAS use, the dean and the assistant dean for teaching, learning and assessment—drives SOE assessment policy and guidelines for academic programs. This committee is playing a key role in implementing the new cycle and process for data analysis and review at three points in each academic year, and it engages departments in individual and collective discussion and problem solving related to emerging academic challenges and areas in need of improvement. Further, the committee continues to refine the SOE’s system for evaluating its effectiveness in meeting goals set forth in its mission statement and conceptual framework, as well as professional, accreditation, state and national standards.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

The SOE’s comprehensive, integrated methods of assessing student learning outcomes span a range of direct and indirect—as well as quantitative and qualitative—measures. At the level of degree candidates, all core assessments in the SOE’s initial and advanced programs are aligned with its conceptual framework as well as state standards, SPA standards and national professional standards (Appendix 22.2.2). Moreover, these assessments employ standardized rubrics that explicitly outline state and SPA standards to be measured; the rubrics are housed in the academic departments and are also maintained electronically (Appendix 22.2.3). As with program- and unit-level assessment reports, those at the candidate level include an “alignment key” that identifies the specific state standards,
SPA standards and conceptual framework elements identified in the assessment. End-users can use the alignment key to aggregate and disaggregate data across programs, cohorts, semesters and academic years or by standard or sub-standard. All initial and advanced programs also include midpoint assessments, internship/clinical practice assessments and a capstone project—in addition to sharing common admissions criteria and GPA requirements for candidate continuation.

NCATE requires education programs to collect data on candidates and program/unit operations at multiple “decision points” and to employ multiple modes of assessment at these points for candidate, program and unit evaluation. All degree and certification programs in the unit meet this requirement. In addition to sharing common admissions criteria and GPA requirements for continuation in the program, all degree and certification programs include midpoint assessments, internship/clinical practice assessments and a capstone portfolio project. See Appendix 22.2.4 for an assessment plan for initial certification programs, and Appendix 22.2.5 for an assessment plan for advanced programs.

Appendix 22.2.6 provides an example of the student learning outcomes assessments for the school’s Teacher Development and Leadership program. As with other SOE programs, course-embedded and internship/clinical assessments unique to the Teacher Development and Leadership program are aligned with the conceptual framework as well as relevant state and national standards (on the front-end and in unit data-collection and reporting systems). The SOE’s comprehensive, integrated set of evaluation methods for monitoring candidate and program performance, and managing and improving unit operations, includes internal and external measures housed in two databases:

- **JHU School of Education Data Warehouse**: A centralized Web-based system that houses admissions data, demographic data, enrollment data and candidate GPAs.
- **JHU Center for Technology in Education (CTE) Data-Collection and Reporting Tool (DART)**: A centralized Web-based system that houses rubrics for common assignments, scoring sheets, candidate data from course-embedded assessments and portfolio data from candidate capstone experiences. Each assessment housed in DART is aligned with appropriate state and national standards—including SPA standards (e.g., ACEI, CEC, IRA, ISTE, NCSS) and indicators, INTASC standards and the elements of the school’s conceptual framework.

The Data Warehouse and DART have a 1:1 feed of student data, and the querying functions of each system allow faculty and staff to aggregate and disaggregate candidate data using multiple search variables (e.g., Cohort Name/Date, Course Number, Academic Year/Semester, Assignment Type/Name), including queries around specific SPA standards and indicators. The Data Warehouse and DART also include reporting tools that allow faculty and staff to export candidate- and program-specific data to a broad range of analytical systems (e.g., data-mining programs, Excel, SPSS) for use in meetings, forums, curriculum reviews and other program-improvement settings (Appendix 22.2.7 and 22.2.8).

Following the 2008 NCATE review, the Accreditation Committee established a Unit Assessment System task force to evaluate new software and data modeling options that could strengthen the SOE’s data collection and analysis across academic programs. The task force was charged with identifying a solution that would bring all data elements into one system and provide a dashboard to allow school administrators and faculty members to query the system as needed (rather than relying on the OTLA to produce reports at scheduled intervals during the academic year) (Appendix 22.2.9). In November
2008, the task force made a recommendation to the Accreditation Committee for phased implementation of an improved system requiring the purchase of two new data management applications, Digital Measures and Chalk and Wire Reporter (Appendix 22.2.10). The recommendation was approved schoolwide, and the task force is currently engaged in planning for a spring semester (2009) implementation of the first phase of this UAS enhancement. As part of the planning process, the task force will engage in a series of meetings with each academic department to ensure that unique data needs will be addressed in the configuration of the new system. Further, the Accreditation Committee has determined that the task force will become a standing subgroup of the larger committee to ensure that ongoing communication and coordinated problem solving are maintained among academic units, SOE leadership, instructional technology specialists and IT staff.

Building on the phased UAS enhancements described above and coordinating with the institution-wide model for report dissemination described in the Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness segment, the SOE is strengthening its process for ensuring that current, accurate and comprehensive student learning outcomes data drive program improvement. Through efforts coordinated by the Accreditation Committee (soon to be renamed to focus on program improvement), academic departments and program teams will address the following questions at three end-of-semester data review cycles during the year:

- Are students achieving the learning outcomes identified for each program? How do we know?
- Are assessment measures providing the information and data needed to make this determination?
- To the extent that students are not achieving identified learning outcomes, what program improvements are necessary?

In addition to individual program improvement activities, emerging issues that have unit-level impact or resonance will be discussed in committee forums and department chair meetings with the dean.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

As described previously in this report, the SOE has a system in place for ongoing planning, budgeting and resource allocation based on its mission and conceptual framework. Additionally, the enhanced UAS will link learning outcomes and administrative data sets with a single dashboard in future enhancement phases to support ad hoc as well as scheduled reporting at varied levels appropriate to the range of users and stakeholders accessing the system.

Findings from the end-of-semester program reviews are incorporated into decision-making discussions and strategic planning at multiple levels through SOE committees and councils, including program and department meetings, academic policy and academic affairs meetings, school leadership meetings (e.g., the Dean’s Leadership Council), IT and student services meetings, annual budget meetings and university-driven strategic planning sessions. Implementation of the UAS enhancements will allow for on-the-spot querying and reporting to support data-driven decision making.

Results and evidence are disseminated through the SOE’s standing committees, as described earlier. Additionally, faculty members and instructors review assessment findings and results of course evaluations individually with department chairs to reflect on individual effectiveness, as well as in
program teams at least annually. The enhanced UAS will allow for more timely access to standard and ad hoc reports to support more frequent engagement in such discussions.

The SOE’s investment in student learning outcomes assessment is evidenced by its support for the UAS task force and its commitment to implementing task force recommendations—including the upcoming UAS enhancement. OTLA staffing is another indicator of resource allocation to support assessment.

The SOE is committed to confidentiality of student learning outcomes data. Previously, OTLA staff managed much of the data input and reporting related to academic assessments and program review. In the future, the enhanced UAS will include levels of access appropriate to individual users granted rights to enter the system directly. Assessment results will continue to be used for the primary purpose of improving programs and student learning.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**

Appendix 22.1.1  SOE Overview and Organizational Chart
Appendix 22.1.2  SOE Degrees
Appendix 22.1.3  SOE Partnerships
Appendix 22.1.4  SOE Strategic Vision and Current SWOT Analysis
Appendix 22.1.5  Conceptual Framework
Appendix 22.1.6  Unit Assessment System
Appendix 22.1.7  Unit Assessment Summary
Appendix 22.1.8  Summary of Unit Level Decision Points
Appendix 22.1.9  Illustration of Collaborative Improvement Process
Appendix 22.1.10  Recommendations from Collaborative Improvement Process
Appendix 22.1.11  Predefined Reports for Reporting Cycle
Appendix 22.1.12  Summary of Program Level Data-Driven Changes
Appendix 22.1.13  Description of Unit Standing Committees
Appendix 22.2.1  NCATE 2008 Report
Appendix 22.2.2  Standards and Conceptual Framework Alignment
Appendix 22.2.3  Sample Rubrics for Portfolio Assessment
Appendix 22.2.4  Assessment Plan for Initial Programs
Appendix 22.2.5  Assessment Plan for Advanced Programs
Appendix 22.2.6  Example of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment for Teacher Preparation
Appendix 22.2.7  Sample Data Warehouse Ad Hoc Queries
Appendix 22.2.8  Sample Teacher Lesson Plan Assessment and DART Reports
Appendix 22.2.9  New Unit Assessment System Diagram
Appendix 22.2.10  UAS Task Force Recommendation
Whiting School of Engineering
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Whiting School of Engineering is organized into nine academic departments, 14 research centers/institutes, two teaching centers and a part-time graduate program.

Our undergraduate program includes majors from all of our academic departments in addition to a general engineering degree. Our departments offer undergraduates the option to minor in their discipline, and we have transdisciplinary minors in areas such as robotics and entrepreneurship and management.

Our departments offer full-time master’s programs and doctoral programs in their disciplines. In addition, we offer various full-time, professionally oriented master’s programs in information security, financial mathematics, engineering management (new this year) and biomedical innovation and design (new this year).

We offer a wide array of part-time master’s degrees and advanced certificates through our part-time Engineering for Professionals (EP).

The full-time programs are staffed by 118 full-time faculty (including nine members of the National Academy of Engineering), plus an additional 50 research faculty/scientists/engineers. There are approximately 1,400 undergraduate and 700 graduate students enrolled in full-time study. Our part-time graduate program has some 450 faculty teaching 2,000 students. External research support is nearly $50 million per year.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Whiting School of Engineering’s mission (Appendix 23.17) is a focused version of the mission of the university. We use our strategic plan (Appendix 23.1) as a yardstick against which we measure our progress. In addition, we assess our units through self-studies (Appendix 23.7) and reviews by the Homewood Academic Council, a governing body shared with our colleagues in the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences.

There is a tight alignment between the missions of The Johns Hopkins University (JHU) and the Whiting School of Engineering (WSE). The tripartite JHU mission is “[a] to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for life-long learning, [b] to foster independent and original research, and [c] to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.” These three themes are echoed and focused in the WSE mission statement which asserts that we will provide:

- knowledge for the world through innovative research that leads to improved quality of life and enhances the safety and security of future generations (corresponding to JHU mission item [b] and [c]),
- an education, grounded in fundamental scientific principles, that prepares students to solve the complex, technology-based problems of the 21st century (corresponding to JHU mission item [a]) and
• the world’s next generation of engineering leaders through creative curricula and programs that instill ethical values, an appreciation for the importance of diversity, an entrepreneurial spirit and a love of learning (corresponding to [a] and [c]).

The details of how we will accomplish this mission are specified in the WSE strategic plan (Appendix 23.1).

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

As shown in Figure 6, the WSE goals are defined by means of our mission statement (Appendix 23.8) and our strategic plan (Appendix 23.1). These goals are implemented through our department and centers. Success in our endeavors is assessed by the Homewood Academic Council, our Engineering National Advisory Council and through the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). Feedback from these bodies is used to reflect on our activities in meetings of the faculty at both the department level and school level (e.g., by the Dean’s Office and at faculty retreats) in order to refine our mission and improve the implementation of our goals.

![Figure 6](image)

The most recent WSE strategic plan (Appendix 23.1) was developed in 2006 and serves as a template for monitoring our progress. The plan gives specific, ambitious, measurable goals in the following broad areas: (1) Collaboration and Innovation, (2) Bioengineering, (3) Education for Leadership and (4) Strategic Partnerships.

The strategic plan is a guideline and a metric by which we monitor our overall progress. We recently reviewed this plan point by point to produce a strategic plan analysis of progress (Appendix 23.2), in which we discuss the level of accomplishment for the various goals we set for ourselves. This analysis was presented to the WSE National Advisory Council at its fall 2008 meeting (Appendix 23.3). Furthermore, aspects of the strategic plan were reviewed at a schoolwide faculty retreat in October 2008 (Appendix 23.4).
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For example, one of the goals in our plan is to aggressively build WSE pre-eminence in five areas that span traditional disciplines outside of bioengineering (Appendix 23.1). To that end we have built in three areas: a new Center for Excellence in Human Language Technology, a new Institute for Data Intensive Engineering and Science and a new Systems Engineering Institute. In the arena of education, our plan calls for the creation of a comprehensive suite of contemporary master’s degrees (Appendix 23.1). To that end, we have launched a new master’s program in financial mathematics, and are poised to launch new master’s programs in bioengineering innovation and design as well as in engineering management.

In addition to school-level outcome assessment, our nine departments, various research centers and part-time master’s program, Engineering for Professionals (EP), are also regularly assessed.

Departments and other educational units are thoroughly reviewed by our Academic Council every five years. These reviews include self-studies by the departments (Appendix 23.7) and extensive interviews by a subcommittee of the Academic Council, oral testimony by the department chair to the full Academic Council (at which the president of the university participates) and reports to the dean of Engineering.

Our Engineering for Professionals—which serves professionals in the region with an extensive menu of master’s and certificate programs—has its own strategic plan (Appendix 23.5). Progress toward fulfilling the EP strategic plan is regularly monitored by the EP Advisory Council, the associate dean for EP and the dean of Engineering (Appendix 23.6).

Our research centers are reviewed by the office of our vice dean for research a few years after they are established. They are also subjected to periodic external reviews by the agencies that fund them (Appendix 23.8).

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

Funding for major initiatives is allocated by the dean of Engineering in consonance with our strategic plan. For example, bioengineering is a key component in our strategic plan. Therefore, in the past few years, aggressive funding has been provided to establish our Center for NanoBioTechnology and our Center for Bio-Innovation and Design.

Operating funds for departments and centers are directly wired to measurable outcomes. Department funding is largely determined by research and teaching metrics (indirect cost generation, classroom contact hours, graduation rates, etc.). However, some flexibility in the budgeting process is maintained to allow resources to be routed to new ventures (such as our recent faculty hiring needed to start our financial mathematics program). This flexible portion of unit budgeting enables the dean to promote strategically those programs that foster the mission of the school.
Figure 7 depicts the major interactions in our Institutional Effectiveness processes.

1. The mission of the Johns Hopkins University is echoed and refined in the WSE mission (Appendix 23.17).

2. The WSE mission provides the overarching principles that underlie the WSE strategic plan (Appendix 23.01).

3. The strategic plan is a guiding document for the dean in setting priorities. It is also reviewed and updated by the dean.

4. The dean reports to the National Advisory Council (NAC) on the state of the school and steps in implementing the strategic plan (Appendix 23.03). The NAC provides feedback to the dean.

5. The National Advisory Council provides input to the strategic plan and assists the dean in implementing the strategic plan.

6. The Academic Council reviews departments (Appendix 23.07) and reports findings to the dean.

7. The dean allocates resources to departments, including operating budgets, faculty salaries and space. Department chairs together with the dean form the core policy body for the school.
8. Academic Council reviews departments.
9. Academic Council reviews faculty for promotion and tenure. The members of the Academic Council are drawn from the faculty (and the faculty of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences).
10. The faculty is organized into department and centers.
11. Centers are reviewed by the Dean’s Office (and by external sponsors).
12. Faculty gives input into the development of the strategic plan.
13. The officers of the university are guided by the university’s mission statement.
14. The dean of Engineering reports to and is accountable to the university’s central administration.
15. The provost chairs the Academic Council. The president participates in departmental reviews.
16. The dean of Engineering works on a strategic level with leaders of other divisions to create joint research and educational opportunities.
17. Faculty interacts regularly with colleagues from other divisions on joint research and educational ventures.

Whiting School of Engineering
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview
The Johns Hopkins University and Whiting School of Engineering missions of providing knowledge for the world are realized, in part, by a wide array of educational programs: full-time bachelor’s/master’s, concurrent bachelor’s/master’s and doctoral, plus part-time master’s and certificate programs. We ensure excellent student learning through rigorous ABET accreditation procedures (at the undergraduate level) and data-governed oversight at the graduate level.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy
Please see Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy in the Whiting School’s Effectiveness Assessment Plan, p. 70.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes
The Whiting School of Engineering (WSE) fields a broad array of educational programs, each with its own custom-tailored assessment procedures. These programs can be categorized into three broad areas: undergraduate, master’s and doctoral education.

Undergraduate Education: Most of our undergraduate programs are accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). These programs have a tightly coupled process in which courses, laboratory and capstone experiences are tied to highly specific student educational objectives and learning outcomes that we measure directly (e.g., through course assessments) and indirectly (e.g., through alumni surveys, course evaluations). In all cases, the extensive data collected
is reviewed annually by department faculty and advisory committees; these data are used to make frequent adjustments—or in some cases, large-scale redesign—to courses and curricula (Appendix 23.9). Indeed, some departments link individual examination items to specific learning outcomes to monitor those outcomes separately from others.

Only one department (Applied Mathematics and Statistics) does not have an ABET-accredited program (ABET has no accreditation program in this area). Nevertheless, many applied mathematics courses are closely integrated into the other departments’ curricula; consequently, the same data-driven evaluation of courses and the degree program takes place in that department.

In addition to the scrutiny from ABET, all departments’ programs are periodically reviewed by the Academic Council (as described in Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes, p. 60).

New programs (majors and minors) and significant changes to those programs are overseen by the WSE Curriculum Committee. New programs are subsequently reviewed by the Homewood Academic Council and the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC).

Undergraduate student advising\(^1\) is a key component to a successful college experience. We monitor the quality of this component through student surveys (Appendix 23.18). This data served as input to discussions of the quality of student advising at our recent WSE retreat (Appendix 23.4) that led to discussions on how to improve advising (e.g., through better faculty training and the creation of a faculty handbook, now in development).

**Master’s Education:** The Whiting School offers a broad array of master’s degree programs for a wide range of students. The student body includes full-time terminal master’s students, part-time terminal master’s students, concurrent bachelor’s-master’s students and doctoral students who earn a master’s degree en route to their PhD.

The master’s programs are designed to build on a student’s undergraduate preparation by providing greater depth and breadth. Our master’s programs can be divided into two broad categories:

- Some master’s programs emphasize advanced work in specific disciplines; all of these include a track that culminates in a research project that is evaluated by the faculty while others can be completed entirely through course work. Master’s programs in this category are typically titled with the name of the department that runs the program.
- Other master’s programs combine advanced study in a discipline with practical, career-advancing objectives. These include most of EP’s master’s degrees as well as our master’s programs in security informatics, financial mathematics, engineering management, and bioengineering innovation and design.

\(^1\) All undergraduate students are assigned to WSE faculty advisors with appointments in the department in which the student is majoring.
Thus, master’s education is primarily course-based with (in some cases) a capstone and/or research component added. Course selection is critical; it is assessed by the student’s faculty advisor, the student’s department (see sample master’s program form in Appendix 23.11) and the WSE Graduate Committee that certifies the master’s degrees.

The majority of our terminal master’s degree candidates attend our Engineering for Professionals (EP) program as part-time students. Most of the courses in this program have explicit learning objectives, and assessments in those courses are designed to measure those objectives directly. In addition, EP conducts a fall survey to assess the quality of student services and instruction, class questionnaires for each course and a graduation survey to assess the achievement of program (as opposed to course) objectives (Appendix 23.14 and 23.15).

The WSE strategic plan calls for greater participation by undergraduates in five-year concurrent programs. To this end, our new suite of master’s degrees (such as financial math and engineering management) will create additional opportunities for this enhanced education.

New master’s programs and modifications to existing programs are reviewed by the WSE Graduate Committee, the Homewood Academic Council and ultimately by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC).

**Doctoral Education:** The central goal of doctoral education is the creation of new knowledge through original research under the supervision of a faculty mentor.

Various requirements in our doctoral program exist to ensure students’ preparedness for their research program. These include introductory and advanced course work, qualifying examinations, thesis proposal examinations and other supporting requirements (such as proficiency in computing and communication).

Doctoral students are mentored by a faculty supervisor. In addition, many departments assign a committee (consisting of a few faculty members) to each doctoral student to monitor that student’s progress. In all cases, student progress is reviewed by the department faculty every semester.

Johns Hopkins University does not have a separate graduate school. Each school and department oversees its own graduate programs. Quality of the doctoral program is ensured by oversight of the university’s Graduate Board that reports to the Homewood Academic Council. The Graduate Board oversees various administrative aspects of doctoral education (e.g., approval of leave-of-absence status). More significantly, it mandates and manages the administration of the Graduate Board Oral (GBO) examination. This examination is administered by five faculty members, including examiners from outside the student’s home department. In most cases, the GBO exam is linked to a student’s thesis proposal and functions to ensure that students are ready for the research program upon which they plan to embark.

The doctoral dissertation is the culmination of the student’s research efforts. The dissertation is read closely by two faculty members (usually one is the research mentor) who must attest that the work is of high quality, originality and suitability for scholarly publication. The thesis is then defended at a public oral examination.

---

2 One department uses the GBO exam as its thesis defense.
The quality and effectiveness of our doctoral education are assessed through various direct and indirect means. The direct measures include review of fundamental and advanced course work, qualifying examinations, GBO exams, and thesis review and defense. Indirect measures include results from a graduate student survey (Appendix 23.16) and data collected for the recent NRC ranking.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

This subject is also discussed in the Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation section of the Whiting School’s Effectiveness Assessment Plan, page 69. The dean of Engineering provides startup funds for new ventures based on the priorities delineated in the strategic plan. Operating budgets are directly wired to measurable education metrics (enrollments, number of doctorates awarded, etc.).

Academic activities (courses, laboratories, degree programs, etc.) are reviewed continuously in all departments based on direct and indirect measures of student achievement. Significant modifications to academic programs are reviewed by units external to the department sponsoring the course/degree.

**Undergraduate.** Figure 8 depicts the process for ensuring student learning outcomes at the undergraduate level.

![Figure 8](image_url)

The department faculty collects data from direct assessment of learning objectives, surveys of current students, surveys of alumni and course evaluations. This data is used in the adjustment and/or redesign of courses and curricula. This process is closely reviewed by ABET, and key portions are reported to and examined by the Academic Council. External stakeholders, such as departmental advisory boards, review programs and suggest improvements.
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*Graduate:* Figure 9 depicts the process by which we ensure learning objectives in doctoral education.

![Figure 9](image)

Course work provides the advanced foundation needed to prepare students for research that is ultimately presented in the students’ doctoral dissertations. Students’ foundational knowledge is assessed through course assignments (homework, papers, exams) and qualifying exams. Research progress is assessed by faculty research advisors and by dissertation supervisory committees. Every doctoral student is assessed by a Graduate Board Oral exam organized by the JHU Graduate Board; the Graduate Board has ultimate responsibility for ensuring the quality of doctoral education; it reports to the Academic Council. Students are surveyed to ensure that overall programmatic objectives are met. In addition, the Academic Council reviews all departments, and the National Research Council reviews doctoral programs.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**

- Appendix 23.1 The Whiting School of Engineering Strategic Plan
- Appendix 23.2 Strategic Plan Analysis of Progress
- Appendix 23.3 Review of Strategic Plan by the WSE National Advisory Council
- Appendix 23.4 Notes from Our Most Recent Faculty Retreat
- Appendix 23.5 Engineering for Professionals Strategic Plan
- Appendix 23.6 List of EP Strategic Plan Accomplishments
- Appendix 23.7 WSE Department Self-Study Example: Biomedical Engineering
- Appendix 23.8 WSE Center Reviews Example: Center for Computer Integrated Surgery
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 23.9</th>
<th>ABET Report Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.10</td>
<td>Alumni Survey Reports Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.11</td>
<td>Sample Master’s Program Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.12</td>
<td>Freshman Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.13</td>
<td>Course Evaluation Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.14</td>
<td>Engineering for Professionals – 2007 Student Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.15</td>
<td>Engineering for Professionals – Student Questionnaire report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.16</td>
<td>Graduate Survey Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.17</td>
<td>Engineering School Mission Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 23.18</td>
<td>Advising Survey Results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nitze School of Advanced International Studies
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) is a prominent and respected graduate school of international affairs, with campuses in Washington, D.C., Bologna, Italy, and Nanjing, China. SAIS is devoted to preparing a diverse student population for positions of responsibility in the increasingly interdependent global community. The foundation of the curriculum focuses on international issues of functional and regional importance, with an emphasis on economics and foreign languages. SAIS offers a one-year master’s degree, a one-year midcareer master’s degree, a PhD degree, a two-year diploma and nondegree certificates (Appendix 24.1.1 and 24.1.2).

