



JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
FINAL REPORT | MAY 15, 2003

JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY

Executive Summary

In January 2002, President William Brody and Provost Steven Knapp charged a newly formed Commission on Undergraduate Education with diverse members from across the Hopkins community to identify the core values that should characterize a Hopkins' undergraduate experience and to develop recommendations for specific actions that would improve the quality of undergraduate education, both inside and outside the classroom, in all five University divisions that offer undergraduate degrees: the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences, the Whiting School of Engineering, the Peabody Institute, the School of Nursing, and the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education.

During the next 12 months, Commissioners organized themselves into four working groups (Academic Experience, Advising and Career Support, Diversity, and Student Life), reviewed relevant reports from peer institutions and national associations, examined undergraduate survey data, spoke with key campus faculty and administrators, met with external consultants, and conducted focus groups in order to assess the current state of affairs and to make recommendations for improvement in undergraduate education. An interim report was produced and distributed in late January 2003. Subsequently, over two-dozen community meetings were held during February, March and early April to discuss CUE's interim recommendations. After consideration of all the comments and suggestions from members of the meetings and from a special e-mailbox set up to receive feedback, this final report was created, endorsed by the full Commission and sent to President Brody and Provost Knapp.

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

In the Commission's view, to great extent, the University fulfills that mission. Hopkins students are offered a wide array of outstanding academic programs. Student who anticipate later graduate or professional study are prepared exceedingly well; those who enter the professions directly demonstrate high levels of professional competence. Undergraduate education takes place in a stimulating environment that is culturally diverse and rich in its international dimensions. Like their faculty mentors, large numbers of Hopkins students are engaged in the process of research and discovery.

Notwithstanding the many positive aspects of our undergraduate programs, students' current levels of satisfaction with both their academic and social experiences at Johns Hopkins are lower than we should find acceptable and do not reflect the educational experience that the University can and should provide. In terms of institutional reputation and our own values, we cannot afford to continue business as usual. Ours is an institution that accepts excellence as a threshold criterion for any undertaking. We expect to be competitive for the very best faculty and students. We expect to engage in world-class research. Our goal should be to offer the very best quality undergraduate experience.

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

The following 34 recommendations from the Commission cover four broad areas of undergraduate life at Johns Hopkins: the academic experience, advising and career support, diversity, and student life. Not all these recommendations are equally important in the context of each of the different divisions. The Commission does, however, think there are several that should be given priority as a result of their potential impact. These are the provision of small group or “capstone” experiences for upperclassmen; guaranteed university housing for Homewood students; and a significant increase in the diversity of the undergraduate student body. The Commission urges the five schools to develop plans to implement these recommendations and to identify resources to support them. Together, we think they have the potential to enhance significantly undergraduate education in this research-intensive environment.

Recommendations Regarding the Academic Experience

1. Assign specific responsibility for assuring the quality of undergraduate education to a senior level administrator in each school’s dean’s office and regularly bring together those individuals to facilitate discussion of undergraduate concerns across the University.
2. Appoint a faculty Director of Undergraduate Studies in each department or degree program that offers an undergraduate major.
3. Conduct broad reviews of the quality of undergraduate degree programs on a regular cycle, in addition to, or as part of, existing reviews of academic departments.
4. Assure that juniors and seniors have access, within their majors, to small classes and to appropriate small group experiences, including “capstone” courses.
5. Expand the opportunities available to first-year students for intellectually engaging academic experiences in a small group format.
6. Provide various faculty incentives for good teaching, and ensure deliberate and appropriate recognition of teaching excellence in faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure.
7. Increase support for faculty and graduate students in teaching effectiveness—including pedagogical consultation, assistance with enhancing teaching and learning through instructional technologies, and strengthening the course evaluation system—and improve the campus physical infrastructure to enable such.

8. Support actively efforts to ensure that all members of the University community are educated about what constitutes academic integrity and understand their obligations to act with honor in each and every academic matter.
9. Encourage efforts to broaden the mix of academic interests in the student body in order both to enrich the intellectual discourse and to match student enrollments more closely to academic resources.
10. Ensure that the undergraduate experience has a significant international dimension by offering students attractive opportunities for foreign study and internships, coursework with an international character, and campus activities and programs that take advantage of the University's rich international resources.
11. Thoroughly study the current weekly course schedule and class scheduling practices to determine whether adjustments might be made to enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience.
12. Give final examinations only during the final examination period.

Recommendations Regarding Advising and Career Support

13. Strengthen faculty engagement in advising by making expectations clear, by providing mentoring and orientation, and by more explicitly including effective service as an advisor as one of the considerations for salary and promotion decisions.
14. Improve communication and leverage activities among the career support services offices, departmental advising coordinators, academic and pre-professional advising staff, alumni offices' staff, and other related service providers.
15. Explore the centralization of some advising/career support resources, such as study abroad, internships, and fellowships.
16. Create a position within the Johns Hopkins Alumni Office that, in concert with the various school career support service offices, would develop networking and internship opportunities for undergraduates.
17. Assure undergraduate access to professional career planning and development services, including employment support for the growing number of undergraduates who choose not to go directly to graduate/professional school and desire employment after earning their baccalaureate degrees.
18. Assure adequate physical and technical facilities (including a state-of-the-art website and electronic student portfolios) for career support services offices in each school.
19. Assure that each school tracks its graduates' post-baccalaureate activities, whether advanced study or employment.
20. Include an evaluation of academic advising and career support in all undergraduate satisfaction surveys.