SAIS has a number of governing bodies that establish and support institutional goals and priorities. Among these is the Academic Board, which serves as a critical source of review and advice for the dean in setting an overall course for the future of SAIS’s three campuses, which will ensure the strength and advancement of the school (Appendix 24.1.3: and 24.1.4).

In 2006, the SAIS Advisory Council and leadership defined a 10-year strategic plan that encompassed the missions of both the school and the university. This project was conceived as a means to define institutional goals and develop an operational plan to achieve these goals. Concurrently, the senior leadership developed a Business Excellence Campaign (BEC) that addressed the modernization of SAIS facilities, the development of IT resources and the establishment of a more cohesive and standardized approach to administrative functions. As they shared the same desired outcome of supporting student learning by improving institutional effectiveness, the two initiatives were combined and are now jointly known as Rolling Back the Future (RBTF) (Appendix 24.2.1 and Appendix 24.2.2).

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

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

SAIS’s mission is to provide an interdisciplinary professional education that prepares a diverse graduate student body for internationally related positions of responsibility; to foster research, scholarship and cross-cultural exchange; and to contribute knowledge, expertise and leadership to the global community.

There is a direct link between the university’s mission as a whole and SAIS’s mission. Both focus on developing the skills and knowledge to be able to contribute to a larger community. They affirm that learning is an ongoing process through gaining comprehension and experience that lead to innovative discoveries.
In order to achieve its mission, SAIS must be able to attract, retain and support the best and brightest students and to provide these students with the best possible professional education and practical experiences. To do this, we must serve our students in the following key areas:

1. Admissions and Career Services
2. Financial Aid
3. Infrastructure and Technology
4. Enhancing the SAIS Experience

SAIS’s assessment policy for institutional effectiveness builds upon RBTF with its focused purpose and comprehensive nature. The RBTF model employs the following methodology described in Figure 10.

![Figure 10](image)

To ensure cohesiveness, SAIS utilizes a centrally guided approach to data collection and assessment. This approach facilitates the sharing of information and enables equitable definitions of resource requirements, timelines, individual and departmental roles and responsibilities, and intermediate steps. Reporting will be an ongoing process, both planned and informal, with information available in oral and written forms according to the needs of the audience.
Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

Committees were formed to focus on and perform comprehensive assessments of each of the aforementioned functional areas as part of an internal review. Stages of this process were shared with SAIS students, faculty and staff who provided input and suggestions. This exercise resulted in the identification of nine goals that are strategic imperatives for SAIS:

1. Select a superlative student body with diversity in academic and career interests, as well as national origin and ethnicity.
2. Launch and support careers of leadership in international relations.
3. Secure resources to attract and retain the best talent.
4. Develop a systematic approach to awarding financial aid in order to respond to need, recognize merit and enhance diversity.
5. Pursue innovative financing options for student aid, including loan forgiveness for graduates with a sustained commitment to nonprofit or public service and buffer funds for students whose education outside their home country is affected by exchange rate volatility.
6. Build infrastructure (facilities, people, processes) that reflects SAIS’s standing and allows the school to fulfill its ambition.
7. Use technology as a tool to uncover, connect and support physical and human assets.
8. Enhance the total SAIS experience to add value, continuity and intensity within and beyond the classroom from pre-term through graduation.
9. Increase substantive engagement of, and service to, alumni.

Each goal has been broken down into more defined objectives. These objectives have each been assigned specific and measurable tasks that serve as steppingstones and provide means to monitor both short-term and long-term progress toward completion of the goal. The tasks, including the implementation of additional instruments of assessment, have been allocated to individuals and have projected timelines for completion (Appendix 24.2.2).

SAIS currently employs many assessment tools that have led to important initiatives in recent years. Examples of direct assessments include benchmarking exercises, space assessments, curriculum reviews and performance appraisals. Indirect school effectiveness measures include course evaluations, exit interviews and satisfaction surveys administered to the students, faculty, staff and alumni (Appendix 24.2.3, 24.2.4, 24.2.5, 24.2.6 and 24.2.7).

The RBTF project has afforded SAIS the opportunity to focus on and prioritize the institutional goals for the school. As articulated in the school’s mission statement, SAIS focuses on offering students a practical and international education, which occurs both in and out of the classroom. For this reason, assessing such areas as diversity, academic programming, career services, technology and infrastructure is among the school’s top priorities. Success in these areas underlies our ability to function efficiently as an institution and to afford our students the necessary skills and competencies to achieve their desired goals.

To see SAIS through the student perspective, the Student Government Association surveys the student body on a semiannual basis to get feedback on academics, resources and services.
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(Appendix 24.2.8). The administration reviews and makes recommendations for changes in resources, technology, infrastructure and academics based on the results of the survey. Through the Office of Academic Affairs, assessments are conducted to review student enrollment patterns, population trends, budget factors, student services and academic success (Appendix 24.2.9, 24.2.10 and 24.2.20). Additionally, evaluations are administered for every course taught at SAIS. The evaluation process involves the collection, analysis and dissemination of data regarding student experiences, instructional evaluation and content evaluation (Appendix 24.2.12).

In addition, the RBTF plan has generated many other assessment activities at SAIS. A facilities study was commissioned to assess the current use of space at the school (Appendix 24.2.13). This study is part of the review of SAIS’s infrastructure (facilities, people and processes). Concurrently, Career Services conducted an extensive internal review and benchmarking exercise to determine ways in which it could better serve students in launching careers in international relations. In addition, through surveys, interviews and benchmarking analyses, SAIS has reviewed the success of current software solutions and learning technology.

The RBTF plan of action for the next year includes surveying and creating a template for strong academic program models to ensure efficient allocation of resources, exploring and implementing academic technologies, standardizing and further integrating the three SAIS campuses and developing a staff guidebook of policies and procedures (Appendix 24.2.18 and 24.2.17). To aid in attracting the best and brightest students, the school plans to pilot a program for a SAIS Revolving Loan Fund and increase funding to support student internships and career-related tracks. A faculty diversity survey is being created in order to have a better understanding of the teaching culture at the school. Career Services plans to expand counseling opportunities for alumni and international students. The office has also added a requirement that admitted applicants complete an online assessment of their professional goals and competencies as a prerequisite for entering required career courses, and it has created a survey for assessing student interest in various types of employment (Appendix 24.2.19).

In order to ensure successful and efficient transitions in all areas at SAIS, developing better reporting capabilities has been made a priority.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

The facilities study and the review of business processes have led to the strategic implementation of “smart classrooms.” Training and maintenance models for classroom equipment have been developed and are in the initial stages of implementation. In addition, the following actions have been taken (Appendix 24.2.4):

- Inventoried technology, furnishings and capabilities in all classrooms and auditoriums and made necessary functional improvements
- Surveyed faculty, students and staff regarding infrastructure needs
- Redesigned budget and resource management process
- Hired an HR manager and began professionalization effort
- Began process of improvement efforts in financial aid, admissions, HR and financial management areas
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The following developments were a direct result of Career Services’ internal review (Appendix 24.2.16):

- Implemented a new academic week calendar earmarking Fridays as a day reserved for “Professional Development” activities
- Developed a new six-week Career Readiness course for all first-year students
- Created a new mentoring program for international students and offered workshops co-led by Career Services staff and international student advisors
- Developed SAIS 200 global marketing strategy to build strong internal alumni teams within top employers of SAIS students

The review of technology and software utilization at SAIS has produced the following results (Appendix 24.2.21):

- Hired a CIO and an instructional designer
- Installed wireless networks on all campuses
- Migrated to MS Exchange
- Redesigned and launched a new schoolwide Web site and migrated to a new content management system
- Piloted SharePoint implementation
- Established an operational technology group for better coordination of IT issues

To remain competitive, SAIS is taking actions to enhance its current technological capabilities in the areas of teaching, learning and administrative procedures (Appendix 24.2.17). SAIS adopted software solutions to both complement and utilize the advances in its infrastructure and broaden the learning experience. These solutions include online course management systems, online evaluations, anti-plagiarism software and electronic examinations (Appendix: 24.2.15).

After reviewing findings and results, SAIS allocated money to hire new staff in technology as well as to expand the infrastructure and the technological and human resources (Appendix: 24.2.22). The development office has played a major role in the RBTF plan, prioritizing its fund-raising efforts to help support these two positions, in addition to supporting the other goals of the RBTF.

The RBTF project has helped to define short-, medium- and long-term strategic courses of action for SAIS to adhere to in the pursuit of excellence. Through the refinement of subgoals and proposed actions, RBTF clarifies the purpose, priorities, role and scope of all administrative units, while engaging and empowering them to enhance the student experience and promote efficient and effective learning. As it is a central effort, resources are allocated to the achievement of the various goals in an efficient and equitable manner.

Through the RBTF project, the school plans to use institutional effectiveness assessment results to change and enhance existing programs and to develop new programs and resources to support the mission of the school. Assessment reports will be evaluated over multiple years in order to confirm that progress has been made. The results from the findings will, with the support of the faculty, staff, students and alumni, be used to create new committees, initiatives and/or projects to strengthen the effectiveness and efficiency of the school.
Nitze School of Advanced International Studies
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview
The SAIS Rolling Back the Future (RBTF) strategic initiative not only outlines a plan for institutional effectiveness, it supports student learning outcomes. In addition various school-wide committees, academic programs, administrative units and student groups have procedures to effectively and systematically assess student learning outcomes on an ongoing basis. Because many of these operational groups have been working independently, the academic dean has recently begun centralizing all the goals, data and assessments from each group and is creating a single operational plan for student assessment and outcomes that will be reviewed and updated routinely.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy
The Johns Hopkins University’s mission is to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery into the world. SAIS’s mission is to provide a professional education through a practical approach to research, scholarship, and cross-cultural interaction and exchange with the purpose of empowering our students to contribute knowledge, expertise and leadership to the world. There is a direct linkage between the university’s mission as a whole and SAIS’s mission. Both focus on developing the skills and knowledge to be able to contribute to a larger community. They affirm that learning is an ongoing process through gaining comprehension and experience that lead to innovative discoveries.

As a top-ranked graduate school in international relations, SAIS has set the standard for international affairs education over the past six decades, yet the school must continue to evolve if it is to remain at the forefront of preparing tomorrow's global leadership. The RBTF plan (Appendix 24.2.2) ensures that SAIS will be the pre-eminent graduate school in international relations, training future world leaders through an interdisciplinary and practical approach for careers in public and private service. The initial plan works back from 2015 to the present and identifies new directions and enhancements to assess and support the mission, goals and objectives of the institution and prepares a solid road map for this vision. In addition, the RBTF combined with the related student learning outcome committees is merging into a larger student outcomes assessment plan.

The student learning outcomes assessment plan includes both qualitative and quantitative data from the school as a whole and its parts. It focuses on key defining factors such as degree completion rates, the satisfaction and expectations of the SAIS community (students, faculty, staff, alumni) and alumni career progression. It looks at the student experience in and outside the classroom, curriculum review, benchmarking and division of resources to support the outcomes. It also reviews existing policies and guidelines to make sure they are being followed and, in some cases, updated to meet the needs of the students in an always changing global environment.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes
SAIS ensures that each degree and program/department has clearly articulated goals that are effective, comprehensive, participatory, flexible and dynamic. Students follow a guided plan with core course requirements in a functional or regional area and in international economics (Appendix 24.3.1). They must complete core examinations in focused areas of international relations, reach
language proficiency in a second language (Appendix 24.3.2) and complete an oral examination (Appendix 24.3.3) that ties their functional or regional area with international economics. These requirements are explicit and transparent. Although requirements vary according to academic program, all fields of study throughout the institution share a common academic culture.

The school uses multiple learning outcomes to determine student success. The standards for success are conveyed through course descriptions, syllabi (Appendix 24.3.4), stated program requirements and through the school’s mission statement. In each course, outcomes are measured directly through examinations, research papers, in-classroom performance and presentations, and grades. Indirect assessments include course evaluations by students that measure their specific satisfaction with a faculty member or course and their overall satisfaction level (Appendix 24.2.6). Since SAIS is a professional school, measures also include the assessment of post-graduation employment in fields of international relations (Appendix 24.3.6).

In accordance with the mission, SAIS graduates should possess the ability to quantitatively analyze issues of functional and regional importance. For this reason, expected learning outcomes for SAIS students include the mastery of economic concepts, the ability to speak two languages and a core understanding of cultural and societal dynamics.

As part of the assessment plan, the Office of Academic Affairs, headed by the academic dean, meets annually with the faculty and support staff of each program/department to review their past course selections, faculty assignments, program support activities, past course evaluations and program budget to prepare for the next semester. After all program meetings have taken place, there is an overall curriculum review to ensure that there is no duplication of efforts and that each program is adhering not only to its individual requirements but to the mission of the school. Additionally, an academic competitiveness committee utilizes benchmarking data to perform metric analyses of the achievement of student learning outcomes. In addition, an outside consultant was hired to review the PhD program during the spring 2009 semester. This included analyzing student progress, academic policies and procedures, graduation rates and student satisfaction (Appendix 24.3.8). On a regular basis, students receive and are offered academic advising from both their faculty advisor and a general academic advisor to ensure that they are focused and on track to graduate. Academic advising provides students with transcript reviews, degree audits (Appendix 24.3.9) and academic counseling. Through advising, SAIS utilizes an alert system to ensure that struggling students receive immediate support from their advisor and the academic dean.

Realizing that we needed to put more support into PhD, MIPP, Academic Advising and joint-degree programs, the Office of Academic Advising has created a new position that will continue the assessment of these programs and provide more support for the student population. In addition, an assessment of all academic programs at SAIS will be conducted as part of the RBTF plan. This review will focus mainly on supplementary programming and student learning outside of the classroom to ensure that students can be involved in complementary educational experiences that provide professional preparation and connect class content to practice.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

Additional results that came from the assessment include a Career Services survey, which brought to light the fact that students expected more professional skills training from their SAIS education. This training was added to the curriculum. Another assessment result indicated that because there were
too many students in certain academic programs, adequate resources to provide productive outcomes were limited (Appendix 24.3.11). These programs were then capped. The results of student evaluations were assessed across every course. Some outcomes indicated the need to diversify course offerings, hire new faculty and reassess the grading mechanisms within each course.

Following the assessments, many decisions were made to allocate and reallocate resources within the school. Part of the RBTF plan included the development of fund-raising efforts in order to enhance the student experience. Resources were also allocated to offer competitive salaries to the part-time faculty in order to attract and retain the best and brightest in the field and to provide students with both theoretical and practical knowledge. SAIS has also allocated time in the academic calendar (Appendix 24.2.16) and increased resources for professional development and skill-building courses that focus on critical thinking, and written and oral communications skills. Multiple workshops and noncredit courses were funded through this effort (Appendix 24.3.12).

SAIS has a communications office that disseminates information on a weekly basis and provides important messages to the students, faculty and staff. In addition, information is relayed through a variety of sources such as the student listserv, the SAIS Web site, alumni newsletters, monthly staff meetings and Dean’s Forums with the student body, hosted by the Student Government Association (Appendix 24.3.13). These sources also provide opportunities for valuable feedback.

Student learning depends on an efficient and effective educational experience. The RBTF goals and their outcomes will, therefore, play a critical role in shaping student learning outcomes. Additional initiatives resulting from the RBTF plan include the expansion of technology—specifically the use of learning management systems to track progress and promote additional pedagogical opportunities (Appendix 24.2.17), the planned creation of a writing center and the improvement of the multimedia language lab and modern electronic library resources. Leading the charge, SAIS continues to receive resources and support from the Advisory Council, Academic Board, Student Government Association and program directors. These governing bodies exist to ensure that the checks and balances are in place to provide the expected outcomes.

The school plans to use the student learning outcomes assessment results to enhance, change and develop new and existing programs and resources to support its mission. These reports will be evaluated over multiple years in order to confirm that progress has been made. The results from the findings will be used to create new projects, committees or initiatives to strengthen the learning outcomes that the school has committed to through the support of the school’s faculty, staff, students and alumni.
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School of Medicine
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview
Since the 2004 decennial review for the MSCHE, a number of opportunities have been realized, or are being pursued or planned, to further the mission of the School of Medicine (SOM) at Johns Hopkins University. Some of these opportunities include the opening of the Johns Hopkins University Simulation Center in March 2008, the opening of the Johns Hopkins University John G. Rangos Sr. Building for basic biomedical sciences in April 2008, the planned opening of the Armstrong Medical Education Building in June 2009, the implementation of the new Genes to Society curriculum for the MD program beginning in the 2009–2010 academic year (some transition is occurring now), and the planning of new curricula for the PhD and master’s programs that coincides with facilities renovation to meet new curricular needs sometime in the next five years. These opportunities are important to be aware of because they are proof of the progress the SOM has made in the past five years in enhancing its culture of assessment and evaluation.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy
The SOM offers a variety of degree programs ranging from the MD program to 13 PhD and two master’s programs in areas as diverse as Cellular and Molecular Medicine and Art as Applied to Medicine. Even with the broad range of programs, the SOM has a comprehensive mission that aligns with the university’s mission. Appendix 12 contains the SOM catalog that includes the mission statement on page 9.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine is to educate medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in accordance with the highest professional standards; to prepare clinicians to practice patient-centered medicine of the highest standard; and to identify and answer fundamental questions in the mechanisms, prevention and treatment of disease, in health care delivery and in the basic sciences.

The school’s assessment plan operates as outlined in Figure 11. The assessment process ensures that each program’s objectives are matched with the school’s mission and the metrics used for student assessment are appropriate. Each program gathers student data, which is evaluated and reported through designated faculty and administrative channels. When necessary, performance improvement measures are taken to improve the student assessments. Successful examples of this plan are outlined in upcoming sections.
The overall educational program development/assessment strategy used in the SOM is also diagrammed in Figure 11. The general process begins with the SOM and program missions that include associated goals and objectives. A program is then developed or modified to meet the goals and objectives, and data are gathered as the program operates. The data are then interpreted to see if the desired objectives are realized. Based on the interpretation of the data, additional modifications might be made, or additional resources provided through the budgeting process, to enhance learning for students in the program, and additional data are then collected. As program goals and objectives are modified, new means of gathering data (both direct and indirect) about program effectiveness and student learning are also developed so assessment can support program needs. Across programs, the assessment procedures are designed to be useful, cost-effective, reasonably accurate and truthful, planned and organized, systematized and sustained. The collected data are communicated to appropriate audiences and used as part of the budgeting process.

**Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes**

The institutional effectiveness of the MD program is assessed through a variety of internal and external groups (e.g., Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee, Student Assessment and Program Evaluation Committee, Medical Student Society, year-level student curriculum committees and the LCME) using a range of methods to collect data directly (e.g., internal lecture-, course-, and program-level surveys, biennial reviews of courses and clerkships, LCME accreditation activities, and student learning outcome information such as performance on internal examinations and residency
placement) and indirectly (e.g., performance on national licensing examinations, surveys of residency directors that have taken our MD graduates for additional training and the American Association of Medical Colleges Graduate Questionnaire) during and after students complete our programs so that changes can be made to the programs to enhance institutional effectiveness for the MD program.

The institutional effectiveness of the PhD and master’s programs is assessed through a variety of internal and external groups (e.g., SOM MA/PhD Committee, and program-specific policy committees, student representation committees, the Graduate Student Association [GSA] and the National Institutes of Health [NIH] Training Grant Review panels) using a range of methods to collect data directly (e.g., internal lecture-, course- and program-level surveys, and student learning outcome information such as performance on internal examinations and graduate placement) so that changes can be made to the programs to enhance institutional effectiveness. For example, the PhD program in Cellular and Molecular Medicine (CMM) training grant application to the National Institutes of Health (Appendix 25.1.2) describes various processes associated with program oversight, effectiveness and improvement. There is a central Policy Committee providing program oversight that also receives student input through the Student Representation Committee (Appendix 25.1.3). There are also processes in place to admit students into the program, and request or limit faculty participation in the program. The PhD and master’s programs also look at quantitative outcomes such as students graduated and time to degree. For example, in the CMM program, 39 of the 42 training cohort graduated with the PhD (three were awarded master’s), and the average time to degree was five and a half years (Appendix 25.1.2). The programs also use this quantitative data to enhance their processes. For example, the CMM program tracks recruitment efforts and reasons students choose not to matriculate so future recruitment efforts can be enhanced.

The programs also seek external reviews regarding their institutional effectiveness. This is done primarily through highly competitive training grant applications to the NIH. The reviews provided by the scientific panels convened by the NIH provide useful feedback about institutional effectiveness for each program and how they compare on a national level. For example, these reviews contain critiques in areas such as program administration and organization, diversity, admissions, faculty, the institutional training environment and program outcomes. Two sample NIH reviews can be found in Appendix 25.1.3 and 25.1.4.

The programs also seek reviews by various SOM review groups. For example, the Graduate Student Association (GSA) is active in providing feedback on the PhD and master’s programs in a variety of ways, including an annual survey (Appendix 25.1.5). Survey results are transmitted from the GSA to the SOM MA/PhD Committee. In turn, those results are communicated to the dean of the SOM for review and action. The programs also receive feedback on institutional effectiveness from the SOM MA/PhD Committee, which conducts five-year program reviews. These reviews focus on curricular issues, student and faculty selection, program administration and program outcomes. Appendices 25.1.6 and 25.1.7 contain sample reviews for Cellular and Molecular Medicine and for Cellular Molecular Physiology.

The section above outlines the many different direct and indirect measures the SOM uses to measure institutional effectiveness. The direct measures are internal lecture-, course- and program-level surveys, biennial reviews of required MD courses and clerkships, five-year reviews of graduate programs, LCME accreditation activities and student learning outcome information such as performance on internal examinations and residency placement. Examples of indirect measures include
performance on national licensing examinations, surveys of residency directors that have taken our MD graduates for additional training and the American Association of Medical Colleges Graduate Questionnaire. Both MD and graduate programs use multiple internal and external review committees to measure the effectiveness of the curriculum.

A critical outcome the SOM has achieved is its maintenance of accreditation from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). The SOM was notified in June 2007 of the LCME’s action “to continue accreditation of the educational program leading to the M.D. degree at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine for the balance of the prior term. The program’s next full survey will take place during academic year 2013–2014.” A copy of this most recent action letter is found in Appendix 25.1.8.

The 2005 self-study the SOM conducted served as a useful framework in preparation for the LCME site visits that occurred in January 2006 and January 2007. The LCME Briefing Book, with all required accreditation materials, is available upon request. The LCME accreditation standards overlap with the MSCHE standards (because some of the LCME standards are much more detailed, there are over 100 standards compared to the 14 for MSCHE). Much of the LCME self-study work has relevance to the preparation of this Periodic Review Report. Appendix 25.1.9 contains a crosswalk from the 14 MSCHE standards to the LCME standards.

The Educational Policy and Curriculum Committee (EPCC) provides curriculum governance for the MD program as described in the EPCC bylaws in Appendix 25.1.10. This committee of more than 50 faculty, staff and medical students meets monthly throughout the academic year to provide curriculum oversight and examine institutional effectiveness including student learning outcomes. Appendix 25.1.11 shows an organizational chart of the EPCC that includes assignment of responsibility for various LCME accreditation standards, and Appendix 25.1.12 contains agenda and minutes from two recent meetings of the committee.

The Student Assessment and Program Evaluation (SAPE) Committee is a subcommittee of the EPCC that conducts course and clerkship-level reviews, and provides quantitative data on individual and programmatic outcomes, along with recommendations for improvements. Course and clerkship reviews involve review of learning objectives and their relation to MD program mission, instructional methods, and assessment of learning strategies, course evaluations and faculty development activities. The committee meets once or twice each month to review all required courses on a two-year cycle. Reviews are communicated to the course or clerkship director and sent to the EPCC for approval and follow-up. Once a review performed by SAPE is approved by the EPCC, the course or clerkship director has 90 days in which to respond to EPCC how it will implement the recommendations made in the SAPE review. Appendix 25.1.13 shows sample SAPE reports that illustrate the interview framework used by the SAPE committee when meeting with the course or clerkship director, and Appendix 25.1.14 shows the schedule of course reviews for the upcoming and past academic years. The SAPE committee also regularly reviews its own processes and has procedural changes approved by the EPCC so there is a broad awareness and ownership of the assessment process.

As described in an earlier section, the MA/PhD committee conducts five-year program reviews for the PhD and master’s programs. These reviews focus on curricular issues, student and faculty selection, program administration and program outcomes.
Because of their wide range of content and the lack of program-specific regulatory organizations, the PhD and master’s programs do not have the specialized accreditation enjoyed by the MD program. While this situation can allow a wide range of flexibility for the programs, we also realize that it may lead program leaders to emphasize discipline-related issues that only implicitly recognize elements, such as institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning, normally addressed in the certification of professional degrees. Nevertheless, with the assessment model in Figure 11, and internal and external review of the various programs, in the upcoming years, we would like to progress with the graduate programs as we have with the MD programs, by boosting the data collection processes.

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

Both the direct and indirect measures of the MD program suggest the MD program is meeting the program objectives because our graduates are excelling in their careers post-graduation. The program director’s survey, sent to residency directors one year after SOM students have graduated, suggests that SOM graduates are among the top of their peers in professionalism and clinical competency. The alumni survey sent to our graduates, also one year post-graduation, indicates that they think our curriculum prepared them well for internship and residency. Our students continuously perform in the upper tiers across the country on the United States Medical Licensing Exam (USMLE). The continued training grants enjoyed by the graduate programs are a testament to the quality and effectiveness of those programs.

Issues considered by the EPCC in recent years include review of various data in support of curricular decision making. For example, the EPCC asked course and clerkship directors to review item analysis of nationally standardized examinations to ensure that students receive appropriate instruction; broadened content areas in the curriculum resulting from annual analysis of the American Association of Medical Colleges Graduation Questionnaire; and determined that the low incidence of graduates changing residency specialty choice supports the current flexible Year 3 and Year 4 clinical portion of the curriculum, which offers students opportunities to identify their specialty niche.

Examples of recommendations from the SAPE Committee that have been made to enhance student experiences in various courses or clerkships include standardizing case write-ups, assessing the reliability of evaluations made on the wards as well as additional forms of evaluation of students while on the wards, creating objectives for each instructional session and comparing examination results with national norms.

The Student Outcomes Research Data (SORD) warehouse is a tool that has been developed, with support from the vice dean for education, to provide an easily accessible warehouse of student-level data that can be used across the MD curriculum for investigating and enhancing individual courses and clerkships. The warehouse contains approximately 250 data elements for 1,400 students (representing students graduating between 2000 and 2010). These data elements include pre-matriculation data (e.g., college, major and degree, MCATs, GPAs from Admissions), medical student years data (e.g., data such as grades for courses and clerkships and USMLE performance from the Registrar) and post-graduate data (e.g., ratings of interns at end of PGY1 year by program directors).

Appendix 25.1.15 shows examples of standard reports available through the system, although ad hoc data requests are also possible. Reports such as these are shared annually with the chairs of the year-level committees of the EPCC (Year 1, Year 2 and Clerkship Directors), and the chair of the SAPE
Committee and the associate dean for curriculum, so that the data can be used to inform the course improvement process.

The continuous monitoring of the SOM’s effectiveness has proven useful. Information gathered has driven the allocation of resources to address areas of concern that have come from various institutional measures. Using data gathered from course and graduation surveys, the SOM’s administration has realigned resources to meet the needs identified.

**School of Medicine**

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan**

**Overview**

The School of Medicine (SOM) of The Johns Hopkins University offers a variety of degree programs ranging from the MD program to 13 PhD and two master’s programs in areas as diverse as Cellular and Molecular Medicine and Art as Applied to Medicine. There are approximately 480 medical students and 850 graduate students in the school. See Appendix 25.1.1 for more information on the SOM. In 2005, the SOM conducted a self-study in preparation for the Liaison Committee on Medical Education visit. A renewed focus on assessment of student learning was an outgrowth of that self-study. Given the faculty’s embracing of the efforts, the SOM has taken on many initiatives and invested both monetary and human capital in enhancing student assessment at the SOM.

**Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy**

Even with its broad range of programs and students, the SOM has a comprehensive mission that aligns with the university’s mission (Appendix 12 contains the SOM catalog that includes the mission statement on page 9):

*The mission of the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine is to educate medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in accordance with the highest professional standards; to prepare clinicians to practice patient-centered medicine of the highest standard; and to identify and answer fundamental questions in the mechanisms, prevention and treatment of disease, in health care delivery and in the basic sciences.*

The school’s assessment plan operates as outlined in Figure 11. The assessment process ensures that each program’s objectives are matched with the school’s mission and that the metrics used for student assessment are appropriate. Each program gathers student data, which is evaluated and reported through designated faculty and administrative channels. When necessary, performance improvement measures are taken to improve the student assessments. A successful example of the process is the workings of the Student Assessment and Program Evaluation (SAPE) Committee. SAPE evaluates each MD program course, and a component of each program evaluation is the effectiveness and validity of student assessments. SAPE has many times recommended improving test question quality, which in turn improved the overall effectiveness of the SOM’s student assessment.

The assessment policy and guidelines for the MD program are driven by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME) standards, which require that medical schools “collect and use a variety
of outcome data, including national norms of accomplishment, to demonstrate the extent to which its educational program objectives are being met.” After a 2005 self-study and 2006 site visit, the SOM was notified in June 2007 of the LCME’s action “to continue accreditation of the educational program leading to the M.D. degree at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine for the balance of the prior term. The program’s next full survey will take place during academic year 2013–2014.” A copy of this most recent action letter is found in Appendix 25.1.8.

Because of their wide range of content, and the lack of program-specific regulatory organizations, the PhD and master’s programs do not have the specialized accreditation enjoyed by the MD program. While this situation can allow a wide range of flexibility for the programs, we also realize it may lead program leaders to emphasize discipline-related issues that only implicitly recognize elements, such as institutional effectiveness and assessment of student learning, normally addressed in the certification of professional degrees. Nevertheless, with the assessment model in Figure 11, and internal and external review of the various programs, the PhD and master’s programs are in compliance with MSCHE Standard 14.

All program requirements are available in the SOM catalog (Appendix 12).

**Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes**

The stated aims of the MD program include student growth in six areas: science and practice of medicine, clinical competence, the social context of medicine, communication, professionalism and lifelong learning. Appendix 25.2.1 lists the 11 expected outcomes across these areas. To help students achieve growth in these areas, instruction takes place in a variety of formats including lectures, small group tutorials and small group clinical teaching. Assessment of learning in these outcomes areas includes instructor-developed examinations, national licensing examinations, oral presentations, written assignments, observations of student interactions with real and “standardized” patients, and other means.

Student learning in the MD program is assessed by a variety of people (faculty, residents, standardized patients) using a range of methods (e.g., written exams, problem sets and problem-solving exercises, lab practical examinations, small-group work, observed structured clinical encounters, global ratings of clinical performance and standardized patient encounters) that are matched to the learning objectives within the pre-clinical and clinical education of the students so students receive specific feedback of their learning and so the assessment results can be fed back into the curriculum to enhance future learning. Appendix 25.2.2, from the LCME self-study, contains a summary of these assessment techniques in the required pre-clerkship and clinical courses. A specific example is shared below to illustrate the role of assessment of learning in the MD to provide individual feedback to students and to enhance the overall program.

Student learning for the master’s programs is assessed by a variety of faculty (including course faculty, master’s essay readers and the SOM MA/PhD Committee) using a range of methods (e.g., problem sets, small group discussions, written and oral examinations, and editorial commentaries) that take place in and out of courses and are matched to the educational level of the students, culminating with a project-based essay so students receive specific feedback of their learning and so the assessment results can be fed back into the program curriculum to enhance future learning. As an example, the MA Program in Medical and Biological Illustration students enroll in the SOM Anatomy course, and knowledge of the discipline is validated in the master’s project supervised by a member of the
Surgery department. Evaluation by the faculty preceptor is incorporated into written commentary provided to the student for personal reinforcement and to the department to enhance progress of future students.

The missions of the PhD programs are available in Appendix 25.2.3. Student learning for the PhD programs is assessed by a variety of individuals and groups of faculty (including course faculty, the PhD advisor, the Thesis Committee, the Graduate Board Oral Examination Committee, thesis readers, graduate faculty and the SOM MA/PhD Committee) using a range of methods (e.g., problem sets and small group discussions, written comments from laboratory directors, presentation of research findings in a public forum, presentation and defense of a thesis proposal, written essays, and written and oral examinations) that take place in and out of courses and are matched to the educational level of the students, so students receive specific, individualized feedback of their learning and so the results can be fed back into the program to enhance future learning and research. Assessing learning in laboratory research also provides a new baseline for work by future students in specific labs.

The MD and graduate programs use both direct and indirect forms of assessing student learning outcome measures. Examples of direct MD program assessments include lab practical exams, written and computerized exams, problem sets and exercises, small group work, Observed Structured Clinical Encounters (OSCEs) and the Comprehensive Clinical Skills Exam. Forms of indirect assessment include end-of-course evaluations, the American Association of Medical College’s Graduation Questionnaire, an alumni survey of graduates one year post-graduation and a program directors survey sent to residency directors of our graduates. Throughout the fall of 2008, online testing was piloted for the MD program, and in November 2008 the EPCC voted to institute online testing as a policy. Courses and clerkships will work with the Office of Academic Computing to make this transition. Online testing will allow improved validity of exams, faster grading and feedback from students and teachers, and question banks.

Direct assessment methods in the graduate programs include written exams, oral exams and thesis work. Indirect methods include end-of-course evaluations, grades and student satisfaction surveys sent to the student body.

A successful assessment added recently to the MD program is the Comprehensive Clinical Skills Examination (CCSE). CCSE is a collection of standardized patient encounters that rising fourth-year students take in the new Simulation Center. The encounters are designed to assess learning outcomes associated with the science and practice of medicine, clinical competence, communication and professionalism. In fall 2008 students had 10 patient encounters and were asked to take an appropriate history, perform a focused physical examination, generate possible diagnoses for the patient, develop plans to help the patient and write a note summarizing the results. The standardized patient assesses the student according to a checklist as to whether the student asked a particular history question or performed a particular physical exam maneuver. Patients also evaluate the encounter in terms of various communications and professionalism issues from the patient perspective. Faculty members score the students’ notes. In addition to receiving a case-by-case and dimension-by-dimension report, students are notified after their notes are scored if they did not pass the examination. Appendix 25.2.4 provides a sample report. In that case remediation assistance is provided by a group of faculty. Analysis of results from fall 2006 showed that students needed more support writing notes, so several clerkships added such exercises for the 2007–2008 academic year. Since the exam was put in place in fall 2006, all of our students have passed a required national licensing exam that is of a similar format (Step 2 Clinical Skills of the United States Medical Licensing Examination).
A novel assessment of exemplary learning in the graduate programs is examined through Young Investigators’ Day, an annual SOM competition in which faculty committees judge student research efforts for their impact on basic and translational science and the creation of new knowledge. Awards are made to 18 students from across the programs. Appendix 25.2.5 contains a summary of the assessment processes for the PhD programs.

The direct and indirect outcome measures during a student’s career at the SOM are discussed above. A tool, the Student Outcomes Research Data (SORD) warehouse, was developed with support from the vice dean for education to provide an easily accessible warehouse of student-level data that can be used for investigating and enhancing individual courses and clerkships, and across the MD curriculum. The warehouse contains approximately 250 data elements for 1,400 students (representing students graduating between 2000 and 2012). These data elements include pre-matriculation data (e.g., college, major and degree, MCAT scores, GPAs from Admissions), medical school data (e.g., data such as grades for courses and clerkships and USMLE performance) and post-graduate data (e.g., ratings of interns by program directors).

Appendix 25.1.15 shows examples of standard reports available through SORD, though ad hoc data requests are also possible. Reports such as these are shared annually with the chairs of the year-level committees of the EPCC (Year 1, Year 2 and Clerkship Directors), and the chair of the SAPE Committee and the associate dean for curriculum, so that the data can be used to inform the course improvement process.

Now that the pre-matriculation and matriculation data in SORD are functioning smoothly for the MD program, the SOM is placing emphasis on gathering increasing amounts of post-graduation data. This will include residency placement, publications, awards won by alumni, faculty appointments and additional alumni surveys on the usefulness of their medical education at the SOM. A new director of the Office of Medical Education is being recruited, and it will be a priority that this person improves the assessment procedures for the PhD and master’s programs, as has been done for the MD program.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

As outlined in Figure 11, student assessment outcomes are linked to resource planning. The close monitoring of student assessments through various administrative bodies (EPCC, SAPE, MA/PhD Committee) allows attention to be brought to troubled courses. In recent years, the MD program invested much human capital into the Office of Medical Education Services (OMES). The director of OMES worked with MD courses on psychometrics and test validity and implemented the CCSE described above. All vastly improved the quality of tests in the MD program.

The SOM aims to make available to teaching faculty the results and evidence of their work, while respecting the privacy of students. Data collected on specific courses, including student performance, are housed in SORD and made available to course directors, year directors, SAPE and EPCC as necessary. To respect students’ privacy, only aggregate data is shared. There has been an increased effort to make assessment results available online. All MD courses are available online for faculty using BlackBoard. This includes the descriptions and learning objectives; some courses use online evaluations. Many courses take advantage of BlackBoard’s online quiz function. The SOM has committed to support efforts to move the MD program’s student assessment to be fully online, and all courses will be required within the next year to move to online testing. MD outcomes from the Graduation
Questionnaire and USMLE scores are also posted on a Web site, that all faculty can access. EPCC minutes and materials are also posted internally for faculty.

Depending on the findings of the self-studies and reports from committees, the SOM provides resources as needed. Examples of initiatives that have been undertaken in recent years to better student assessment opportunities include the opening of several buildings: the Johns Hopkins University Simulation Center in March 2008, the Johns Hopkins University John G. Rangos Sr. Building for basic biomedical sciences in April 2008 and the planned opening of the Armstrong Medical Education Building in June 2009. There are also plans for curricular revisions at both the MD and PhD levels. The Genes to Society curriculum for the MD program will begin in the 2009–2010 academic year (some transition is occurring now), and the planning of new curricula for the PhD and master’s programs that coincides with facilities renovation to meet new curricular needs sometime in the next five years.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**
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School of Nursing
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing (SON) has been at the forefront of nursing education, research and practice since its establishment as a degree-granting entity in 1984. The SON offers the BS, MSN, DNP and PhD degrees. Enrollment in these nationally and internationally recognized programs is: BS, 362; MSN, 174; PhD, 17; and DNP, 50. The BS and MSN programs are accredited by the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission (NLNAC) and by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). The SON has 66 full-time faculty and 120 part-time faculty. It is ranked seventh by NIH in terms of research funding when compared with other schools of nursing; in FY 2007 NIH funding was $5,627,567.

The SON has, in the past five years, made significant progress in enhancing a culture of assessment and evaluation. A 2007–2008 CCNE self-study provided insight as to institutional and programmatic areas needing improvement. The current SON assessment plan guides administration, faculty, staff and students in a comprehensive and ongoing assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The mission and goals of the SON align with those of the university, and its goals support their shared enterprises—education, research and professional practice.

The mission of the School of Nursing is to improve the health of individuals and diverse communities locally and globally through leadership and excellence in nursing education, research, practice and service.

The strategic goals of the SON are reflected in the 2004–2009 strategic plan: to enhance excellence in research, teaching and practice; to cultivate an environment that embodies the SON values of excellence, respect, diversity, integrity and accountability; to position Johns Hopkins nursing as a global leader in nursing and health care; and to achieve planned growth that is strategically driven, innovative and financially sound (Appendix 26.1). The person currently responsible for oversight of the strategic plan is the assistant dean for strategic initiatives.

The SON assessment plan (Appendix 26.2) (Figure 12) addresses the following outcomes: mission and governance, faculty, resources, curriculum and program effectiveness (student learning outcomes). The assessment policy and guidelines, as outlined in the plan, include a listing of the anticipated outcomes, data collection and summarization (who, tools/techniques, frequency), data synthesis and development of findings (who, frequency), recommendations and decision making. The person currently responsible for oversight of the assessment plan is the director of the Office for Teaching Excellence.
Schoolwide assessment and strategic planning, which reflect the SON mission, are integrally related to and dependent on the participation of faculty, students, staff, alumni and other members of the communities of interest (practice community, state regulatory agency, credentialing agencies). The most recent comprehensive schoolwide self-assessment was conducted in 2007–2008 in preparation for a February 2008 accreditation review by the CCNE. The self-study was based on the SON’s evaluation of the degree to which it met CCNE standards with regard to the baccalaureate (BS) and master’s (MSN) programs. The Faculty Senate and its standing committees have subsequently undertaken a review of the SON assessment plan and academic programs in order to address areas needing improvement. The dean submitted a SWOT Analysis for Strategic Planning to Provost Johnson in April 2008 (Appendix 26.3). The assistant dean for strategic initiatives is reviewing the strategic plan in collaboration with the Dean’s Leadership Group to determine the degree to which the four goals have been met to date (Appendix 26.4). She is also organizing focus groups with faculty to elicit their input into the degree of attainment of the current strategic goals and related priority areas; one such group met in late January 2009.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

In addition to the schoolwide assessment and planning activities described above, routine and ad hoc effectiveness assessments are conducted by departments, degree programs, offices/services (such as the Office for Student Affairs) and Faculty Senate standing committees. Examples of assessment con-
ducted by these groups include the following: departmental productivity reports, analysis of course evaluations by level and program, analysis of graduate and alumni satisfaction surveys, review of recruitment and retention rates for each program, and faculty salary equity analyses.

Quantitative and qualitative assessment methods are used, based on the issue under review; they include routinely collected administrative data (student data, academic program data, budget, external grants and contracts, appointments and promotions), as well as data collected and analyzed for the issue at hand (for example, the 2008 online survey used to determine faculty perspectives on excellence in teaching). Assessments also come from external sources. For example, the Dean’s National Advisory Council brings its diverse interests and expertise to SON development issues.

Examples of recent assessments that led to changes in the SON enterprise are:

- **Education**: Course and program evaluations, workforce needs assessments and graduate satisfaction survey results provide data that are used to strengthen the SON academic activities. The SON determined from analysis of these data that offering the DNP degree would build on the practice and administrative strengths of the faculty and would address the SON mission to provide leaders in these domains.

- **Research**: Faculty and students depend on centrally supported resources such as the Computer Network Services (CNS) and the Center for Nursing Research and Sponsored Programs (CNRSP). The dean approved the recruitment and hiring of a biostatistician to support faculty and to teach the master’s course in biostatistics. This internal resource has enhanced the data analysis section of SON research proposals.

Each department chair is responsible for ongoing departmental assessment, planning and implementation of departmental goals that align with SON goals. Each associate dean works closely with faculty, staff and schoolwide committees to coordinate mission-driven activities and relevant aspects of the plan; for example, the associate dean for research holds semiannual research retreats to give faculty the opportunity to evaluate existing resources and to determine additional needs. The academic program directors have direct responsibility for the program effectiveness component of the plan. The dean has ultimate responsibility for schoolwide assessment and strategic initiatives, and their implementation and evaluation.

The SON assessment plan has implications for improving productivity and enhancing quality of life for faculty, staff and students. One outcome has been the development of the Office for Teaching Excellence (OTE), which addresses plan component #20, Curriculum: “Creative and innovative teaching/learning approaches are used…” and strategic goal #1: “To enhance excellence in…teaching.” It is anticipated that the OTE will support faculty in the improvement of clinical and classroom teaching and will provide resources for the enhanced use of instructional technology (Appendix 26.5: Executive Summary: Recommendations from the Office for Teaching Excellence Task Force).

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

As a result of the most recent accreditation self-study and external review, it was determined that the CCNE standards for the BS and MSN programs had been met. Guided by the findings of the self-study and the strategic plan goals, SON activities are under way. These include (a) faculty teaching in all degree programs (BS, MSN, DNP, PhD) continuing to integrate innovative instructional strategies into classroom and clinical settings based on student, graduate and alumni feedback, formal program...
reviews, course evaluations and workforce needs assessments; (b) the SON’s continuing education course offerings, designed and implemented by the Institute for Johns Hopkins Nursing continuing to expand based on participants’ evaluations, ad hoc surveys and identified workforce needs; and (c) implementation of a Post-Master’s Certificate in Nursing Education (recently approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission), with the goal of addressing the nursing faculty shortage. Despite increased competition for decreasing NIH funding, SON revenue from research grants and contracts has continued to grow. Faculty and students conduct research and offer clinical services throughout the United States and in numerous other countries. Faculty serve on editorial boards of prestigious journals and as elected officials of professional organizations. They also serve on committees and consult for such agencies as the World Health Organization, the National Institutes of Health and the Institute of Medicine.

The Dean’s Leadership Group is routinely apprised of the SON revenues and expenditures by the associate dean for finance and administration. The dean is responsible for allocating general funds for central services needed to support the SON mission and strategic plan, including the building expansion plan, which will be phased in as funds permit. General funds are allocated to departments based on an operating budget formula; the academic programs are likewise allocated funds based on faculty salaries, benefits and resources needed to support each program. Requests for faculty positions originate with the program directors in collaboration with the department chairs and are based on programmatic needs.

Department chairs have responsibility for generating departmental assessments, outcomes and planned changes in collaboration with their faculty groups. Program directors have responsibility for generating programmatic assessments and proposed curricular changes in collaboration with faculty. Members of Faculty Senate schoolwide committees serve as conduits of information and ideas between the administration and faculty. There are students on each of the program curriculum committees who represent their colleagues with regard to curricular issues. Lunchtime meetings of the dean with students and All-School meetings with faculty, staff and students provide the dean with a forum in which to learn of issues and to share schoolwide concerns and accomplishments. Aggregate administrative data are posted online, as are assessment and planning documents. The most recent strategic planning assessment (Initial Implementation Survey) was conducted in order to determine faculty satisfaction with the newly implemented departmental structure; data are being analyzed by department chairs.

The SON has long been committed to critical self-evaluation. General funds are allocated to support the comprehensive assessment plan and strategic planning processes. The administrative commitment to self-assessment is further demonstrated through the appropriation of funds to implement the major strategic plan recommendations, all of which have been vetted by constituents and are congruent with the SON mission. In addition, the dean exercises her prerogative to appoint ad hoc committees and task forces to assess new opportunities and initiatives, such as the Office for Teaching Excellence.

The SON uses effectiveness assessment results to monitor the success of the SON academic, research and practice activities; to maintain salary equity for faculty and financial solvency for the SON; to ensure the highest quality of academic programs; to facilitate communication and collaboration among faculty, staff and students; to enhance teaching and advisement/mentoring of students; to enhance faculty development in the teaching role; to position the SON as a global leader in nursing and health care; and to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of centrally supported services for
faculty, students and staff. Assessments enable us to ensure that the ongoing flow of data collection and summarization, data synthesis and development of findings, recommendations, and decision making occur SON-wide and in departments, centers such as the Center for Nursing Research and Sponsored Programs, degree-granting programs and support services. The overall goal is to ensure that faculty, students and staff are able to teach and learn at the highest level, to conduct research, to engage in professional practice and to serve the profession and the community (local to global). See JHU SON Case Statement (Appendix 26.6).

School of Nursing
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview
The faculty have reaffirmed their commitment to a culture of assessment of student learning outcomes. We have taken on several new initiatives, and SON administration is investing both monetary and personnel resources to the enhancement of student assessment in both undergraduate and graduate programs.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The mission of the School of Nursing is to improve the health of individuals and diverse communities locally and globally through leadership and excellence in nursing education, research, practice and service.

The SON offers the undergraduate program (BS) Accelerated (13.5 months) and Traditional (two years) options. The admission, retention and graduate requirements for the BS degree are detailed in the SON catalog and in the BS academic manual. The Faculty Senate has standing committees that provide oversight for admissions, progressions and curriculum for the BS program.

The SON offers the graduate programs MSN (and dual degrees MSN/MPH and MSN/MBA), the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) and the Doctor of Philosophy (PhD). The admission, retention and graduate requirements for each of these programs are detailed in the SON catalog and in the program academic manuals. The Faculty Senate has standing committees that provide oversight for admissions, progressions and curriculum for each of these graduate programs.

Ensuring that the undergraduate program (BS) meets the accreditation, school, university and Maryland Board of Nursing standards is a major focus of the SON assessment plan, under the rubric program effectiveness. It has also guided the SON in the assessment of recruitment, admission and retention strategies; financial aid; student services; instructional technology resources; mentoring; course and program evaluations; faculty-to-student ratios; faculty expertise in teaching, research and practice; graduation rates; employment opportunities; NCLEX-RN pass rates; and employer satisfaction with the program.

Ensuring that the graduate programs (MSN, DNP, PhD) meet school, university, accreditation and certifying agency (i.e., the American Nurses Certification Corp.) standards is a major focus of the ongoing self-assessment, which also guides faculty in the evaluation of recruitment, admission and
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retention strategies; financial aid; student services; instructional technology resources; mentoring; course and program evaluations; faculty-to-student ratios; faculty expertise in teaching, research and practice; graduation rates; employment opportunities; certification examination pass rates; and employer satisfaction with the program. The MSN is accredited by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE); the DNP program will be reviewed by CCNE in October 2009. It is anticipated that the PhD program will be evaluated by expert consultants during the 2009–2010 academic year.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

A description of each program’s courses, learning objectives and evaluation methods is available online. The undergraduate program (BS) objectives and program outcomes (Appendix 26.7) are based on core standards put forth by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN). The goals of the SON interface with the JHU and SON mission and BS program outcomes. Selected academic outcomes measures include graduation rates, NCLEX-RN pass rates, program satisfaction reports from Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI) for graduates and alumni at one and three years, employer satisfaction reports via the BS Employer Rating Scale, employment/graduate school enrollment rates and alumni achievements. The degree program outcomes and course objectives are reviewed by the Baccalaureate Curriculum Committee (BCC) annually to ensure they are aligned with the SON mission and goals, AACN Essentials of Baccalaureate Education for Professional Nursing Practice (AACN, 2008), Maryland Board of Nursing requirements (Nurse Practice Act, 2008) and nursing workforce needs. Modifications in the existing program outcomes and curriculum are approved by the BCC.

The MSN, DNP and PhD graduate program outcomes (Appendix 26.8) are based on core standards put forth by AACN. The goals of the SON interface with the JHU and SON mission and graduate program outcomes. Selected academic outcomes measures include graduation rates, certification examination pass rates, program satisfaction reports using the Program Satisfaction Questionnaire (PAQ) for the master’s graduates and the Educational Benchmarking Inc. (EBI) tool for MSN alumni at one and three years, employer satisfaction reports via the MSN Employer Rating Scale, employment/graduate school enrollment rates and alumni achievements. The DNP program faculty are developing graduate and alumni satisfaction surveys. The PhD program faculty use a faculty-developed program satisfaction survey form; plans are under way to formalize PhD alumni follow-up. The degree program outcomes and course objectives are reviewed by the specific program curriculum committee annually to ensure they are aligned with the SON mission, goals, AACN documents (The Essentials of Master’s Education for Advanced Practice Nursing, The Essentials of Doctoral Education for Advanced Practice Nursing, Indicators of Quality in Research-Focused Doctoral Programs in Nursing), Maryland Board of Nursing requirements (Nurse Practice Act, 2008) and nursing workforce needs. Modifications in the existing program outcomes and curricula are approved by the appropriate curriculum committee.

Faculty use a variety of metrics to assess individual and cohort learning outcomes. Undergraduate program (BS) courses are reviewed by level to monitor the use of varied and objective-related evaluation strategies; as a result of this process, students are provided with the opportunity to demonstrate their attainment of course objectives by level using a variety of methods (Appendix 26.9). At the end of each semester, students are asked to complete an online evaluation of each course in which they are enrolled. The evaluation consists of quantitative and qualitative components (Appendix 26.10).
The BS program director and department chairs use cohort results to recognize teaching excellence or to provide mentoring to faculty as needed. Additional measures which the faculty anticipate developing/refining for assessment of student learning outcomes in 2009 include case scenarios using simulation, enhanced preceptor evaluation forms and an electronic portfolio to be developed and maintained by each student. At graduation students are surveyed to evaluate the quality of their experiences at the SON: instructional, student support and advisement. The BCC uses the EBI tool, which provides the BCC with a detailed analysis of student satisfaction; the committee also uses an EBI survey to measure alumni satisfaction and achievement at years one and three after graduation.

**Graduate programs** courses are reviewed annually to monitor the use of varied and objective-related evaluation strategies; as a result of this process students are provided with the opportunity to demonstrate their attainment of course objectives using a variety of methods (Appendix 26.9). At the end of each semester, students are asked to complete an online evaluation of each course in which they are enrolled (Appendix 26.10). The graduate program directors and department chairs use cohort results to recognize teaching excellence or to provide mentoring to faculty as needed. Additional measures that the faculty anticipate developing/refining for assessment of student learning outcomes include advanced practice case scenarios using simulation and a capstone project for DNP students. All graduate students are surveyed at the time of graduation to evaluate the quality of their experiences at the SON: instructional, student support and advisement. The graduate curriculum committees use the relevant data to conduct a detailed analysis of student satisfaction, which is used for program review and revision. The MSN Curriculum Committee also uses an EBI survey to measure alumni satisfaction at years one and three after graduation. The DNP and PhD curriculum committees are planning to develop or purchase alumni survey forms that will enable them to measure these graduates’ program satisfaction and achievement.

The overarching goal of the **undergraduate program** (BS) is to graduate students with the knowledge, skills and values needed to contribute to the health of individuals, families, groups, communities and populations. To that end, program and level outcomes and course objectives are aligned with the requisite knowledge, skills and values (Appendix 26.11). Knowledge and skill building occur through course work, seminars, mentored research, and practice opportunities, elective courses and student organizational experiences. In turn, learning is measured by many different faculty who use methods appropriate to each type of learning objective/experience, ranging from assessing group project participation to evaluating oral and written presentations to rating clinical performance.

With regard to the **graduate programs**, the MSN program prepares nurse experts in advanced practice and/or management for leadership in professional nursing practice and patient-centered health care delivery. The DNP program is a practice-focused doctoral program designed to prepare expert nurse clinicians, administrators and executive leaders to improve health and health care outcomes. The PhD program prepares nurse scholars to conduct research that advances the theoretical foundation of nursing practice and health care delivery. To that end, program outcomes and course objectives are aligned with the requisite knowledge, skills and values for each degree. Knowledge and skill building occur through course work, seminars, mentored research and practice opportunities, elective courses, MSN scholarly projects and portfolios, DNP capstone projects, and doctoral dissertation research (traditional or manuscript format). In turn, learning is measured by many different faculty who use methods appropriate to each type of learning objective/experience.
The current learning assessment processes and activities described above will continue to be used as long as they are determined to be effective in measuring student learning outcomes. The undergraduate program (BS) and graduate programs (MSN, DNP, PhD) are assessed at the SON and program level and are reviewed and revised, as appropriate, to serve changed health care needs while also serving the SON mission and goals. Recruitment, application, admission and enrollment data are tracked by the Office of Student Affairs to help ensure that the programs maintain their exceptional student bodies. Graduation rates and data from student and alumni surveys are reviewed by the program curriculum committees with regard to learning and advisement experiences and support services. The DNP and PhD programs are planning to develop or purchase satisfaction survey forms for their graduates and alumni. Leaders of the OTE will continue to assist faculty with overall course evaluation and enhancement of teaching and evaluation methods to monitor and enhance student learning outcomes.

Because excellence in teaching and advisement are critical to student learning, the BS program director and the BCC are discussing possible changes in course evaluation format to increase their validity and reliability. In addition, the BS course coordinators have asked the director of the Office for Teaching Excellence to develop a peer evaluation plan, so that teaching can be evaluated not only by students but also by experienced colleagues. The graduate program directors and curriculum committees are discussing possible changes in course evaluation format to increase their validity and reliability. Plans to institute more valid and reliable employer surveys and documentation of alumni achievement are also under way.

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

The undergraduate program (BS) outcomes, level and course objectives are reviewed by the BCC to ensure alignment with and responsiveness to projected nursing workforce needs and professional guidelines and standards. The strength of the BS program is evident from the number of applications and enrolled students; the caliber and increasing diversity of the student body; and the retention and graduation rates, employment rates, and alumni satisfaction and success. The consistently high pass rate on the NCLEX-RN by BS graduates, an almost 100 percent employment/graduate school enrollment rate, high graduate satisfaction at the end of program and one and three years post-graduation, and positive feedback on the Employer Rating Scale indicate that the BS program outcomes are being met.

The graduate programs outcomes and course objectives are reviewed by the appropriate curriculum committee to ensure alignment with and responsiveness to projected nursing workforce needs and professional guidelines and standards. The strength of the graduate programs is evident from the numbers of applications and enrolled students; the caliber and increasing diversity of the student body; and the retention and graduation rates, employment rates, and alumni satisfaction and success. The consistently high pass rates on the certification examinations by MSN graduates, an almost 100 percent employment/graduate school enrollment rate, high graduate satisfaction at the end of program and one and three years post-graduation (MSN and PhD), and positive feedback on the MSN Employer Rating Scale indicate that the graduate program outcomes are being met. The prestigious positions obtained by PhD graduates, as well as numerous publications and presentations from their doctoral research, indicate that the PhD program outcomes are being met. The first DNP cohort was admitted in January 2008; the first opportunity to assess program outcomes will be in winter 2010.
Resource allocation at the SON level is informed by the SON assessment plan, the strategic planning process, and assessments of new opportunities and challenges made by the SON leadership and the Faculty Senate standing and ad hoc committees/task forces. Consequently allocations are then made to such projects as (a) the conduct of in-depth degree program review; (b) the support of the Student Outreach Resource Center (SOURCE) and other initiatives to provide students with opportunities for community-based experiences; (c) the implementation of teaching workshops for full- and part-time faculty; (d) the enhancement of the course evaluation process with the inclusion of faculty peer review; (e) the increased recognition of excellence in teaching and advisement; and (f) the maintenance and improvement of the programs’ infrastructure, to name a few.

With regard to the undergraduate program, the value of this linkage is evidenced by the dean’s decision to establish an Office for Teaching Excellence (OTE). Data from students’ evaluation of BS courses, end-of-program satisfaction surveys and BCC reports indicated that students were not always satisfied with the classroom and clinical instruction they received. The Office of Academic Affairs offered a series of faculty development sessions during the 2007–2008 academic year. However, it was apparent that additional resources would be needed to address this issue; with faculty input via an online survey and the work of a faculty/student/staff task force, recommendations for the structure and goals of the OTE were submitted to the dean. A director and co-director have been appointed and planning for the “rollout” of the OTE is under way. In addition to reports at departmental, Faculty Senate and All-School meetings, communication regarding the OTE will be provided via the electronic newsletter The Daily SON, the SON Web site and the SON catalog.

With regard to the graduate programs, an example of the linkage between assessment data, resource allocation, decision making and planning is the decision to design a BS to PhD option for students seeking a research career. Data from student surveys, focus groups and queries to the director of the PhD program indicated that students were often eager to pursue the PhD in preparation for a research career and preferred not to complete a clinically focused MSN first. The PhD program director worked with the PhD Curriculum Committee, the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Student Affairs to design the curriculum, advertise the option, and recruit students. Resources were provided by the dean and the offices of Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to make this a successful curricular innovation.

All course descriptions, learning objectives and course evaluation strategies are available online, as are the academic program descriptions, admission requirements and outcomes. The most recent CCNE accreditation self-study and strategic plan are also posted online.

There are many resources that support student learning assessment. Among them, the centrally supported Computer Network Services (CNS), Audiovisual Services and Division of Marketing and Communication work together to provide online access to course descriptions and aggregate evaluation data, program requirements and outcomes, and instructional materials. Together, they provide the infrastructure to support the SON’s expanding online course offerings and the development of electronic teaching tools. CNS and the new OTE will work with faculty to develop and use new technologies and teaching methods and employ new learning assessment approaches that enhance the learning environment.

This report is replete with examples of how assessments are used to enhance the educational experience for students. Degree program outcomes reflect current and future nursing workforce needs and are aligned with a wide variety of learning opportunities. Course evaluations, annual student satisfac-
surveys and other assessments are used to identify strengths and inform initiatives to address areas needing improvement in the academic programs. The effectiveness of these efforts is confirmed in high retention and graduation rates and outstanding licensure and certification rates.

Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence
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The Peabody Institute Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

The Peabody Institute was founded in 1857, but music instruction only began in 1866. Originally, the Institute had four divisions. Today, it has two, the Peabody Conservatory and the Peabody Preparatory, which was founded in 1894. Since 1977, the Institute has operated as a division of The Johns Hopkins University. The Conservatory has approximately 650 students in three degree programs and three diploma programs, enumerated below. The Preparatory has approximately 2,000 precollege and continuing education students on four campuses.

The Peabody Conservatory supports two student orchestras, a student wind ensemble, a student opera company, two student choruses and myriad chamber ensembles. The number and types of instruments required for these ensembles are determined by the standard repertoire. The programming of standard repertoire is part of the Conservatory curriculum. As a result, the admission of students to staff these ensembles is crucial to the effectiveness of the Conservatory. Yearly assessment of the Conservatory is tied to the admissions cycle.

Peabody is completing (as of May 2009) its first year of Institute-wide strategic planning. The Strategic Planning Committee has set the task of improving strategic management through a regular assessment of the deliverables enumerated in the mission statement and a dynamic response to allocating resources based on that assessment.

The strategic planning initiative at Peabody represents a bold step forward. While Peabody must perform yearly self-assessments for enrollment management, Peabody has relied on the dual accrediting mechanisms of MSCHE and the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) for the scheduling and content of virtually all long-term self-assessment. The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) has also formed a part of establishing our degree programs, while the Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) supervises our Music Education program. Long-term self-review was only undertaken when and where it was required, with little thought to assessing the areas and practices that have not merited special attention. The situation was addressed by the Peabody Change Team (2003–2006), which made significant progress, detailed below. However, the Change Team was derailed by a short period of unprecedented change: Peabody has been led by three directors in five years; in the last year alone, Peabody has replaced all three deans in the Conservatory. However, with new leadership in place, the Strategic Planning Committee is charged with revisiting our mission and procedures and implementing a regular schedule of assessment.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The core values of the university’s mission statement are education, the cultivation of lifelong learning, originality and service to the world. These values are reflected in Peabody’s mission statement:

Through comprehensive excellent education, the Peabody Institute nurtures talent and creativity; provides aspiring musicians from diverse backgrounds 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 (Appendix 27.2.1).
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Peabody’s emerging assessment policy will judge institutional effectiveness on the basis of four key success factors:

1. Attract and retain exceptional students;
2. Provide comprehensive excellent education;
3. Place alumni in successful careers; and
4. Cultivate successful strategic management and supportive student services.

These success factors are already evaluated on a yearly basis, as shown in Figure 13.

**Figure 13**

**The Peabody Assessment Quartet**

---

Peabody attracts and retains students through targeted recruitment. Each applicant is heard in an individual audition and takes exams in Music Theory and Ear-training. At the graduate level, the applicants also take written tests in Musicology. The entire school closes for a week in February to
accommodate these auditions, as the faculty hears well over 1,000 applicants who are applying for approximately 200 openings.

The quality of the Peabody curriculum is assessed by a number of measures that are detailed in the SLOA plan. In the 2008–2009 school year, Peabody conducted an undergraduate curriculum review; plans are in place for a five-year cycle of curricular reviews (Appendix 27.2.5). Alumni will be tracked in a series of surveys. The last survey was in 2002; data from a new survey is currently under review (as of May 2009) (Appendix 27.1.2). Plans are still evolving for the assessment of strategic management. Peabody plans to implement a five-year cycle of strategic planning, scheduled for action between our MSCHE and NASM accreditation periods. The assessment instrument should produce the quality of admissions, peer-benchmark, tuition and alumni data currently under review by the Strategic Planning Committee, and that data should be used to recalibrate resources allocated to admissions, curricular needs, and attracting and retaining the best faculty available.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

Peabody offers three degrees, Bachelor of Music, Master of Music and Doctor of Musical Arts, and three professional diplomas, the Performer’s Certificate, the Graduate Performance Diploma and the Artists Diploma. Three degrees are awarded with the coordination of other Johns Hopkins schools: the double-degree in Performance or Composition and Recording Arts and Sciences in conjunction with the Whiting School of Engineering (WSE), the Bachelor of Music and Bachelor of Arts or of Science double-degree in conjunction with WSE or the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences (KSAS), and the Master of Arts in Recording Arts and Sciences in conjunction with WSE. The requirements for these degrees are based on the guidelines set forth by NASM, and are enumerated in the Peabody catalog, a document that is thoroughly revised every spring. The articulation of the learning outcome for each degree is found in Appendix 27.1.1.

In a 2002 survey of alumni, it was revealed that 74 percent of the 193 respondents still pursue a career related to music, and 69 percent derived over 80 percent of their income from musical pursuits. Although a large number of the respondents are teaching, the breadth of musical pursuits is wide and varied. A sample of the results may be found in Appendix 27.1.2. Peabody is evaluating data from a new survey (May 2009) with more targeted information, particularly regarding the pursuits of recent graduates.

In the five years since the 2004 MSCHE decennial report, Peabody has begun three large-scale self-assessments of institutional effectiveness: the Change Team (2003–2006), a spring 2007 review of the admissions process and institution-wide retreat, and the current Strategic Planning Committee. Some details of these assessments follow.

The first of the three large-scale self-assessments began in 2003 when Robert Sirota, then director of the Institute, impaneled a committee called the Change Team. The Change Team coordinated with an organizational specialist from the university’s Human Resources division. A comprehensive internal review dominated the 2003–2004 academic year, which included:

- a series of retreats for Peabody department heads and other leaders;
- a review of internal work practices and reporting structures;
• coordination with the marketing firm Edelman to gauge the national visibility of the Conservatory; and
• the review of an alumni survey.

After analyzing the data, the Change Team highlighted four areas that needed to be addressed:

• faculty and staff accountability for meeting job objectives;
• communication between areas of the Peabody Institute and with the university;
• assessment and tracking of student success; and
• structures for managing our finances.

The Change Team assembled a series of proposed recommendations to be presented to the senior leadership and vetted the recommendations in a series of five Impact Assessment meetings for the Peabody community. Approximately 70 people attended these sessions. As a result of this feedback, the team adjusted the recommendations and presented them to the director and the deans. The changes that were enacted are described in the next section.

The second large-scale assessment was completed in the spring of 2007, when Peabody reviewed and revised the admissions process. Admissions is a crucial part of the enterprise and essential to the success of all students. The goal is to admit students who will enhance the performing ensembles, which are akin to learning laboratories, and create the best performing opportunities for other students. In this sense, populating the Conservatory is like staffing a football team, in that the school requires students with specific skills. Without the correct mix of students with required skills, all students are adversely affected because the school cannot program the ensemble projects that the curricula require. An example of the kind of planning required is shown in Appendix 27.1.7. A review of documents and working procedures revealed the following:

• Financial aid was not giving due consideration to financial need; financial aid packages were heavily skewed toward a few talented individuals, who tended to consume a disproportionate amount of the available resources;
• Moreover, by fast-tracking the scholarship money, the school ignored important sources of revenue that could have been obtained by requiring students to apply for federal financial aid; and
• Students with special skills required for the ensembles were sometimes overshadowed by exceptionally gifted students in areas where their skills were not as much of a priority. For example, in a year when the orchestra desperately needed a contra-bassoonist, a talented contra-bassoonist might have lost much-needed financial aid that went to an exceptional violinist.

The developing details of this survey were presented to an Institute-wide retreat in May 2007. Thereafter, changes were made to the admissions process, as described in the next section.

Peabody’s strategic planning initiative is the third large-scale self-assessment. This new initiative intends to make the yearly assessment of institutional effectiveness recursive, by implementing a five-year cycle of long-range assessments. The long-range assessments would review yearly assessments as well as the assessments generated as a response to MSCHE and NASM. The current Strate-
Peabody is proud to have one of the lowest student/faculty ratios among benchmark institutions (Appendix 27.1.5). Peabody can also point to the career longevity of the average faculty member as evidence of commitment to the institutional mission. However, the amount of budget allocated for each student is not appreciably higher or lower than that of schools with much higher student/faculty ratios. More analysis is required to determine if budgetary resources are currently allocated in the best interest of our students.

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

The size of the Peabody Conservatory, relative to the other schools of the university, is such that a large percentage of the faculty holds seats on the committees that assess, plan and allocate resources. The faculty held a majority stake in the Change Team and holds a majority stake in the current Strategic Planning Committee. As a result, the same individuals who assess students participate in larger assessment of student learning. As noted in the response to Standard 14, the level of inquiry into learning assessment has been too narrow to date, but the access to planning and resource allocation has been uncommonly generous. Peabody requires the participation of faculty to complete these necessary tasks.

In response to the recommendations of the Change Team on the issues of accountability and communication, detailed in the previous section, the following changes were made:

- The organization of the administration was revised to reflect fewer direct reports to the director between 2004 and 2006.
- The External Relations department was created from the Development Office and the Communications Office in 2005.
- Staff job descriptions were completely rewritten with the oversight of the university by 2005.
- Several training classes specific for Peabody were developed and first offered in 2005, including classes on change management, conflict resolution and personality styles.
- Institute-wide meetings were established in September 2004.
- A documented process for the creation of new committees was established in March 2005.
- Regular student course evaluation was initiated in spring 2005. Peabody’s plan for student course evaluations was a subject of concern in the MSCHE 2004 decennial report. It should be noted that while course evaluations are only reviewed by the administration of the Conservatory, absent a tenure system, the administration makes all decisions about faculty load and compensation.

A more complete summary of implantation of the Change Team recommendations can be found in Appendix 27.1.3-4. The remaining areas that were action items for the Change Team—assessment and tracking of student success, and structures for managing Peabody’s finances—are principal objectives for the current Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee, respectively.
Following the assessment of Peabody’s admissions process, detailed in the previous section, Peabody switched from need-blind financial aid to need-aware financial aid in 2007. All students are required to submit an application for federal financial aid. As a result, the school made a more equitable dispersion of financial aid resources. Moreover, by requiring students to seek federal financial aid, the school enjoyed more overall resources and was able to increase the average financial aid package 20 percent in the first year of implementing the new strategy. Anecdotal evidence suggests the level of performance in our ensembles has increased.

The Peabody Institute
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

Overview
Responding to the Peabody’s self-study for the MSCHE 2004 decennial report, the evaluation team noted: “Assessment is a constant fact of life in a conservatory environment. Auditions, rankings, chair positions, and competitions are an integral part of student life.” Peabody’s assessment of individual students has only increased in the ensuing five years. These procedures are detailed in Appendix 27.2.2. However, Peabody’s assessment of student learning has been too narrowly focused on the present, with little correlation of the yearly outcomes. The ongoing work of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Strategic Planning Committee seeks to remedy this situation with routine assessment mechanisms.

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

Peabody’s mission statement is further amplified by an educational philosophy, clearly articulated in all printed materials:

> The Peabody Conservatory strives to provide aspiring artists with the skills to pursue professional careers in music as well as with the education to become leaders in the cultural life of their communities...

Peabody students go on to occupy the top echelons of the music profession worldwide. However, because they engage in broader, humanistic courses, they also are able to play important roles in society, not just on the concert stage. The Institute’s students and graduates are music entrepreneurs who have a dynamic presence in society, where they are advocates not just for themselves but also for the importance and relevance of music and art in contemporary culture. Peabody’s philosophy reflects its founder’s vision to bring together a community of artists, scholars and teachers to train artists, scholars and teachers. (Appendix 27.2.1)

As an indirect assessment of student learning, the previously treated alumni survey reflects the diverse paths of Peabody alumni as leaders of cultural life (Appendix 27.1.2). Internally, Peabody’s focus has been directed to assessing students’ abilities to pursue professional careers in music.

In general, Peabody has assessed student learning with three mechanisms: internal departmental self-assessments, external departmental reviews and curricular assessment by intradepartmental faculty committees.
Internal departmental self-assessments are the most informal mechanisms to assess student learning. However, given the nature of Peabody’s curricula, it can be the most effective. A student’s progress in mastering the bowing of a string instrument or the diction of the words in a sung passage is hard to capture on an assessment rubric. The departments at Peabody meet monthly to discuss the issues in their classroom and studios. Because many members of the faculty are performing professionals or have teaching engagements at peer institutions, these discussions often have the broader perspective of comparisons to working professionals and students at other schools. Finally, the yearly jury, which is a requirement for all performers, is a means of assessing student learning because faculty members in a department assess the learning of students in other studios. As a result of internal departmental self-evaluations, curricula are reviewed regularly, usually in anticipation of the yearly review of the Conservatory catalog.

An example of departmental self-assessment is captured in Figure 14. See Appendix 27.2.3 for a case study of an actual student.

An external departmental review is a process that is administrated by the Peabody Academic Council, a committee chaired by the president of the university with the provost of the university presiding. In a procedure that resembles an accreditation process, the Academic Council impanels a committee consisting of faculty and senior staff to do a self-study. Consulting faculty from peer institutions are contracted as an evaluation team to review the self-study and visit the campus. The original committee is then directed to respond to the evaluation team’s report and make recommendations. An external review of the Humanities Department is reprinted in Appendix 27.2.4.
Chapter 5 – The Peabody Institute

The Faculty Assembly of the Peabody Conservatory maintains standing committees to review the curricula of undergraduate students, graduate students and doctoral students. These intradepartmental faculty committees, which are co-chaired by the associate dean of academic affairs, do the most thorough assessments of student learning in that they review the progress of students through their degree programs. The Undergraduate Committee reviews grades and sends letters of concern to students who are making insufficient progress. The Graduate Committee performs the same role but is also charged with grading the academic capstone project for each for graduate student. The Doctoral Committee monitors almost every non-major aspect of doctoral students’ residency and candidacy. Of particular note is the preliminary oral exam administered by subcommittees of the Doctoral Committee. As a result of the preliminary exam, the Doctoral Committee can refer a doctoral student back to a specific department for remedial study before progressing in the doctoral program.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

Some examples of student learning assessment by means of internal departmental assessments:

- the yearly for-credit juries of every performer in every degree program by a faculty committee. Each student receives a grade from a major teacher and a grade with written comments from the faculty committee;
- the grading of capstone recitals;
- the yearly audition (independent of the juries) of students for large ensembles;
- a broad colloquy, largely conducted over e-mail, about the Music Theory curriculum in the summer of 2006, in anticipation of the current curriculum review.

Some examples of student learning assessment by means of external departmental reviews:

- a comparison and review of the curriculum of the Humanities Department, 2004–2005, by faculty from peer institutions.
- a comparison and review of the curriculum of the Computer Music Department, 2006–2007, by faculty from peer institutions.
- a comparison and review of the curriculum of the Recording Arts Department, 2007–present, by faculty from peer institutions.

Some examples of student learning assessment by means of intradepartmental faculty committees:

- the monitoring of student progress each semester by the Undergraduate Committee.
- the yearly grading of the capstone writing project for Master of Music students by the Graduate Committee.
- the yearly preliminary oral exam administered by subcommittees of the Doctoral Committee and the oversight of all topics selected for written and oral examinations over the three-to-five-year duration of the degree program.

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

The results of internal departmental assessments are difficult to capture on an assessment rubric. Often, the collaborative grading of student juries results in small but significant changes in pedagogi-
cal approaches. For example, after hearing a slate of 20 violinists, the violin faculty may decide to make changes in their orchestral repertory classes to address a deficit perceived by hearing a cross section of their students. A more significant result would be to inform the administration to allocate more financial aid resources to compete for talented students in key positions. For example, after hearing a slate of 20 brass juries, it may become clear that gifted trumpeters will graduate, and the orchestra and wind ensembles will require two or three “ringers” to shore up the parts for scheduled repertoire.

The results of external reviews are easier to document. A short list follows:

- As a result of the 2004–2005 Humanities Department external review, the Academic Council approved a complete restructuring of undergraduate humanities requirements. Peabody hired an additional professor. A non-music concentration (a minor) was approved based on courses taken at KSAS. Finally, a digital portfolio project was approved as a built-in student-learning assessment.
- As a result of the 2006–2007 Department of Computer Music external review, the Academic Council approved the adoption of a bachelor’s degree in computer music.
- As a result of the 2007–2008 external review of the Recording Arts Department, the Academic Council approved a restructuring of that curriculum and the hiring of a new professor.

Following is a short list of curricular and procedural changes that have been enacted by intradepartmental faculty committees since the 2004 MSCHE decennial report.

- All new courses in the Conservatory curricula were added after a vetting process in the governing committee. Representative classes, each of which addresses a curricular or remedial need, include Anatomy and Injury Prevention for Musicians, Seminar in Opera Stage Directing, French Piano Music and The Business of Music.
- Responding to a need to enforce higher standards in the academic courses, the Undergraduate Committee changed the requirements for acceptable academic standing in April 2008. Undergraduates now must maintain a cumulative and current grade point average of at least 2.50 and a grade of at least B- in their major area (lessons, juries, recitals, hearings).
- The Graduate Committee raised the requirements for acceptable academic standing in April 2008. Graduate students must maintain a cumulative and current grade point average of at least 3.0 and a grade of at least B- in the major area (lessons, recitals, graded hearings) in order to be considered in acceptable academic standing and eligible for graduation.
- Finally, responding to a need to raise the quality of academic writing, the committees raised the minimum requirements on TOEFL scores for international students.

A new intradepartmental faculty committee in 2008–2009 is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This committee (as of March 2009) has made key recommendations to better align our curriculum with the stipulations of NASM, and has sought to build learning assessment instruments into the curriculum. The committee’s recommendations await a vote by the Academic Council and regulatory approval by NASM before an anticipated implementation in the 2009–2010 school year.
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Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence

Appendix 27.1.1 The Learning Outcome for each Degree and Diploma Program
Appendix 27.1.2 Data from the 2002 Survey of Alumni
Appendix 27.1.3 The Change Team’s Announcement of Recommendations
Appendix 27.1.4 The Status of the Original May 2004 Change Team Recommendation as of Summer 2006
Appendix 27.1.5 Benchmark Assessments from the 2008–2009 Strategic Planning Initiative
Appendix 27.1.6 Yearly Assessments of Enrollment Management
Appendix 27.1.7 Example of Yearly Assessment of Enrollment Management for Four Majors
Appendix 27.2.1 The Mission Statement and Educational Philosophy of the Peabody Institute
Appendix 27.2.2 Overview of Student Assessments
Appendix 27.2.3 Example of Student Assessments
Appendix 27.2.4 Example of External Review
Appendix 27.2.5 The Charge of the 2008–2009 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Appendix 27.2.6 Benchmark Assessments by 2008–2009 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Bloomberg School of Public Health
Effectiveness Assessment Plan

Overview

For more than 25 years, the Bloomberg School of Public Health has linked strategic planning with assessment of its enterprises—education, research and practice—to help ensure that the school effectively fulfills its mission. The schoolwide approach is described below. Assessments of units within the school (e.g., departments, degree programs) vary in input and scope but, in general, follow the same dynamic assessment and planning process (Figure 15).

Assess: The school undergoes an accreditation review every seven years, during which an in-depth self-study and external review are conducted to determine how well the school has met the goals and objectives of its strategic plan and to identify strengths and weakness. Following the review, the leadership, faculty, students, staff and alumni engage in a strategic planning process that builds on the accreditation evaluation to further assess the school’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

Plan and Prioritize: Based on this analysis, a new strategic plan is developed that identifies and prioritizes schoolwide goals and objectives and their associated recommendations, as well as monitoring and evaluation metrics.

Implement, Monitor and Evaluate: During the next seven years, the strategic plan recommendations are implemented with ongoing monitoring and evaluation to determine their effectiveness. Based on the monitoring and evaluation and assessments of the changing internal and external environments, a program or activity is maintained, modified, discontinued or initiated, with continued monitoring and evaluation to ensure that the goals, objectives and mission of the school are fulfilled.

Figure 15 – Assessment Cycle
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Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is the oldest and largest school of public health. The school’s mission statement reflects its domestic and international commitment to public health.

The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is dedicated to the education of a diverse group of research scientists and public health professionals, a process inseparably linked to the discovery and application of new knowledge, and through these activities, to the improvement of health and the prevention of disease and disability around the world.

The mission statement also parallels the three-pronged mission of the university, which is:

- to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning (educate scientists and public health professionals),
- to foster independent and original research (discovery of new knowledge), and
- to bring the benefits of discovery to the world (application of new knowledge).

Schoolwide assessment and strategic planning are integrally related and dependent on the participation of faculty, students, staff, alumni and members of the larger school community. The most comprehensive schoolwide self-assessment is conducted every seven years in preparation for accreditation review by the Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH). The self-study is based on 10 CEPH criteria that assess how well the school has met its goals and objectives articulated in its seven-year strategic plan (Appendix 28.1). Following the accreditation site visit, the school undertakes a strategic planning process addressing issues of importance, including those identified during the self-study and accreditation review. The resulting strategic plan becomes the guiding blueprint for the school for the next seven years. It includes goals, objectives and recommendations and identifies metrics to assess their effectiveness (Appendix 28.2). The strategic planning process also reviews the mission statement of the school. During the most recent planning process, it was the consensus that the mission statement, modified in 2000, continues to articulate the school’s mission, and the International Declaration of Human Rights, created in 1992 by the students, faculty and alumni, expresses its values (Appendix 28.3).

Strategic plan goals and objectives are implemented, monitored and evaluated throughout the seven-year cycle by those the plan assigned as responsible. New opportunities and issues are addressed by the school’s leadership during routine meetings of the associate deans and the Committee of the Whole and may also be discussed by standing or ad hoc committees and the Faculty Senate, Advisory Board and Alumni Council (Appendix 28.4). Strategic plan goals and additional pressing issues are also assessed during the annual School Leadership Retreat of deans, department chairs, Faculty Senate leaders and key faculty who chair schoolwide standing committees. Consensus decisions resulting from the three-day retreat also help guide the school during the subsequent years.

Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes

In addition to the schoolwide assessment and planning activities described above, routine and ad hoc effectiveness assessments are conducted by departments, degree programs, centers/institutes, offices/
services, and departmental and schoolwide committees. Assessment examples (Appendix 28.5) include:

- Departmental Self-studies and Reviews
- Degree Program Reviews
- Center and Institute Reviews
- Course Evaluations
- Graduate Exit Surveys
- Assessment of Minority Faculty Recruitment
- Faculty Salary Equity Analyses
- Faculty Exit Interviews
- Annual Faculty Reviews

Quantitative and qualitative assessment methods vary by the entity or issue under review and include routine administrative data and data collected and analyzed for the issue at hand. When apropos, analytic techniques are developed. For example, the Department of Biostatistics developed and conducts an annual analysis of faculty salaries that is reviewed and discussed by the dean and department chairs and used to ensure equitable salary support. Assessments also come from external sources. As examples, the Alumni Council advises on emerging trends in and needs of the public health workforce, and the Health Advisory Board brings its diverse interests and expertise to development issues (Appendix 28.4).

The most recent accreditation self-study determined that all major goals and objectives of the previous strategic plan were met in full or in part, and the subsequent accreditation site visit in 2006 found no significant deficiencies; the school is fully accredited until 2014. Nonetheless, effectiveness assessments continue; examples of recent assessments that led to changes include:

**Education:** Course and degree program evaluations, workforce needs assessments and student exit surveys provide data used to strengthen the school’s academic activities. The departments of Biostatistics and Epidemiology designed new course series to meet the varied needs of students pursuing the school’s 100 professional and research degrees in laboratory, social and quantitative sciences.

**Professional Practice:** Faculty and students engage in professional public health practice through a myriad of activities, organizations and agencies, including the university-based Urban Health Institute and the schoolwide Program in Applied Public Health. Recent external and internal reviews, respectively, led to the Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health assuming administrative responsibilities for the institute and to the reorganization of applied public health activities to form the new Office of Public Health Practice and Training and the appointment of a new associate dean for public health practice and training.

**Research:** Faculty and students depend on centrally supported resources such as the Internal Review Board, Information Systems and the Office of Research Administration. To shorten review time, the Internal Review Board introduced new procedures, based on faculty, staff and student feedback; to provide more efficient and effective support services, Information Systems and the Office of Research Administration are also instituting changes.

---

3 Examples of administrative data include student and academic program data (see Assessment of Learning Outcomes Effectiveness), budget (revenue sources and expenditures), percentage of accepted grant proposals, promotions, appointments, etc.
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The dean, along with associate deans and department chairs, has ultimate responsibility for school-wide assessments and initiatives and their coordination. The associate deans work closely with faculty, staff and schoolwide committees to coordinate activities within the three enterprises, including implementing and monitoring strategic plan recommendations. Although the department chair is responsible for ongoing departmental assessment, planning and implementation, each department undertakes a self-study every five years. A formal review focusing on leadership, administration, and educational and scholarly programs is then conducted by a committee of faculty from other departments appointed by the dean. One year after the review, the chair reports progress in meeting the self-study and review recommendations to the Advisory Board.

The 2008 strategic plan recommends strengthening existing assessment processes. It makes recommendations designed to improve productivity and enhance quality of life by increasing efficiency, effectiveness and coordination of schoolwide resources and to broaden communication and information access. Efforts to increase student course evaluation response rates and initiate routine alumni and employer surveys are under discussion.

Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation

Degree programs innovate based on student and alumni feedback, formal reviews, course evaluations and workforce needs assessments. The school’s online, off-campus and continuing education course offerings continue to expand based on student demand and workforce needs. Approximately 2,000 students are currently enrolled, and continuing education enrollments exceed 10,000 annually. Recent assessments informed the reorganization and expansion of professional practice activities and led to efficiencies in research support systems. Despite increased competition for decreasing National Institutes of Health funding, revenue from research grants and contracts doubled during the past decade; research is conducted in over 100 countries. Faculty serve on the editorial boards of prestigious journals, as elected officers of professional organizations and on committees of such agencies as the World Health Organization, World Bank, National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Institute of Medicine and the National Academy of Sciences.

The Committee of the Whole is routinely apprised of the school’s revenues and expenditures by the senior associate dean for finance and administration and the Finance Committee. The dean is responsible for allocating general funds for central services needed to support the school’s teaching, research and practice programs. Activities such as the school’s long-term building expansion plan are phased in as funds permit. General funds are allocated to departments based on formulas accounting for the department’s contribution to the academic program and research revenue. The formulas allow each department to predict its revenue and make plans for the next year that reflect goals emanating from its standing committees, self-study and external review. Requests for faculty positions originate with the department; however, all professorial positions must be justified by the chair, discussed by the school’s Advisory Board and approved by the dean.

Department chairs have responsibility for sharing schoolwide and departmental assessments, outcomes and changes with their faculties. Members of schoolwide committees, the Faculty Senate and the Student Assembly serve as two-way conduits of information and ideas between the administration and faculty and students. Town hall meetings with students and the dean’s State of the School address

---

4 Reviews are also conducted before the search for a new chair is initiated and external reviewers may serve on the review committee.
are effective methods of sharing schoolwide concerns and accomplishments. Aggregate administrative and course evaluation data, and assessment and planning documents, are posted online. The most recent strategic planning process included round-table discussions with faculty, staff and students to seek feedback and generate ideas. It, nonetheless, identified communication weaknesses and made recommendations to enhance information dissemination about schoolwide issues and decisions, and opportunities for research, practice and collaboration (Appendix 28.2).

The school has long been committed to critical self-evaluation. General funds are allocated to support the comprehensive accreditation self-study and strategic planning process. Departments and the Student Assembly appoint representatives to serve on these and other schoolwide committees. The administration’s commitment to self-assessment is further demonstrated through the appropriation of funds to implement the strategic plan recommendations that have been thoroughly vetted by the school’s constituents and are congruent with the school’s mission and financial resources. In addition, the dean exercises his/her prerogative to appoint ad hoc committees to assess new opportunities and initiatives.

As described above and evident from the most recent accreditation review, the school uses varied and comprehensive effectiveness assessments to monitor the success of its academic, practice and research activities; maintain salary equity for faculty and financial solvency for the school; ensure the highest quality of course instruction and degree programs; facilitate communication and collaboration among faculty; enhance student and junior faculty mentoring; and increase efficiency and effectiveness of centrally supported services for faculty, students and staff, for example. The assessments identify school strengths, as well as challenges and new opportunities, which, in turn, inform planning, introduction of new programs and activities, strengthening or discontinuation of existing ones, allocation of resources and appropriate metrics for ongoing evaluations. This repeating spiral of assessment, planning and implementation occurs schoolwide and in departments, centers/institutes, degree programs and support services to ensure that faculty, students and staff are able to conduct research, engage in professional practice, and teach and learn at the highest levels in Baltimore and worldwide.

**Bloomberg School of Public Health**

**Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan**

**Overview**

The approach used by the Bloomberg School of Public Health to assess learning outcomes begins with assessing future needs in public health from the perspective of curriculum content, changing ways in which students learn and broadening the student base (Figure 16).

**Assess:** Evaluating student learning begins by assessing the future needs of public health researchers, practitioners and the public; reviewing existing degree programs; and evaluating the school’s resources.

**Identify:** These assessments help identify the educational needs of public health students and, in turn, the degree programs, competencies and curricula/learning opportunities the school can offer to meet those needs and help fulfill its mission.
Provide Learning Opportunities: Learning opportunities for students occur in the classroom, laboratory and field, as well as online and via new technologies such as MP3 downloads. Opportunities to improve teaching and mentoring skills are available to faculty through workshops, online resources and faculty-to-faculty mentoring.

Evaluate and Improve: Evaluations of student learning and learning opportunity effectiveness inform efforts to improve curricula, venues and methods for teaching and learning, and related assessment tools.

Figure 16 – Assessment Cycle

Linked Mission, Goals and Assessment Policy

The Bloomberg School of Public Health has been at the forefront of public health education, research and practice since its founding in 1916. The school’s mission and activities align with the mission of the university. Both mission statements emphasize education by putting it first among their three core enterprises—education, research and professional practice. The school’s mission statement also reflects its domestic and international commitment to public health. During the 2008–2009 academic year, the school enrolled approximately 2,000 students from more than 70 countries.

*The Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is dedicated to the education of a diverse group of research scientists and public health professionals, a process inseparably linked to the discovery and application of new knowledge, and through these activities, to the improvement of health and the prevention of disease and disability around the world.*
The relationships among the school’s mission, goals, assessments and strategic planning process are described in the Bloomberg School’s Effectiveness Assessment Plan section, page 119, and are further delineated in Figure 2. Degree programs are accredited by the Council on Education for Public Health. Ensuring that each degree program meets accreditation, school and university requirements is a major component of the school’s accreditation self-study. The self-study also assesses recruitment efforts, admission practices, student demographics, financial assistance, student support services, mentoring, course and degree program evaluations, professional practice opportunities, faculty-to-student ratios, faculty qualifications, graduation rates and other indicators related to academic programs (Appendix 28.6). These assessments and additional analyses of public health education, research, practice and workforce needs inform recommendations made in the school’s subsequent strategic plan, which is aimed at ensuring that the student body is diverse, receives appropriate support and mentoring, and has access to the highest quality of education. For example, as a result of reviews recommended by the 1999 strategic plan, executive boards to oversee the Master of Public Health (MPH) and Doctor of Public Health (DrPH) degree programs were created. As a result of another recommendation, central funds were allocated to develop interdepartmental academic programs.

Linkages at the departmental level are important because all degree programs, except the school-wide MPH program, are departmentally based. They reflect the mission and goals of the department, which, in turn, reflect the multidisciplinary nature of public health. Departmental and MPH degree program assessment, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation parallel those rubrics described under Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness. They are more specifically articulated in the introduction of this document. Departmental self-studies and reviews have led to the creation or merger of departments and changes in degree programs (e.g., creating new or shifting the focus of existing ones) to meet changing public health needs more effectively.

The school offers approximately 100 degree programs, as well as certificates and continuing education courses (Appendix 28.7). The schoolwide admissions and graduation requirements and required methods to assess student learning for each degree are detailed in online policy and procedure memoranda (Appendix 28.8). The schoolwide Committee on Academic Standards, with faculty representation from each department, reviews all new or substantially changed degree programs, courses and certificates to ensure they adhere to the school policies. Within those guidelines, departments and the MPH Executive Board establish specific admission criteria, curricula and learning assessments per degree program.

**Assessment Goals, Outcomes, Measures and Processes**

Student learning assessments occur at the course and degree program level. A description of each course, and its learning objectives and evaluation methods, is available online and used by students to determine if the course will meet or has met their academic needs. Similarly, a detailed description of each degree program, including required and elective course work, competencies and learning objectives, is posted online and/or in student handbooks. Each learning objective is mapped to learning opportunities (e.g., courses, journal clubs, internships, thesis research) and evaluation methods (e.g., course work, examinations, thesis defense) (Appendix 28.9). Degree program requirements and competencies are reviewed by the faculty responsible for the degree program to ensure they align with the school and department mission/goals, public health priorities, research directions and workforce needs. Admission, curricula, graduation criteria and learning assessments are the same for full-
and part-time degree programs.\(^5\) All courses offered by the school, regardless of venue or format, are taught by school faculty.\(^6\) Course objectives, content, requirements and evaluation methods are equivalent for courses taught in more than one venue.

The school uses a variety of direct metrics to assess individual and aggregate student learning. All students complete a culminating experience (capstone, essay, thesis) evaluated by faculty. Doctoral, MPH and some departmental master’s students prepare seminar or poster presentations assessed by faculty and/or external experts. Some laboratory-based programs require graded laboratory rotations with different faculty. All professional MHS students, and MPH students without population-based health experience, complete a mentored internship with preceptor evaluation. MHS, ScM and doctoral students sit for written comprehensive examinations, and doctoral students take oral examinations and defend their theses/dissertations. Each doctoral student meets at least annually with his/her thesis advisory committee made up of the advisor and two to four other faculty from within and outside the department. Following the meeting, the committee prepares a written evaluation of the student’s progress and development that is shared with the student. As a result, each student receives, at a minimum, independent evaluations from course instructors, academic advisors and capstone readers or theses committees. The learning assessment methods for each degree program are included in the program’s competencies.

The school also employs indirect measurements. At the end of each term, students are asked to complete an online evaluation of each course (Appendix 28.10). The quantitative and qualitative assessment includes information about meeting course learning objectives. Department chairs use aggregate results to recognize teaching excellence or provide guidance to instructors if needed. Graduating students are surveyed to evaluate the quality of their mentoring and learning experiences. The MPH program biannually surveys students regarding the curriculum and other program aspects, such as advising. Some departments seek alumni and student feedback through surveys, focus groups, etc. Annual graduation rates for doctoral and master’s students are monitored. There are also independent evaluations of student learning through degree program accreditation and application reviews for the school’s 29 pre-doctoral training grants (Appendix 28.11).

The overarching goal of the school’s degree programs is to graduate students with the knowledge and skills needed to contribute to public health policy, programs, education and research. To that end, degree program competencies and learning objectives are aligned with the requisite knowledge and skills developed through course work, journal clubs, seminars, mentored research and internships, culminating experiences, etc. (Appendix 28.9). In turn, student learning is measured by many different faculty who use methods apropos to each type of learning experience, ranging from assessing group project participation to evaluating oral presentations to rating internship performance.

The current learning assessment processes and activities described above will continue. Degree programs are assessed at the school and departmental level and created and modified, as appropriate, to serve changing public health directions, while serving the school’s mission and student needs. Application, admissions, enrollment and graduation data are tracked by departments, academic deans and the Committee on Academic Standards to help ensure the school maintains its exceptional student body.

\(^5\) The MPH, DrPH and MHS in Occupational and Environmental Hygiene are the only degree programs offered part time; each is also offered full time.

\(^6\) The school offers courses online, in Barcelona, Abu Dhabi and Hong Kong/Singapore (MPH and DrPH only), and condensed-format courses during the Summer and Winter Institutes in Baltimore and the Fall Institute in Barcelona.
Because quality instruction and mentoring are critical to learning, deans and the Committee on Academic Standards are discussing course evaluation changes to increase their representativeness and validity, and additional opportunities to recognize and promote excellence in instruction and mentoring or provide guidance. Course and degree programs in Europe, Asia and the Middle East will be assessed using processes employed in the Baltimore and online offerings, along with site-specific evaluations. A new methodology to track graduation rates is being developed. Plans to institute more routine schoolwide alumni and employer surveys are under way. The 2008 strategic plan recommends a variety of approaches to define, measure, assess and promote quality instruction and mentoring and, thus, enhance learning. For example, the plan recommends that standardized degree program reviews be mandated at each department review (Appendix 28.2).

**Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation**

As described elsewhere, departmental faculty, the MPH and DrPH executive boards, and the Committee on Academic Standards provide ongoing degree program oversight. Each degree program’s competencies and learning objectives are reviewed by degree program faculty to ensure alignment with public health needs and directions. Every course has learning objectives and is evaluated by its students at the end of the term. Each department conducts a self-study and is externally reviewed every five years. Schoolwide initiatives to strengthen academic programs are based on assessments from the accreditation self-study, strategic planning process and other evaluation opportunities. The strengths of the academic programs are evident from the numbers of applicants and enrolled students, the caliber and diversity of the student body, graduation rates, alumni employment and alumni contributions to public health (Appendix 28.15).

Each department chair allocates resources for the departmental degree programs based on assessments of enrollment; student achievement; student, faculty and alumni feedback; and public health needs. At the time of promotion, teaching portfolios, including evaluations of the faculty’s courses and mentoring, are reviewed by the Committee on Appointments and Promotion. Academic program needs are considered when creating new faculty positions.

Resource allocation at the school level is informed by the accreditation self-study, strategic planning process and assessments of new opportunities and challenges made by the school’s leadership, with assistance from the Advisory Alumni Council, Health Advisory Board and standing and ad hoc committees. Allocations are then made to a) establish interdepartmental degree programs and concentration areas and off-site offerings, b) conduct departmental and degree program reviews, c) provide student services, d) support the Student Outreach Resource Center (Appendix 28.16) and other initiatives to provide students with opportunities for community-based public health–related experience, e) hold teaching workshops, f) enhance course evaluations, g) recognize teaching and mentoring excellence, g) support Information Systems, the Center for Teaching and Learning with Technologies and the Multimedia Center, as well as libraries and h) maintain and improve school infrastructure.

---

7 The school received 3,058 applications and enrolled 2,030 students from 75 countries in 2007. Graduation rates are > 95% for full-time MPH students, ~ 90% or more for other master’s students and ~ 70% (within 8 years) for doctoral students. Continuing education enrollment exceeds 10,000 each year.
(classrooms, teaching technologies, computer services, and laboratories and other research and practice facilities).

All courses and their descriptions, learning objectives and aggregate student evaluation assessments are available online, as are descriptions of all degree programs and their requirements, competencies, learning opportunities and evaluation methods. The most recent accreditation self-study, current and past strategic plans, and policy and procedure memoranda are also posted online.

Many of the resources that support learning assessment have been described (see Linked Assessment Results, Planning and Resource Allocation, p. 122). Among them, the centrally supported Information Systems, Center for Teaching and Learning with Technologies and the Multimedia Center work together to provide online course descriptions and evaluations, degree program requirements and competencies, and teaching workshop materials. They provide the infrastructure needed to expand online course offerings and develop and maintain electronic teaching tools. Their education design specialists work with faculty to develop course objectives, use new technologies and teaching methods that enhance the learning environment, and employ new learning assessment approaches.

This report is replete with examples of how assessments are used to enhance the student’s educational experience, ranging from determining the degree programs to identifying appropriate technologies to enhance learning. Degree programs are assessed and modified, as appropriate, to ensure the highest quality of teaching and mentoring. They and their degree program competencies reflect current and future public health needs and are aligned with learning opportunities. Course evaluations, student surveys, and other routine and ad hoc assessments identify strengths and inform initiatives to ameliorate weaknesses in the academic programs. The effectiveness of these efforts was confirmed in the most recent accreditation self-study and external review, and their continued importance is reflected in the new strategic plan.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**
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Chapter 6 – Planning and Budgeting Processes

The mission of The Johns Hopkins University is “to educate its students and cultivate their capacity for lifelong learning, to foster independent and original research, and to bring the benefits of discovery to the world.” This statement gives equal weight to instructional, research and service components of our mission, with global dimensions. The weight and mix of these three components of the university-wide mission differ across the divisions, making each planning, evaluation and resource process unique by intent and design. Divisions produce the building blocks that form the foundation for producing an integrated institution-wide plan.

Johns Hopkins’ leadership currently plans and prioritizes the pursuit of this mission in the following ways: growing support for financial aid for students; recruiting, retaining, developing and diversifying our world-class faculty; and making investments to synergize interdisciplinary efforts aimed at making the whole more than a sum of its constituent parts. These efforts would not be possible without the strength and commitment of the trustees and the significant support of donors, federal and state governments, and our foundation partners. Johns Hopkins University has well-defined priorities and measures of success, described in Chapters 3 and 5, which are continually reviewed and updated.

World-class faculty and students are the critical elements of a university, none more so than Hopkins. The opportunities for collaboration in an environment so rich in intellectual, physical and technological support are what attract and retain the best and brightest from around the world to keep Hopkins our nation’s leader in research. Maintaining this leadership is our goal and commitment. In the context of pressure on traditional revenue sources, changing demographics, evolving interdisciplinary knowledge bases and accelerating scientific discovery, and increasing competition for talent, maintaining pre-eminence requires strategic thinking, coordinated planning, and effective and efficient institutional processes.

Though appropriately articulated in different ways, the mission statements, planning and budget processes of the divisions and university ensure effective coordination toward these common goals. Chapter 5 outlined the division-specific planning; evaluative-specific resource allocation decisions made at all levels of the university administration—institutional, provost, schools and department—are driven by these respective missions. The process described herein depicts how the separate planning, evaluation and resourcing processes of the divisions at separate sites articulate into an integrated institution-wide plan for achieving the collective and separately articulated missions.
Organizational Context

As noted earlier, Johns Hopkins University is a decentralized university by design. Its institutional culture and processes value innovation and empowerment of researchers and departmental leaders on the front lines of education and research. This decentralization by design is equally true of our resource allocation and resource allocation processes. Ninety-six percent of revenues reside at the level of dean or below. Planning the allocation of the people, time and money in pursuit of mission begins at the divisional level. Coordinating resources allocation and planning efforts in such an environment requires that Johns Hopkins University plan for the future thoughtfully, with multiple planning processes at many levels within the organization (Figure 17).

Planning, accreditation, evaluation and resourcing activities occur regularly within functional areas, divisions, departments and programs, both in the academic and nonacademic realms. These activities supplement and support the larger institutional priorities, and provide direction at the local level. As will be highlighted in this chapter, planning at Hopkins is a continual and iterative process focused on fulfilling institutional and unit priorities, and identifying, allocating and reallocating resources, as necessary, to address a dynamic set of objectives and opportunities.
Academic Strategic Planning

Academic planning drives the budget and resourcing processes. Deans use assessment efforts, both institutional effectiveness and learning assessments, in the planning processes within departments and across schools and divisions. Johns Hopkins finished a comprehensive strategic plan in 1994. That plan served as a blueprint for the expansion of the university’s global influence, a building campaign that has nearly doubled Johns Hopkins’ teaching and research space, and two development campaigns that collectively raised more than $5 billion. The more recent Framework for the Future, discussed earlier, provides the foundation for the university’s next steps, and importantly, included a focused effort to assess the ways and means for resourcing the identified strategic priorities. The Ways and Means working group developed planning and financing mechanisms to invest in intellectual, administrative and physical environments in order to foster creative scholarship and learning.

The provost, deans and directors of all the divisions, as well as the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees, meet regularly to review the strength of programs and establish and pursue academic priorities. These reviews include overarching priorities for each major discipline as well as identification of the need for resource allocation to support those priorities. These reviews also feed into development campaign priorities to ensure alignment between fund raising and academic priorities.

The responsibility for assessing student learning—and integrating resource planning to support it—is placed at the most appropriate institutional level. Given the decentralized culture at Johns Hopkins University, the schools are assigned the responsibility for assessment. They do so generally under the leadership of a senior administrator whose portfolio includes relevant academic affairs responsibilities and who functions as a School Assessment Coordinator. This individual provides coordination and oversight of a school’s assessment of student learning and collaborates with school faculty and staff to foster “a culture of assessment.” It rests with faculty in departments and programs to specify appropriate learning outcomes and measures and to use the results of assessment to improve academic programs. The divisions are charged to integrate these efforts with the institutional planning and resource allocations aimed at improving school effectiveness.

School assessment coordinators will also serve on the newly created Standing University Committee on Assessment. This standing committee evolved from the collective work of these coordinators, many of whom served as members of the 2009 Periodic Review Report Committee. Reporting to the provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, this body serves, university-wide, as a consultant and authority on outcomes assessment and university effectiveness. It will coordinate and support assessment activities across multiple schools and major administrative units. The assistant provost for institutional research serves as a member of this committee and acts as a resource for assessment efforts. The current role and involvement of the Office of Institutional Research in support of institutional advancement are described briefly in Appendix 29. Another member of this standing committee is the vice president for finance who coordinates the finance and planning-related outcome data, provides analysis and writes reports with a university-wide focus that integrate student learning, school effectiveness and resource allocations.

Resource Planning and Management

Resource planning deadlines are timed to coincide with the ongoing calendar by which the provost works with the deans to use academic strategic plans and information within the budget processes.
that follow to match goals to resources. Resource allocation is the result of a thoughtful process of self-examination and is an inherent part of ongoing activities.

University budgeting, as with student assessment and evaluation, is a decentralized, bottoms-up process with each school, center or institute individually developing their budgets within general university guidelines. It is important to understand that the individual operating units are the primary generators of funding, mainly through instruction, research, clinical service and philanthropy. The overwhelming majority (roughly 96 percent) of the funds remain with the operating unit that generated the funds, with only a small portion reallocated to the cost of running the central administration.

Each division employs a division business officer (DBOs) who works alongside the dean to guide financial decision making and planning and to oversee financial activity within the unit or college and to create an annual budget for the college. These DBOs also have functional working relationships with the executive vice president for finance and administration, the university controller, and the executive director of financial analysis and planning, helping to ensure financial coordination at the university level.

Each division within Hopkins is responsible for setting both short-term and long-term goals for its unit and planning strategies to meet those goals. The goals are informed and influenced by the more comprehensive institutional-level priorities. The provost reviews the plans via an annual report process to ensure they support and further Hopkins’ broader mission. Each school has curriculum review processes in place to change and/or improve educational programs. Moreover, the schools have aspirations for scholarly activity appropriate to the institution’s purpose and character.

The linkage of academic planning, university priorities and resource allocation is inherent in the budgeting and planning functions of the university. The provost and senior vice president for finance and administration ensure this alignment. Together, they review and regularly monitor the budgets developed by the deans in consultation with department chairs. The joint hearings that they hold early each year work to ensure that the divisional plans and budgets reflect a coordinated, thoughtful and effective use of resources aligned to the pursuit of goals for the division and the university as a whole.

In order to ensure that appropriate processes are in place for each school, the provost and each dean will undertake, beginning in fiscal year 2011, a review, once every five years, of a school’s existing school effectiveness and student learning outcomes assessment plans. Each dean and the divisional business officer will be asked to share and discuss details about the ongoing linkage between school assessment results, the use of results for school advancement purposes over a five-year time horizon, and how such adjustments and revisions have been incorporated into the school’s assessment plans. Each year two schools will undertake the review; all nine will have done so over the course of five years. The process will, of course, provide for additional discussion and review as special circumstances arise.

In addition to the direct involvement of deans and department chairs, the faculty is provided information and input in the budget and planning processes. For example, the Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) of the university faculty involves 13 faculty members representing the nine schools of the university. The FBAC reviews budget and planning assumptions prior to the development of the plan, is presented the annual budget and five-year plan, and receives regular updates on resource and administrative issues that affect faculty and students.
This process results in aligning the divisional statements of mission and efforts toward student learning, institutional effectiveness and program evaluation into a comprehensive, coherent and resourced plan for achieving the university’s missions in teaching, research and practice (Figure 18).

Figure 18

The resourcing piece of this plan is embodied in Hopkins’ budget and five-year financial plan (see Appendix 5) published each May. The plan is predicated on the budget policies and planning assumptions approved by the provost and Board of Trustees. Schedules show the overall university plan and also present the plan’s divisional components. The annual publication of the operating and capital financial plans includes each college’s individual operation plans as well as summary plans for other major operational segments. The narratives of the divisions in the publication highlight the initiatives that are either under way or being planned, along with the implications and challenges for the divisional resource plan. The result is an integration of the financial plan with the academic, research and practical mission(s) for each division.

The Board of Trustees through its Finance Committee regularly monitors progress against the budget and long-range plans, explicitly linking the financial status of the division to its ability to achieve its mission. The university’s financial results are presented in their entirety to the Trustee Finance Committee four times each year. The Finance Committee first reviews and recommends action or approval of the year-to-date and projections of all revenue and expenses. The Trustee Finance Committee also approves estimates of tuition (based on enrollment projections compiled by Institutional Research and Planning in consultation with the divisions), endowment and temporary investment income, state of Maryland appropriations, salary and benefit costs, expenses related to new initiatives, scholarship/financial aid increases, utilities, and other miscellaneous income and expenses.
Input from revenue-generating units is sought, as is information from major expenditure-producing units, such as the Benefits and Facilities. In addition, administrative units throughout the university contribute to resource management and development for the benefit of the whole. For example, the Office of Human Resources is leading institution-wide efforts aimed at more effective talent management and organizational development.

Hopkins’ complexity, decentralization and focus on innovation demand careful and coordinated planning efforts, but the organization would not be best served by a one-size-fits-all process. Johns Hopkins’ history demonstrates its unique ability to grow and adapt planning processes and resource allocation to fit current objectives and institutional needs. Perhaps the most significant example of this is the realignment of the relationship between the Hopkins Health System and the Johns Hopkins University’s School of Medicine. Developed over a decade ago and evolved over time, the thoughtful organizational design of Johns Hopkins Medicine provided clearer and more enduring working relationships that recognize both distinct goals and missions and the synergies of the two legal entities working together in a collaborative way through the structure of Johns Hopkins Medicine.

**Divisional Budgets and Plans**

Within a decentralized university, individual divisions at Johns Hopkins hold accountability for their financial results and resource allocation toward their distinct missions. Historically, the financial strength of the divisions has varied, with several in good financial positions and others less so. For example, in the past the School of Nursing and the Johns Hopkins University Press faced financial challenges. These units now generate annual surpluses. The School of Engineering faces financial challenges at this point, but the plan reflects a measured approach to move toward financial health. The key to financial strength at Hopkins is that each division has an achievable plan to address financial challenges when they arise and to make sustained progress toward their academic plans and missions.

The divisions differ markedly in their reliance on particular revenue sources and the relative importance of the aspects of the mission (academic, research and clinical), and thus they face different challenges, requiring division-specific strategies to maintain financial health. For example, the School of Medicine and the Bloomberg School of Public Health must protect the positions they occupy as the number one recipients of sponsored research funding for schools of their kind while being attentive to their academic mission. In the current environment, both schools expect lower research growth and are able to address this trend, absorb the cost of substantial research space constructed in recent years and still generate operating surpluses. The School of Medicine will use these surpluses and accumulated reserves to fund its capital program. The Bloomberg School is slowing increases in operating expenses and curtailing facility renovations. In addition, it will continue the planned spending of a large gift for malaria research received in prior years.

The Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering derive the bulk of their revenue from tuition, but research is also an important component of their budgets. Consequently, they have the task of combining the need for student-oriented management of their instructional programs with the demands of maintaining their research. The Krieger School is planning small increases in enrollment targeted to disciplines with teaching capacity, while the Whiting School is implementing a plan to increase graduate enrollments.

The Peabody Institute; the schools of Nursing, Advanced International Studies and Education; and the Carey Business School are heavily weighted toward instruction and therefore must focus on
enrollment management, student services, financial aid and market-based pricing. It is critical for them to monitor market trends and adapt to student needs. Each of these schools has developed a plan to balance budgets and generate surpluses in the out-years of the plan.

**Units That Serve Divisions of the University**

Other academic and service units beyond the nine schools operate within similar processes and expectations for integrated planning and budgeting. Many of these units exist to ensure coordinated delivery and financing of key aspects of student and academic life.

Three examples illustrate the importance of these other university units in servicing the constituent divisions. The Homewood Student Affairs (HSA) division includes all non-academic functions that support the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering. The departments within HSA include student life functions, admissions and enrollment, financial aid administration, athletics, student health and wellness, ROTC, housing and dining, and other services. Financial aid and HSA’s operating expenses are funded by allocations from the Krieger and Whiting schools. Housing and Dining Services at the Homewood campus are managed by HSA and are self-supporting.

The Sheridan Libraries successfully play a central role in the intellectual and social life of all members of the Johns Hopkins community. The capital budget for the Sheridan Libraries includes one major project focused on students, a learning commons adjacent to the Eisenhower Library on the Homewood campus. The Brody Learning Commons is a $30 million new library building planned now for FY 2013.

Within the decentralized culture that defines Johns Hopkins University, University Administration is planned and budgeted as a self-standing entity that provides coordinated post-award research administration, accounting, legal, talent development and recruitment, development, coordination of substantive academic program change, liaison with university peers and national organizations, and community affairs support to their divisional counterparts. University Administration depends to a significant degree on resource support from the divisions to achieve these goals. This relatively unique relationship ensures accountability and alignment between central administration and divisional leadership.

University Administration also provides academic leadership and seeks to address comprehensive efforts such as faculty diversity and retention and incentivizing interdisciplinary efforts. The Mosaic Initiative is one example of these efforts. University Administration will provide at least $5 million over the next five years in matching funds for departments seeking to improve faculty diversity, including hiring and retaining outstanding women and underrepresented minorities.

These efforts to synergize cross-divisional efforts are made increasingly possible by efficient and effective management of central operations. University Administration continuously seeks to improve efficiency of business operations that support the divisions so that resources stay focused on the academic enterprise. Shared service centers, such as Payroll, Benefits, and Accounts Payable/Receivable, have been established with a goal of consolidating services and reducing costs across the divisions. Expenses for centrally provided services and support are recovered using various allocation models. The operating costs for these departments are recovered through allocations throughout the divisions of the university and from the health system. In addition, the chief investment officer now serves
as the portfolio manager for both the university and health system endowments. Leadership from University Administration and the divisions are taking the next steps in these efforts through planning aimed at revenue and cost moves to generate resources that can be reprogrammed to the academic enterprise.

Generally, these units have flexibility equal to the divisions’ but are responsible for effective coordination to ensure that their plans meet the needs and expectations embodied in the other divisional plans.

As will also be shown next, central administration plays many roles in resource planning that are critical to the functioning of the university.

**Consolidated Planning and Monitoring**

Johns Hopkins University has strong centralized oversight systems with systematic monitoring of financial performance and risk. Attention to financial management issues permeates the institution. Central administration as well as the divisional deans and directors and their fiscal officers are all key participants in the fiscal management of Hopkins. Trustees are attentive to financial issues and provide an important oversight of the management of resources and monitoring of results. New systems are beginning to generate information to allow management to track and analyze relevant trends using data never before available.

There are numerous strategies the university uses to manage financial risk to ensure divisions successfully meet their planned objectives. Conservative budgeting has been a hallmark of the university’s financial planning process. Divisions typically forecast conservative revenue attainment. For example, several schools are projecting flat enrollments in the long-term plan. Most schools budget levels of gift revenue that are often exceeded. Research activity is budgeted to grow from base levels below recent experience. Finally, there are reserves and some contingency funds budgeted to address unforeseen needs that may occur during the year.

*Diversifying revenue streams*, while focusing on core missions, is a strategy for several divisions consistent with their missions. The School of Medicine supports a continuing medical education program that provides a stream of revenue outside its clinical and research programs. It is also investing in technology transfer activities. The Applied Physics Laboratory continues to expand its sponsor base beyond the historical relationship with the Navy to the other military branches and NASA. The Peabody Institute and the School of Nursing, as well as smaller programs like the Center for Talented Youth, are leveraging their expertise and raising revenue through international ventures. Finally, the Krieger and Whiting schools, the Carey Business School and the School of Education operate successful part-time programs that generate net revenue.

*Preparing to adjust for slower growth* in sponsored research is an emphasis, especially as it relates to facilities that are not easily scaled to a lower level of activity. The schools of Medicine and Public Health, notably, lease a significant amount of space for research and administrative activities that can be consolidated if the need arises. Also, a large fraction of their investigators are not tenured faculty, so personnel reductions could be accomplished if sponsored research declined.

Lastly, *maintaining strong reserves and sound fiscal practices* is a means of buffering divisional plans from financial cycles. The university’s strong financial performance has accounted, in part, for
the building of reserves. Reserves grew by 26 percent from FY 2001 to FY 2007. Reserves are projected to end above budgeted levels in FY 2008, at $632.9 million rather than $612 million. Reserves decline through FY 2011 before growing again in FY 2012 and FY 2013.

**Campaign Planning and Fund Raising**

Fund raising is another means by which central administration facilitates efforts to achieve the missions of the divisions in a coordinated way. The success of the earlier referenced fund-raising campaign known as Knowledge for the World illustrates the point. The aim of our fund-raising efforts is to better position Johns Hopkins, within an increasingly complex and globalized society, to teach, discover and put knowledge to work for humanity.

The core of any campaign is the institutional strategy it is designed to address. Questions critical to campaign planning start with the academic leadership and a focus on the institution’s future:

- What big ideas will drive the institution?
- What does Hopkins desire to be in 2020 and beyond?
- What strategic opportunities exist for Hopkins to build on its international reputation and distinction?
- What are the pressing needs/challenges and opportunities that should be addressed to strengthen Hopkins overall and to compete more effectively for the best and brightest students, faculty and staff?
- How should Hopkins capitalize on its competitive advantages to be at the forefront of new discovery?
- What will the university’s funding architecture look like?
- What role will private gift support play in achieving this vision?
- What percentage of the budget should come from gifts? From the endowment?

These questions are based on the institution’s core academic vision and priorities. Led by the president and provost, academic leaders have the responsibility of developing these plans. Involvement in this planning will come in the form of a post-campaign working group composed of over a dozen trustees, the president and provost, and senior development officers. Fund-raising priorities and strategies will emerge from the planning effort. In fact, all development and alumni relations decisions should be centered on the pursuit of this academic-based strategic plan. One of the most important outcomes of the institution’s strategic plans will be the specific campaign objectives and the big ideas that will drive the success of the campaign. This group has been meeting since last summer and advising/partnering with the Office of Development and central administrative leadership in the pre-campaign exploration process.

The results of this process are campaign priorities directly aligned with institutional priorities, including those for student learning and institutional effectiveness across the university’s divisions as noted in earlier descriptions of the programmatic results of the campaign.
Capital Planning

The space and facilities needs of the university are met through an extensive capital planning process driven by academic priorities and long-range, coordinated and interdivisional campuswide master plans for each of the major campuses. The annual capital planning and budgeting process begins with the re-evaluation of the incumbent capital plan against long-range master plans to assure they match the changing needs at the operating unit level. Program needs are refined, facility plans are developed, and the associated capital projects and related operating costs are evaluated. Capital plans become integrated into Hopkins’ operating and capital budget processes, leading to an eventual review and approval by the Buildings and Grounds and Finance committees, followed by the full Board of Trustees. A plan is prepared for each capital project that details:

- the project’s full costs, including project-specific infrastructure requirements;
- all funding and financing sources (if debt financing is employed), including a cash inflow schedule;
- a project schedule, including workload and cash outflow requirements; and
- an estimate of and funding plan for the operating and maintenance costs created by the project.

The university’s capital budget and plan consolidate the individual project plans into a “big picture” view of facilities projects that includes their economic and operational impacts. Projects are evaluated in relation to the university’s academic and other priorities. The planned schedule of projects describes cash flow requirements that must be anticipated. University administrators and divisional business officers work to assure that capital projects address the university’s deferred maintenance and that annual operating and maintenance costs are factored into facilities maintenance and operating budgets.

Other planning efforts related to the university’s facilities plans include:

- campus master planning, which allows Hopkins to consider the physical implications of expansion as well as densification on land and infrastructure and to establish guidelines for long-term growth;
- space utilization and allocation studies, which help Hopkins better utilize its existing facilities;
- university debt planning, led by the university treasurer, which enables the institution to make maximal beneficial use of taxable and nontaxable debt proceeds;
- planning designed to address and manage the university’s deferred maintenance inventory; and
- infrastructure planning for utilities, transportation, and the voice and data networks.

These efforts are sometimes undertaken to evaluate a particular area or address a specific issue, and at other times the efforts are conducted with a more global campus view.

The Changing Fiscal Context

One example of the capacity for shared financial leadership of trustees, central administration, divisional deans and directors, and their fiscal officers is the recent effort to adapt ordinary processes and actions to respond effectively to the current and extraordinary fiscal crisis. The president, provost,
deans and senior administration convened to discuss approaches to preparing for financial consequences of current market turmoil.

With guidance from the central budget office, divisions presented a series of revenue assumptions for key categories likely to be affected by market declines, job losses, and the changing federal and state budget situations. Deans and their fiscal officers worked with the Budget Office to re-evaluate revenues and expenditures for Fiscal Years 2009, 2010 and 2011 against the incumbent five-year plan to quantify the potential impact on divisional resources and programmatic priorities. Divisions and central administration developed and prepared to implement expenditure and productivity measures needed to close revenue gaps identified. These efforts fed directly into the development of revised planning assumptions for tuition, financial aid and enrollment. One of the central forces driving this discussion was a focus on maintaining support for current students and their families in the changing economic climate. Another force was the importance of addressing the changing revenue picture while maintaining commitment to student programming and service level expectations.

The results of these efforts were presented to the Board of Trustees, who provided feedback and guidance. Through this examination, trustees, the president, the provost, deans and other senior leadership secured confidence that management had appropriately and proactively focused efforts internally to adjust planning assumptions, spending and budgets to the changing economic climate and to prepare for the external changes that may make access to cash or credit more difficult.

In preparing the Five-Year Plan (FY 2010–FY 2014), divisions and central administration are looking at the changing resource context as an opportunity to revisit and renew programmatic commitments, to focus on the core mission and to better integrate assessment, learning, effectiveness and resource allocation.

**Overview of Supporting Documentary Evidence**
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Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Certification Statement:
Compliance with MSCHE Eligibility Requirements
& Federal Title IV Requirements

An institution seeking initial accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation must affirm that it meets
or continues to meet established MSCHE eligibility requirements and Federal requirements relating
to Title IV program participation by completing this certification statement. The signed statement
should be attached to the Executive Summary of the institution’s self-study report.

If it is not possible to certify compliance with all eligibility requirements and Federal Title IV
requirements, the institution may attach specific details in a separate memorandum.

___________________________________________________ is seeking:
(Name of Institution)

(Check one) ☐ 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 and Federal requirements relating to Title IV
program participation.

☐ Exceptions are noted in the attached memorandum
(Check if applicable)

_________________________________  ____________________
(Chief Executive Officer) (Date)

_________________________________  ____________________
(Chair, Board of Trustees or Directors) (Date)
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A General Institutional Description

As the 1983 Accreditation Team noted in its on-site visit and subsequent report, Johns Hopkins University is a “decentralized institution, reserving to its academic divisions a large degree of independence in faculty governance, curricula, admissions, budgetary operations, and planning.” The Middle States Commission on Higher Education recognizes Johns Hopkins’ Carnegie institutional classification of “research/very high research activity” and also ranks us as a “single institution at multiple sites.” Following is a brief orientation to the manner by which these three descriptors apply to Johns Hopkins. The statement borrows, liberally, from prior accreditation documentation in order to bring forward relevant history and also includes updates that convey a current picture of the university.

Mission

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 through discovery and integrates that tradition into its undergraduate, graduate and professional programs. Hopkins’ first president, Daniel Coit Gilman, so eloquently laid out the university’s charge that, for more than 133 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:

“If we would maintain a university, great freedom must be allowed both to teachers and scholars. This involves freedom of methods to be employed by the instructors on the one hand, and on the other, freedom of courses to be selected by students (1876).”

The occasion of Johns Hopkins’ 2004 decennial reaccreditation process provided an opportunity to begin reflecting on our institutional mission and, ultimately, to formulate the following statement, more succinct than Gilman’s artful declarations but equally true to our heritage as our sense of our future:

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

The respective missions of Johns Hopkins’ nine academic divisions flow from one overarching university mission.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University Krieger School of Arts and Sciences is discovery—the creation of new knowledge through research and scholarship, and the education of our students, undergraduate and graduate alike, through immersion in this collaborative process. The school’s unique character, above all, derives from its commitment to choose carefully what is worth pursuing and to do so without compromise.
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The Johns Hopkins University *Carey Business School*, a premier humanistic learning community, develops global business leaders and transforms organizations, communities and society through discovery, entrepreneurship and engagement.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University *School of Education* is to support and advance the quality of education and human services for the continuous development of children, youth and adults through teaching, research, program development, leadership and service.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University *Whiting School of Engineering* is to provide knowledge for the world through innovative research that leads to improved quality of life and enhances the safety and security of future generations; an education, grounded in fundamental scientific principles, that prepares students to solve the complex, technology-based problems of the 21st century; and the world’s next generation of engineering leaders through creative curricula and programs that instill ethical values, an appreciation for the importance of diversity, an entrepreneurial spirit and a love for learning.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University *Nitze School of Advanced International Studies* is to provide an interdisciplinary professional education that prepares a diverse graduate student body for internationally related positions of responsibility; to foster research, scholarship and cross-cultural exchange; and to contribute knowledge, expertise and leadership to the global community.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University *School of Medicine* is to educate medical students, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows in accordance with the highest professional standards; to prepare clinicians to practice patient-centered medicine of the highest standard; and to identify and answer fundamental questions in the mechanisms, prevention and treatment of disease, in health care delivery and in the basic sciences.

The mission of the Johns Hopkins University *School of Nursing* is to improve the health of individuals and diverse communities locally and globally through leadership and excellence in nursing education, research, practice and service.

Through comprehensive excellent education, the *Peabody Institute of Johns Hopkins University* nurtures talent and creativity (Preparatory); provides aspiring musicians from diverse backgrounds with 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 (Conservatory).

The Johns Hopkins University *Bloomberg School of Public Health* is dedicated to the education of a diverse group of research scientists and public health professionals, a process inseparably linked to the discovery and application of new knowledge, and through these activities, to the improvement of health and the prevention of disease and disability around the world.

While the overlying focus of the Johns Hopkins University *Applied Physics Laboratory* is on national security in the oceans, land and air, its mission is much broader and includes fostering educational growth, supporting economic development and being an active leader in the local community.
General Institutional Description

The establishment of the School of Arts and Sciences in 1876 (now the Krieger School) was followed by the opening of The Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1889 and the School of Medicine in 1893, both crucial developments in the emergence of modern scientific medicine. In 1909 the university initiated a pioneering evening division (then called the Evening College) offering college-level courses for part-time students. A school of engineering began operations in 1913 and existed until 1966 as a separate division, being re-formed in 1979 as the G. W. C. Whiting School of Engineering. The founding of the School of Hygiene and Public Health (now the Bloomberg School of Public Health) in 1917 addressed significant intellectual and social health problems by incorporating for the first time education and research in the scientific disciplines of public health. Formed in 1942 to meet the crisis of World War II, the Applied Physics Laboratory (APL) became a division of the university in 1948 and continues Johns Hopkins’ important public mission in the area of national security. In the same timely fashion, the School of Advanced International Studies (and since 1989 the Paul H. Nitze School) became a part of the Johns Hopkins Institutions in 1950, when foreign relations had taken on extraordinary complexity and required men and women with exceptional international studies training. Affiliation with the Peabody Institute (1977) and establishment of the Whiting School of Engineering (1979) were, likewise, responses to a need for fresh approaches to artistic, scholarly, pedagogical and social problems.

In Baltimore, Johns Hopkins has three separate campuses and a Downtown Center, which is the home of the Carey Business School faculty and instructional complex. The Applied Physics Laboratory is located in Howard County, Maryland, midway between Baltimore and Washington, D.C. The Columbia Center instructional facility that serves both the Carey Business School and the School of Education is also located in Howard County. In Montgomery County, Maryland, a multidivisional center was opened in 1988. In Washington, D.C., the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies has its main location, with centers in Bologna, Italy, and Nanjing, the People’s Republic of China. In 1992, the university’s presence in Washington, D.C., was expanded to include a multidivisional initiative in part-time programs, located in the Rome Building of the Nitze School. That presence expanded later into leased educational facilities in the adjacent Airline Pilots Association building and, again subsequently, into the university-owned, renovated Bernstein-Offit educational building.

It is important to note that implied in any description of Johns Hopkins and its historical development—and critical to the understanding of Johns Hopkins—is the adjective most often used in reference to the institution’s persona: decentralization. The decentralized nature of Johns Hopkins is both an accurate determinant of its organizational and operational reality and an integral component of its tradition and institutional mythology.

Decentralization means many things at Johns Hopkins. What it mostly means is that the university is a loose collection of academic units, its nine schools, several independent institutes and centers, and Applied Physics Laboratory each having a large degree of autonomy. This characteristic does not end at the unit level; it can be found at the departmental and individual faculty member level, such that independence and latitude are vigorously exercised throughout the institution’s many organizational layers.

The concrete manifestations of decentralization abound. A few key examples should suffice to emphasize the point. Organizationally (and comparatively), University Administration is smaller than what one would expect to find at a major research university. Each school has a full and some-
what parallel administrative structure though which a large majority of work is done—in finances, development, alumni affairs, student services, instructional technology, etc. Conversely, for example, University Administration has no central office for student affairs, or other areas that would be quite common elsewhere.

Financially, the academic divisions have direct control over the bulk of their revenues and expenditures once the university’s annual budget is adopted by the trustees. Almost all monies, whether they be tuition and fees, facilities and administrative recoveries (indirect costs), endowment income, or sponsored research, flow directly to the divisions and are not centrally controlled, much less distributed. In general terms, the university is governed fiscally by the “each tub on its own bottom” approach. Surpluses, where they exist, are retained by the generating school, and deficits are generally addressed, as well, at the local, school level.

Any discussion, however, of five minutes or longer with anyone at Johns Hopkins on the subject of decentralization will turn naturally to its pluses and minuses. The concept and reality of decentralization are neither wholly one nor the other. The balance, for most, is clearly in favor of keeping decentralization as an embrasive feature. It allows full scope for responsibility and initiative where most believe they should reside: at the level where real decisions are best made. But everyone recognizes that there are downsides to this defining feature: overcompartmentalization, parochialism, the inability to readily take advantage of crosscutting opportunity, inefficiencies due to redundancies and to lack of coordinated planning in common areas, the lack of university-wide resources to leverage change across schools and, perhaps most important, an identification by faculty and students more with their school than with the university as a whole.

On the other hand, there does occur within the university much that could be identified as centralized. The University Administration offices, under the vice presidents for finance; development and alumni relations; general counsel; human resources; and government, community and public affairs, do formulate university-wide policies and procedures and coordinate their activities with the schools. The university has a uniform, centralized budget and accounting system, a personnel classification and salary system, and a tight set of donor prospect review protocols, to name but a few examples on the more strictly administrative side. Academically, the provost, who is also senior vice president for academic affairs, regularly brings together and, where appropriate, chairs an endless series of university-wide or multidivisional committees (ad hoc and standing) on issues and projects that cut across the university. In the area of budget preparation and review, the provost and the senior vice president for administration and finance are key players and serve as the necessary bridge between the deans and the president to the Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs, Trustee Finance Committee, Trustee Executive Committee and, ultimately, the full Board of Trustees.

More will be said about decentralization since it will be a pervasive, contextual point of reference for much of what follows in this report and what will be encountered in appendices.

Johns Hopkins is truly international in scope, outlook and activity. Besides the obvious focus of the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (and its two centers, in Italy and China), every school has faculty, students and programs engaged in and affected by international events and issues. At any one time, Johns Hopkins faculty and students can be found in dozens of countries pursuing study and research. Although there are many formalized agreements under which these activities take place, others occur under informal auspices, through individual faculty contacts.
Johns Hopkins is the only major private research university in Maryland. It is the largest private employer in the state and remains a vital part of Maryland’s economic infrastructure and economic development. Through its many part-time programs, it is an extensive educational resource for employers in Maryland and the District of Columbia. Our involvement in part-time education continues to accelerate and diversify. Johns Hopkins, through the president and others in University Administration and the deans, is actively engaged at all levels of the state government and legislature in Maryland issues. What is true on the state level is mirrored in the Baltimore metropolitan area, in both academic and economic matters.

On the national level, the university has a major presence in research and the nation’s research agenda. This presence is reflected in the research done by Johns Hopkins faculty in the basic sciences, the social sciences, engineering, and in medicine and health care. For the latter, there is a direct bridge between fundamental research and more applied research in clinical, nursing and public health settings.

Johns Hopkins’ role is further extended in policy issues. As the Obama administration focuses its attention on health policy and the crisis in American health care accessibility and cost, the expertise of Johns Hopkins faculty can play a distinctive part in examining the issues and formulating policy alternatives. These complex issues will engage the imagination, skill and informed perspective of Johns Hopkins researchers and policy analysts in our schools of Medicine, Public Health and Nursing, as well as the Johns Hopkins Hospital and Health System.

Finally, one aspect of Johns Hopkins that has been and remains a defining characteristic is that its full-time students, graduate and professional students, and postdoctoral fellows still make up the majority of those who matriculate.

The Board of Trustees

For many years, the Johns Hopkins University Board of Trustees has had between 50 and 60 members. Although the board has national representation, it draws most heavily (and naturally) from Baltimore, and then from Washington, D.C., and the New York metropolitan area. Efforts have been taken over the past 10 to 15 years to increase the number of trustees from across the United States, especially where there are high(er) concentrations of Johns Hopkins alumni (in the Midwest, Texas, California and Florida). At the same time and with good success, efforts have also been devoted to increasing the number of women and minorities on the board. The board also includes four young trustees, drawn from graduating students of Arts and Sciences and Engineering.

The board pursues its oversight and fiduciary responsibilities through a number of trustee committees: Executive, Academic Affairs, Finance, Buildings and Grounds, Development, Investments, Nominations, and Audits, Compliance and Insurance. The full board meets four times a year: October, December, February and April. The Executive Committee meets once a month, except those months when a full board meeting occurs in July and August. The other committees have parallel schedules but do not meet as frequently as the Executive Committee.

In addition to the board’s committees, there is a series of advisory councils for the academic divisions, each one chaired by a trustee but including other non-trustee members (usually drawn from school alumni and/or those whose professional field bears upon an academic division’s work).
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Individually and collectively, the trustees work hard and conscientiously with and for the university. Ms. Pamela Flaherty, the chairman of the board, is in frequent contact with President Ronald Daniels on a wide range of issues and planning involving the board. For the board committees, each one has at least one vice president (or the provost, in the case of Academic Affairs) as its principal liaison to the University Administration. There is regular contact between these committee chairs and the administration liaison to prepare for and plan the committee’s activities.

Consequently, the trustees’ involvement with the university is direct, informed and committed. They understand and respect the necessary balance between their responsibility for broad oversight and the university’s responsibility for actual institutional management. Between those two facets of institutional governance, the trustees’ concerns, as evidenced by their comments and questions and full board discussion, are thoughtful, probing and designed to be helpful to the president and his administration in their roles.

University Administration

The president is the standing chair of each of the schools’ academic councils (or advisory boards). In typical Hopkins decentralized fashion, there exists no university-wide faculty governance body. Rather, each division has its own faculty group responsible for appointments, promotions, academic program oversight, etc. The president and provost are charter members of each of these groups and, in the absence of the president, the provost (or a designee) chairs. The composition of these faculty governance groups varies from school to school, reflecting each one’s traditions and conventions. For example, the Academic Council for Arts and Sciences and Engineering is made up of 12 elected full professors, while the School of Medicine’s and the Bloomberg School of Public Health’s Advisory Boards include, for the most part, department heads. There are, of course, variations for the remaining schools.

The direct involvement of the president and provost in the academic councils provides the best, continuous means of their interaction with and understanding of the academic activities of the university. During the academic year, there are about a dozen of these academic council/advisory board meetings each month. Although the pace is frenetic, it does keep the University Administration involved and informed.

Even within the context of the same decentralization discussion, the role and activities of the University Administration are, for the most part, immediately recognizable and differ little from what one would find at other private research universities. Any difference tends to be more one of degree than type.

Divisional Organization

Although there is considerable similarity among the divisions in what they do and how they do it, the deans have great latitude in how they organize their schools and in who does what. Therefore, the nine academic divisions have organizational charts that are similar in the functions being performed, if not always in the titles being used.

In addition to the academic divisions, there are a number of administrative divisions: University Administration, Homewood Student Affairs (which provides the infrastructure support—registrar, financial aid, admission, etc.—for Arts and Sciences and Engineering), Academic Centers (which
includes several independent institutes and centers, the Johns Hopkins Press, all of which report to the provost) and Health Divisions Administration (which provides infrastructure services for the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions). The dean of the Sheridan Libraries reports through the provost to the president, as do all the divisional deans. The Applied Physics Laboratory has its own administrative structure and apparatus, separate, for the most part, from that of the rest of the university.

In addition to the academic and administrative divisions, Johns Hopkins has a number of affiliated units: the American Institute for Contemporary German Studies and the National Foreign Language Center (both in Washington, D.C.). The university acts as the host institution for the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is located on the Homewood campus.
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Methodology Highlights

Timeline

President William Brody is officially notified several times during 2008 about the required submission of the Periodic Review Report to the Commission on June 1, 2009.

Kristina M. Johnson, former dean of the Pratt School of Engineering at Duke University, is appointed provost and senior vice president for academic affairs July 19, 2007, and arrives September 1, 2007.

Provost Johnson, in collaboration with President Brody, appoints Edgar Roulhac, vice provost for academic services, as chairperson of the 2009 Periodic Review Report Committee on December 4, 2007.

On December 7, 2007, Barbara Loftus, Commission vice president and Johns Hopkins liaison, affirms that our highly decentralized organizational structure and classification as a “single institution at multiple sites,” affords us the option of aggregating reports prepared by each of our nine schools when crafting certain PRR chapters (Addendum – 1 of this statement).

As result of a December 11, 2007, Council of Deans meeting discussion about the revised nature, importance and timing of the 2009 PRR, a decision is made to immediately establish a university-wide Periodic Review Report Committee, 18 months in advance of the report’s delivery date.

Periodic Review Report Committee member appointments are confirmed at the end of December 2007. (Addendum – 2). The committee’s initial organizational meeting occurs January 24, 2008, when a general work plan and monthly meeting schedule are established.

At its February 28, 2008, meeting, the Periodic Review Report Committee reviews, discusses and adopted each element of its charge with Provost Johnson, which included:

   a. Assisting each of our academic divisions—and JHU as a whole—in gauging and documenting progress toward fulfilling the university’s mission and goals through the Periodic Review Report planning and preparation process.

   b. Preparing an accurate, honest and timely Periodic Review Report that enables the Middle States Commission on Higher Education to assess effectively JHU’s current status—and future prospects—within the framework of the Commission’s eligibility requirements and accreditation standards.

   c. Observing and rigorously pursuing the Commission’s recommended 10 essential steps—and any others—that may be needed for preparing JHU’s Periodic Review Report.

   d. Delivering a timely initial complete draft and a successful final Periodic Review Report, including:
      • assessment of the impact of significant major developments, changes or challenges subsequent to our 2004 evaluation;
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- an assessment of the response to key recommendations resulting from the 2004 evaluation;
- a review of enrollment trends, financial status, and enrollment and financial projections;
- a determination of the current status of the implementation of plans for the assessment of school and university effectiveness;
- a determination of the current status of the implementation of school plans for the assessment of student learning outcomes;
- a determination of the extent to which linked planning and budgeting processes are in place, schoolwide and overall; and
- as appropriate, recommending in a timely manner key approaches or strategies for review by the provost and Council of Deans that would enable JHU to position itself well in the 2009 Periodic Review Report and the 2014 decennial institutional reaccreditation self-study process.

e. In preparation for the committee’s February meeting, members prepared brief status reports on their respective school student learning outcomes and school effectiveness assessment plans. The same statements served as the starting line and initial reference point for the development of more refined plans, which now appear in Chapter 5 of the PRR.

**Between January 2008 and January 2009, the committee:**

a. **Organized and adapted its work plan, as appropriate.** Extensive early discussion and clarification of Middle States Commission on Higher Education expectations surrounding student learning outcomes assessment and school and institutional effectiveness assessment were a prominent focus in early committee deliberations, yielding a 47-item, self-administered assessment checklist and template that facilitated assessment plan preparation and evaluation.

b. **Collected and reviewed key documents relating to the previous 2004 evaluation.** A document review plan and analysis time frame spanned several meeting agendas, assuring that important core planning documents and data sources were made carefully examined. *(Addendum 3)*

c. **Collected and reviewed other essential data.** Extensive documentation about sources of existing and available school and university planning reports, which was provided by our Office of Institutional Research, was reviewed by the committee. Additional data and information were also collected through special surveys and inquiries, including one that focused on teaching and learning center activities and resources across the university. The results of individual school SWOT analyses as well as the products of a larger institution-wide planning process provided valuable information for PRR chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6. Materials from the proceedings from several Middle States Commission on Higher Education annual conferences, forums, institutes and workshops were shared—in toto—and discussed at great length with the committee. Several committee members attended a number of these same events, particularly the December 7–9, 2008, annual conference, which convened in Baltimore City.
d. Organized, analyzed and interpreted data. This occurred within and across schools and university administrative units in an ongoing manner over 18 months (*Addendum 4*).

e. Generated, reviewed and edited chapters of an initial informational draft of chapters 2 through 6 of the report and shared the same with the Provost Johnson.

f. Remained in contact with Provost Kristina Johnson through efforts of the committee chairperson, via one-on-one monthly meetings where periodic review report plans and preparations were constantly and thoroughly monitored, analysed and facilitated.


On November 11, 2008, the Board of Trustees elected Ronald J. Daniels, provost of the University of Pennsylvania, the 14th president of Johns Hopkins University. President Daniels assumed office March 2, 2009. President Brody continued serving as president until March 1, 2009.

Upon the announcement of President Barack Obama’s nomination of Provost Kristina Johnson to be undersecretary of the U. S. Department of Energy, and Johns Hopkins President Ronald Daniel’s appointment of Scott Zeger as acting provost and senior vice president for academic affairs, a smooth transition occurred in all phases of communication, planning and execution regarding the 2009 periodic review report.

From February through June 2009, the following key report preparation and review processes were undertaken:

a. Chapters 2 through 6 of the report were redrafted, edited and further refined.

b. The PRR executive summary and certification statements were prepared.

c. School faculty and the Council of Deans reviewed and commented on the report.

d. University vice presidents reviewed and commented on the report.

e. The president and provost reviewed and commented on the report.

f. The Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs reviewed and commented on the report.

g. A *Gazette* university newspaper article that was published about the report elicited input from the university community.

h. As appropriate, the report was revised as a result of these reviews.

i. A final report was delivered to the Commission and external reviewers.
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**Addendum 1**

From: Barbara Loftus <bloftus@msche.org>
To: Pamela Cranston <pcrans.t1@jhu.edu>
Date: 12/8/2007 – 7:51:48 AM
Subject: Re: Johns Hopkins University PRR

Pam,
You have provided an excellent review of our conversation. I agree with all your points and do not have anything to modify or change. Ed and I have established an excellent working relationship this past calendar year with regard to additions and changes to Johns Hopkins Statement of Accreditation Status document. I look forward to continuing that relationship now in regard to the PRR. The transition will be very smooth.

Best of luck with your new responsibilities in the JHU Carey Business School!

Barbara

Barbara Samuel Loftus, Ph.D.
Vice President
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
3624 Market St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104-5020
Voice: 267-284-5020

>>> "Pamela Cranston" <pcranst1@jhu.edu> 12/7/2007 – 7:06 PM>

Barbara,

Good to talk to you recently. I found our conversation very helpful. Thanks again. Since we talked on 11127, some personnel changes have been made In the JHU Provosts Office that affect our Periodic Review Report (PRR) process. As of January 1, I will take on new responsibilities in the JHU Carey Business School, so I will no longer be the Johns Hopkins' accreditation liaison officer and I will not coordinate our PRR process. Instead, provost Kristina Johnson selected Vice Provost Ed Rouhac to lead the PRR process and to act as our Middle States accreditation liaison officer. Therefore, Dr. Rouhac will attend the Middle States annual meeting next week rather than me. I know you’ll enjoy meeting and talking with him.

To facilitate a smooth transition, I think it would be helpful for me to summarize our telephone conversation. Please let me know if I misunderstood anything. I will copy Dr. Rouhac to facilitate the handoff.

We started by talking generally about the PRR process. In 2002, MSCHE refined the standards and created an entirely new PRR process. There is now “much more rigor.” The new PRR represents a "significant departure" from the old, pre-2002 PRR. It now provides a linkage to budget and planning.

There is more focus on assessment, planning and budgeting.

There are essentially two tracks: (1) where are you In regarding to the recommendations from the decennial accreditation evaluation team report and (2) how do you assess student learning and how does the assessment of student learning link to budget and planning processes.

In regards to #1, since there were no recommendations, there’s nothing really to report, although I mentioned that we have made progress and would likely report on continued improvement in the undergraduate experience.

In regards to #2, you said that we will NOT be able to report only on undergraduate program learning assessment. Weniust also include graduate programs across the university, including our professional schools.
Second, we reviewed the format of the report, as outlined in the Middle States publication describing the PRR.

1. Executive Summary
2. Summary of institution’s response to recommendations from the previous team report and institutional self-study
3. Narrative identifying major challenges and/or opportunities
4. Enrollment and finance trends and projections
5. Assessment processes and plans
6. Linked institutional planning and budgeting processes.

We agreed that given JHU’s decentralized nature, #1 and #2 could be prepared by the Provost’s Office while each degree-granting division could prepare its own report including #3–6. The complete JHU PRR would simply be an aggregation of the reports from our nine divisions, plus the executive summary (#1) and our update regarding the undergraduate experience (#2).

We talked about the specialized accreditation processes (e.g., ABET and NCATE) that many of our academic divisions have completed recently or will complete this year and whether or not they will be able to re-use much of their good work. I was relieved to learn that they will not be required to recreate the wheel and can use those data again. You advised that they should “data mine” to identify those data that can be used again.

We discussed the required linkage to the budget and the need to link assessment processes to the latest available budget prior to the June 1, 2009 PRR due date. Even though the FY’10 budget next spring is not voted on by the Board of Trustees until May, we will need to use those FY’10 budget figures.

I think that’s about it. Barbara, please do let Ed and I know if I misunderstood any of our phone conversation, and again, thanks for your assistance.

All the best,

Pam

Dr. Pam Cranston
Interim Dean, Carey Business School
Johns Hopkins University
10 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21201

Executive Specialist Ms. Page Barnes
e-mail <page.barnes@jhu.edu>
tel – 410/516-6563
fax – 410/516-0734

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs
Johns Hopkins University
265 Garland Hall/3400 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218-2692

Administrative Coordinator: Ms. Mandy Liberto
e-mail <mliberto@jhu.edu>
Appendix

Addendum 2

Johns Hopkins University

2009 Periodic Review Report Committee Membership

Anne Belcher, PhD
Associate Professor
Director, Office of Teaching Excellence
School of Nursing

Paula Burger, PhD
Dean of Undergraduate Education
Krieger School of Arts and Sciences
Vice Provost
Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Candice Dalrymple, PhD
Associate Dean and Director
Center for Educational Resources
Sheridan Libraries

Michela Gallagher, PhD
Krieger-Eisenhower Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Elizibeth Goodspeed, MHS
Administrator
Office of the Vice Dean for Education
School of Medicine

John Harrington, PhD
Professorial Lecturer
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Nitze School of Advanced International Studies

Cathy Lebo, PhD
Assistant Provost for Institutional Research
Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Betsy Lowry, EdD
Associate Director, Center for Technology in Education
Assistant Dean for Teaching, Learning and Assessment
School of Education

Paul Mathews, DMA
Faculty of the Conservatory
Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Peabody Institute

Edgar Roulhac, PhD, MPH, Chairperson
Vice Provost for Academic Services
Office of the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Edward Scheinerman, PhD
Professor, Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics
Vice Dean for Education
Whiting School of Engineering

Deborah Slingluff, MLS
Director
Library Services and Collections
Sheridan Libraries

Michael Strine, PhD
Vice President for Finance
Office of the Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration

Antoinette Ungaretti, PhD
Assistant Dean
Director of the Office of Learning
Carey Business School

James Yager, PhD
Professor, Division of Toxicological Sciences
Edyth H. Schoenrich Professor in Preventive Medicine
Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
Bloomberg School of Public Health
Addendum 3

Document and Data Collection

(✓ = made available/discussed with the PRR committee; □ = not made available/discussed with the PRR committee)

Key Documents Related to Previous Evaluation

✓ The JHU institutional 1998–99 PRR
✓ The JHU institutional 2004 self-study document
✓ The report of the 2004 visiting team
✓ The JHU 2004 institutional response
✓ The 2004 Commission’s action letter
✓ Any 2004 JHU follow-up report(s) required by the Commission (none required)
✓ Handbook for Periodic Review Reports
✓ Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility and Standards for Accreditation
✓ Student Learning Assessment: Options and Resources
✓ Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations
✓ Planning and Assessment: 2008 Institutes and Workshops for Program and Institutional Improvement
✓ December 12, 2007, e-mail from JHU’s Pamela Cranston to MSCHE’s Barbara Loftus regarding the 2004 Johns Hopkins University Periodic Review Report

Other Essential Documents and Data

✓ Update and disseminate on a regular basis an inventory of institutional reports, evaluations, data collections and other documents that have a clear relationship to the various components of the PRR—beyond and including sources identified above or below—including both paper documents and those available electronically.
✓ Other documents and information that should be gathered and made accessible, including:
  ✓ institutional profiles submitted to Middle States annually since the last evaluation visit of 2004. Profiles include useful enrollment and financial data.
  ✓ current statement of accreditation status
  ✓ substantive change requests and other general notifications submitted to MSCHE (if any)
  ✓ audited financial statements and management letters (or equivalents) for the prior two years
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☑ institutional budget documents
☑ institutional planning documents (e.g., strategic/long-range master plans)
☑ an initial one- or two-page overview statement on current school student learning outcomes assessment processes and plans

Per MHEC, assessment of student learning may be characterized as the third element of the following four-step teaching-learning-assessment cycle that parallels the planning-assessment cycle (described later):

1. Developing clearly articulated learning outcomes: the knowledge, skills and competencies that students are expected to exhibit upon successful completion of a course, academic program, co-curricular program, general education requirement or other specific set of experiences;
2. Offering courses, program and experiences that provide purposeful opportunities for students to achieve those learning outcomes;
3. Assessing student achievement of those learning outcomes; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve teaching and learning and inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

**TASK:** In no more than a one- or two-page overview statement, please describe your school’s current approach to assessment of student learning outcomes, including any requirements of specialized accreditation processes. This is only an internal document and provides foundation for initial PRR committee examination of this topic. For distribution and discussion at the Committee’s February meeting. Please see: MSCHE’s “Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations” and “Guiding Institutional Strategies for Assessment from Innovation to Institutionalization: A Case Study of the United States Naval Academy.”

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING RESPONSE FORMAT for your 1–2 page statement:**

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

2. **School Mission Statement:**

3. **Program and/or Departmental Goal/Mission Statement(s), as appropriate:**


☑ an initial one-page overview statement on current school institutional effectiveness assessment processes and plans
Per MSCHE, assessment may be characterized as the third element of a four-step planning-assessment cycle:

1. Defining clearly articulated institutional (and in this instance, school) and unit-level goals;
2. Implementing strategies to achieve those goals;
3. Assessing achievement of those goals; and
4. Using the results of those assessments to improve programs and services and inform planning and resource allocation decisions.

In other words, at the divisional or school level, collectively how well are you doing what you say you are doing and, in particular, how do you support student learning—a fundamental aspect of institutional effectiveness?

**TASK:** In no more than a one- or two-page overview statement, please describe your current approach to schoolwide effectiveness assessment, including any requirements of specialized accreditation processes. This is only an internal document and provides foundation for initial PRR committee examination of this topic. For distribution and discussion at the Committee’s February meeting. Please see: MSCHE’s “Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness: Understanding Middle States Expectations” and “Guiding Institutional Strategies for Assessment from Innovation to Institutionalization: A Case Study of the United States Naval Academy.”

**PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING RESPONSE FORMAT for your 1–2 page statement:**

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

2. **School Mission Statement:**

3. **Overview of School’s Current Approach to the Assessment of School Effectiveness:**

   - outcomes assessment plans (or similar documents) relative to both the assessment of institutional effectiveness and the assessment of student learning, or detailed descriptions of assessment processes or results.
   - current catalog(s) in paper format, if an electronic version is not available (Note: for electronic catalogs, be sure to identify the URL.)
   - other institutional and divisional documents, only if there is a clear need for them and if there are specific references to the documents within the narrative of the PRR
   - ongoing analysis, development and refinement of school assessment plans and PRR report input.
   - special survey of Johns Hopkins University centers for teaching, learning and support
   - special survey of PRR committee perceptions regarding assessment roles and responsibilities
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Addendum 4

Document and Data Analysis

Documents and Data

Meetings of January 24 and February 29, 2008

1. PRR committee charge
2. Membership list
3. Timeline and Gantt chart
4. Meeting schedule
5. Committee member past involvement in assessment
6. JHU goals and expectations for the 2009 PRR
7. JHU school effectiveness self-assessment checklist
8. JHU student learning outcome self-assessment checklist
9. PRR report components
10. PRR document and data collection and analysis plan
15. JHU Statement of Accreditation Status, MSCHE
16. December 12, 2007, e-mail from Barbara Loftus to Pamela Cranston confirming the nature and format of the JHU 2009 PRR.
17. December 9–11, 2007, MSCHE annual conference materials and notes
18. Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Eligibility Standards for Accreditation, MSCHE
19. Handbook for Periodic Review Reports, MSCHE
20. Certification Statement: Compliance with MSCHE Eligibility Requirements and Federal Title IV Requirements, MSCHE
21. Assessing Student Learning and Institutional Effectiveness, MSCHE
22. Student Learning Assessment: Options and Resources, MSCHE

Two-page initial overviews of current JHU school effectiveness assessment processes/plans

23. –Arts and Sciences (PRR chapter 5, planning starting point)
24. –Business (PRR chapter 5, planning starting point)
25. –Education (PRR chapter 5, planning starting point)
Two-page initial overviews of current JHU school student learning outcomes assessment processes/plans

Meeting of March 19, 2008

- 1993 JHU decennial self-study document
- 1999 JHU PRR
- 2003 JHU Commission on Undergraduate Education Report (CUE)
- 2004 JHU decennial self-study document
- Report of the 2004 evaluation team
- JHU institutional response to the 2004 evaluation team report
- 2004 Middle States Commission on Higher Education action letter
- 2004 JHU follow-up reports (none required)
- Sample JHU Bloomberg School of Public Health program objectives and competencies statements (potential reporting template)
- Debra Humphreys, “Multiple Choice Tests and Institutional Assessments Judged Ineffective by Employers Looking for Improvements in College Learning, American Association of Colleges and Universities (news release), January 22, 2008.

Meeting of April 25, 2008

- March 25, 2008, MSCHE Workshop on “Addressing Public Needs: A Dialogue Among Middle States Members” materials and notes
- April 8–9, 2008, MSCHE PRR Workshop materials and notes
- JHU-MSCHE institutional profile for 2004–2005
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55  JHU-MSCHE institutional profile for 2006–2007
56  JHU-MSCHE institutional profile for 2007–2008
57  JHU-MSCHE substantive change requests and other notifications for 2004–2008
58  JHU budget and financial statements
59  JHU institutional and school planning documents

Meeting of May 28, 2008

61  Approach to undergraduate education learning assessment (oral report)
62  Approach to graduate education learning assessment (oral report)
63  Approach to institutional effectiveness assessment (oral report)
64  2007 Learning Assessment Forum Executive Summary and Working Group Reports, Washington University, St. Louis
65  Assessment models, best practices, reporting formats and templates
66  Case study presentation: Johns Hopkins Medicine Outcomes Assessment, Anne Hoffman, Johns Hopkins Hospital
67  MIT Teaching and Learning Laboratory (assessment and evaluation studies)
68  MIT Teaching and Learning Laboratory (biography of assessment research)
69  MIT Teaching and Learning Laboratory (biography of materials on teaching, learning and assessment)
70  Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching (the scholarship of teaching and learning)

Meeting of June 20, 2008

73  January 16–18, 2008, MSCHE Learning Assessment Institute materials and notes

Meeting of July 25, 2008

74  PRR drafting framework (oral report)

Meetings of September 19, October 17, November 21, December 17, 2008

75  Draft PRR chapter 2 and appendices (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)
76  Draft PRR chapter 3 and appendices  (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)
77  Draft PRR chapter 4 and appendices (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)
Draft PRR chapter 5 and appendices (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)

78  –Arts and Sciences
79  –Business
80  –Education
81  –Engineering
82  –International Studies
83  –Medicine
84  –Nursing
85  –Peabody Institute
86  –Public Health
87  Draft PRR chapter 6 and appendices (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)
88  Draft survey of Johns Hopkins University Centers for Teaching and Learning Support
89  December 7, 2008, MSCHE Workshop for Team Chairs and Evaluators materials and handouts
90  December 7–9, 2008, MSCHE annual conference materials, handouts, follow-up discussion
91  Draft PRR chapters 1, 5 and 6 graphics (ongoing development, review, written and oral reports)
92  Discussion of survey of Johns Hopkins University Centers for Teaching and Learning Support
93  Draft PRR chapter 1 and appendices (ongoing development, review, written and oral progress reports)
94  Collection and review of individual school electronic course catalogs
95  Council of Deans PRR progress report presentation and discussion
96  Trustee Committee on Academic Affairs PRR progress report presentation and discussion

January 23, February 20, March 20, April 24, May 29, 2009

97  Review and reduction of redundancy across PRR chapters; begin line editing
98  Survey, clarification and reaffirmation of school and university assessment roles and responsibilities
99  PRR committee review and reflection upon its charge, planning processes, accomplishments and success
100 PRR review and comments from deans, vice presidents, senior vice presidents, provost, president, trustees
101 Gazette (university newspaper) article regarding the 2009 PRR; comments elicited from the academic community
102 PRR committee review of the final draft
103 Final PRR draft reviewed by President Ronald Daniels
104 PRR editing concluded
105 MSCHE certification statement signed by the president and board chairperson
106 Final PRR submitted to reviewers and MSCHE
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Appendix 29

Institutional Research at Johns Hopkins

Johns Hopkins has developed an organized and sustained institutional research process that evaluates and helps to improve both academic programs and services, providing accurate and objective information about the university in the context of its peers. The Middle States criteria for accreditation anticipate a role for Institutional Research in institutional effectiveness (Standard 7) and learning assessment (Standard 14). This addendum describes a) the general functions of Institutional Research at Johns Hopkins and b) specific activities that support assessment including the longitudinal survey research program, key indicators on undergraduate and graduate education, planning studies, an executive information system, and a national forum on learning assessment. This report emphasizes accomplishments and continuing research since the decennial self-study in 2004.

General Functions

The Johns Hopkins University Institutional Research department provides analytical studies to the executive leadership of the university for planning, policy development, and management of academic programs. The office collects, analyzes, and presents data about the university, building an official source of information about Johns Hopkins. Planning studies examine key issues in higher education like enrollment management, affordability and diversity. Peer studies place the university in context among highly selective research universities. Institutional Research is an active participant in two data exchanges, the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE) and the Consortium for Financing Higher Education (COFHE), helping to establish and align consortia activities with institutional needs. In addition to supporting senior management, Institutional Research coordinates research and compliance initiatives among Johns Hopkins’ nine academic divisions and with leading universities across the country. The department completes an annual series of federal, state and accreditation reports for the university. Institutional Research also designs and maintains databases to support complex analyses and external reporting on a wide range of subjects, including admissions, financial aid, enrollment, degrees awarded, undergraduate and graduate education, research funding, salaries, faculty and staff.

Johns Hopkins relies on a small, central university office with limited additional support in the academic divisions. The university took its first steps toward creating an institutional research office in 1999 and reconfigured the office under new leadership in 2003. Today the important work of this office is assigned to a staff of three professional FTE plus clerical support. The university IR office supports senior executives (president, provost, vice presidents and deans), all academic divisions and many administrative departments. Two individuals, an assistant dean in Engineering and an enrollment analyst in undergraduate Arts and Sciences, provide additional help for their divisions. Institutional Research contributes to a wide range of projects, including guidebooks, rankings, enrollment management analyses, bond ratings, economic impact studies and external studies. The department responds to both internal and external requests for information about Johns Hopkins.

Assessment Activities

Institutional Research designs and administers a **Longitudinal Survey Research Program** that regularly collects input and feedback from undergraduate and graduate students at various points in their academic careers. These studies measure the quality and effectiveness of undergraduate and gradu-
ate education over time and compared to a group of peer institutions. The undergraduate studies are coordinated with a group of 18 highly selective, private universities in the Consortium for Financing Higher Education (COFHE). Graduate studies are coordinated with the 60 top private and public research universities in the American Association of Universities (AAU).

The undergraduate survey research includes annual studies of entering freshmen and graduating seniors, as well as periodic studies of enrolled students and undergraduate alumni. The alumni survey primarily focuses on recent graduates, contacting students who completed their studies three, five and 10 years earlier. Johns Hopkins participated in the Rutgers Academic Integrity Survey in 2005. The Senior Survey also regularly includes questions about the pressures of academic competition, faculty responses to academic dishonesty and student awareness of guidelines for intellectual integrity. IR distributes both comprehensive and specialized topical studies on survey research, numbering nearly 30 reports in 2008. Examples of the survey reports include trends in student satisfaction, significant differences between academic divisions (Arts and Sciences versus Engineering) and subdivisions (e.g., natural sciences versus humanities), learning goals for undergraduate engineering and relative grade deflation.

### Survey Research Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</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>Senior</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>Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Together the Freshman, Senior and Alumni Surveys provide information on student contributions to and the impact of a Hopkins education. The Freshman Survey examines how students selected Johns Hopkins, their assessment of basic skills, expectations for college, time management and the likelihood that they will participate in college activities. The Senior Survey examines the quality of the learning experience and the effectiveness of campus administrative services. Students are asked to rate both the importance of specific skills and types of knowledge as well as how much their abilities have changed in each area since they entered college. It provides an early indication of plans for graduate school and first employment. The Senior Survey also provides critical information on how students pay for college, the impact on their family of paying for college and how financial issues may affect their college experience and post-graduate plans. The Enrolled Student Survey provides a cross-sectional slice of students from first year to final year. Johns Hopkins participated in consortial efforts to redesign the Alumni Survey in 2005, the Senior Survey in 2006 and the Enrolled Student Survey for 2009.

The first systematic survey of all enrolled master’s and doctoral students in the full-time programs in Arts and Sciences and Engineering was conducted by Institutional Research in spring 2006. The Graduate Student Survey (GSS) assessed the effectiveness of course work, faculty interactions, advising and mentoring, qualifying exams and the dissertation process. The survey also collects
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information on financial support, teaching assistantships and post-graduate plans. The GSS is presently being revised by a joint committee of AAU graduate deans and institutional researchers. A primary and secondary set of core questions was issued in February 2009 for the next administration of the GSS.

Taking their cue from the Spellings Commission, the presidents of AAU institutions, including Johns Hopkins, committed to collecting and publishing basic assessment information about undergraduate and graduate education. The AAU Institutional Data Committee (IDC) defined a series of Key Indicators for Undergraduate and Graduate Education. The data collection is being carried out by the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE), the organization of institutional research and planning officers. Johns Hopkins has participated in the AAU Data Exchange since 2004. The undergraduate indicators include retention and graduation, time to degree, information on attrition and graduate placement from the National Student Clearinghouse, and a cost calculator. AAUDE has also developed core questions that can be added to existing Senior and Alumni surveys, expanding the set of peer information available to Johns Hopkins. The AAU questions were added to the 2008 and 2009 Senior Surveys. The key indicators for graduate education include enrollment by program, completion rates, time to degree, graduate student financial support, a graduate student exit survey and PhD outcomes (e.g., placement in postdoctoral positions and employment). Institutional Research is working with AAUDE to develop standards for these exchange items and with the graduate deans at Johns Hopkins to implement the IDC recommendations.

Institutional Research provides additional Planning Studies on a range of topics for senior management. The Faculty Budget Advisory Committee (FBAC) has representatives for each academic division. Founded in the 1970s, the FBAC was established to communicate to the faculty about the financial condition of the university and issues that impact the Johns Hopkins workplace. The FBAC requested an analysis of changing student enrollment and teaching loads in Arts and Sciences and Engineering. The Enrollment Trends Study, issued in May 2005, considered whether professors teach more students or course sections today compared to nine years ago. It also measured teaching loads, class size and percentage of students taught by ranked faculty in a select group of seven departments (Chemistry, Economics, English, Mechanical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Computer Science and Applied Mathematics and Statistics).

The president of Johns Hopkins requested a comprehensive look at the affordability of an undergraduate education at Johns Hopkins. The Affordability Study, issued in October 2005, examines changes in tuition, financial aid and family income over the last 25 years. It utilized national, peer and institutional data. It also provided a model of pending regulatory implications with the proposed College Affordability Index (CAI). A joint subcommittee of the Board of Trustees was formed, with members from the Finance and Academic Affairs committees, to examine Homewood undergraduate tuition. Institutional Research supported the joint subcommittee with extensive analyses of enrollments, endowments, net revenue and net cost, inflation adjustments by CPI and HEPI, undergraduate cumulative debt and the percentage of aided/not aided students. The final report of the subcommittee, issued in October 2006, established guiding principles and priorities for undergraduate tuition and financial aid.

Looking for an efficient way to distribute reports and analyses, Institutional Research designed and created an Executive Information System (EIS) in spring 2008 using content management software (Microsoft Sharepoint). The site provides customized portals for senior executives with a direct and
secure route to the information they need. The EIS includes customized portals for the president, the provost, and each academic division. The portal for Arts and Sciences, for example, includes annual diversity reports, benchmark studies on endowments for student financial aid and faculty, competitive faculty salaries by discipline, undergraduate and graduate rankings, undergraduate and graduate student surveys, tuition proposals, annual undergraduate profiles and links to peer universities. All of these reports are prepared by Institutional Research. The dean designates who has access to the portal for his/her academic division. Separate sections of the EIS support the work of Institutional Research with other administrative units (e.g., Admissions, Registrars, Financial Aid, etc.) and with university task forces like the Commission on the Status of Women. It includes an archive of federal, state and other annual regulatory reports like the Middle States Institutional Profile. Resource materials on policy issues in higher education like university endowments, women in science, unit records systems, the Spellings Commission and the Higher Education Opportunity Act are available through the site. The EIS provides a single, customized point of contact for each executive, with a clean copy of final reports on all subjects.

The provost of Johns Hopkins asked Institutional Research to organize a Learning Assessment Forum in June 2007. With the support of provosts at 22 leading private research universities, 53 representatives met at Washington University in St. Louis to discuss the ways they conduct, sustain and make effective use of the results of assessment. Learning assessment covers a broad range of subjects from learning in the classroom to student development in activities and experiences outside the classroom. Recognizing that methods and goals vary across these different types of assessment, we divided into six groups focusing on assessing students, teaching, programs, general education, learning and student development outside the classroom, and student outcomes after graduation (e.g., employment and graduate school). Case studies were presented, and each working group produced a white paper describing effective strategies and methods for assessment.