Recommendations Regarding Diversity

21. In the area of student recruitment, significantly increase the diversity of its undergraduate student body so that, within five years, Johns Hopkins is in the top decile of its peer group in the enrollment of under-represented ethnic minority students. Toward that end:
 - Prepare a detailed plan for enrolling African-American, Latina/o, and Native-American students, complete with action steps, funding requirements, and an aggressive timetable.
 - Endorse the proposal of the Homewood Admissions' Office to establish "The Baltimore Scholars Program" to provide full scholarships (tuition and fees) to graduates of Baltimore City Public Schools who are admitted to an undergraduate program, beginning with the entering class of 2004.
 - Develop linkages with other Hopkins ethnic minority outreach programs, including successful diversity initiatives by the Center for Talented Youth, and consider forging partnerships with community colleges.
22. Take steps to increase significantly the retention and graduation rates of all undergraduates so that, within five years, these rates at Johns Hopkins compare favorably with those of peer institutions. To accomplish this:
 - Prepare a detailed plan to improve both retention and graduation rates of all students, complete with action steps, funding requirements, and an aggressive timetable.
 - Improve the retention and graduation rates of subgroups of students who are lagging behind their peers. A systematic study should be undertaken to identify the factors that cause students not to persist and to provide a basis for designing appropriate programmatic support and interventions to achieve this goal.
23. Increase significantly the number of under-represented ethnic minority faculty over the next five years by preparing a detailed plan complete with action steps and an aggressive timetable.
24. Assess, within the schools, whether the content of the curriculum taken as a whole provides undergraduates with sufficient opportunities for exposure to diverse disciplines, fields, languages, cultures, and ideas, and where needed, expand the offerings to do so.
25. Assure an array of offerings that reflect the diversity of our campus, city, and nation, including developing a special speaker's series to bring the University community together for at least two major events each year that would focus on issues of diversity.
26. Increase efforts to recruit under-represented ethnic minority staff, especially in those areas that provide student services, and prepare a detailed plan for hiring under-represented administrative staff, complete with action steps and an aggressive timetable.

Recommendations Regarding Student Life

27. Create a coherent, comprehensive residential program, supported by appropriate housing and dining services, that provides Hopkins undergraduates who live in University housing with a variety of living/learning options that support and enhance their academic experience while strengthening the sense of campus community.
28. Begin immediately to develop new residences at Homewood which would, over a period of no more than 10 years, guarantee four years of housing to all Arts & Sciences and Engineering undergraduates who wish to remain in University housing. Explore the feasibility of accommodating Nursing, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, and Peabody students in Homewood residential options.
29. Explore the possibility of a “freshman campus” on the west side of Charles Street.
30. Develop campus facilities to support the need for informal, social interaction as well as for group study.
31. Provide interdivisional programming and intramural sports opportunities (including field space) that create a greater sense of community for Homewood, Peabody, Nursing, and SPSBE students.
32. Increase participation and leadership of academic administrators in student life, making their presence known on their campuses.
 - Academic administrators should engage regularly with students in both formal and informal situations.
 - Deans of each school should meet formally with their student councils every month.
 - The President and Provost of the University should meet each semester with Student Council leadership.
33. Improve food quality and service at Homewood so that it can effectively function as an essential element in community building.
34. Support partnerships to enhance the Charles Village neighborhood and to develop additional amenities that could improve the quality of life for Charles Village residents as well as Hopkins faculty, students and staff.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Nature and Mission of Johns Hopkins University

Established in 1876, the Johns Hopkins University was the first institution of higher education in the United States built upon the primacy of research and graduate study. In his inaugural address,

Hopkins' first president, Daniel Coit Gilman, laid out the institutional charge by asking "What are we aiming at?" and answering his own question as follows: "the encouragement of research and the advancement of individual scholars, who by their excellence will advance the sciences they pursue, and the society where they dwell." Johns Hopkins remains dedicated to advancing knowledge through discovery and to continuing, across all its constituent parts, a tradition of innovation that is part of the University's legacy.

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

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

Rationale for the Commission on Undergraduate Education

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

The idea of re-envisioning undergraduate education at Hopkins and the challenge of improving it within the unique confines of a research-intensive environment comes from many directions and reflects the convergence of a number of lines, including the national discussion of these issues; campus conversations about how we might better serve our undergraduates; recognition of peer competition, as underlined by the Trustees' Task Force on Competitiveness (1999–2001); and President William Brody's and Provost Steven Knapp's keen interest in the quality of the undergraduate experience. Perhaps the most immediate impetus, however, has come from responses to two institutional surveys of Hopkins undergraduates. The response

data show that, in a number of areas, the undergraduate program does not offer the quality of experience that distinguishes Johns Hopkins University in other realms, particularly as compared to our peers. While many students feel extraordinarily well-served by their academic programs and their preparation for advanced study, too many students express disappointment in access to faculty, the size of classes, life outside the classroom, and lack of a sense of community that might be expected in a small university the size of Hopkins. We know also that our retention rate, while extremely high compared to national norms, is not as high as that at distinguished peer institutions.

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

The Foundation on Which We Build

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

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

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

Working Assumptions

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

- Discovery is the hallmark of Johns Hopkins and should form the centerpiece not only of graduate education, but also of undergraduate education at the University. Any reinvention or enhancement to the undergraduate experience must build upon on this research university's focus on discovery.
- Likewise, the Johns Hopkins undergraduate experience should take advantage of the University's distinction as a relatively small-sized institution (in comparison to its peers). That is, undergraduates should experience close relationships with faculty in their major; have ample opportunities to partner with faculty in the discovery process; have opportunities for small group experiences and classes; and enjoy a sense of community.
- Close student-teacher interaction (e.g., seminars and laboratory experiences) is essential to the learning process in a research-intensive institution. Graduate students are also essential partners and a resource for undergraduates.
- Undergraduate education should seek to integrate the intellectual and social lives of students within a caring and diverse community of scholars. Commission members believe that student life outside the classroom should not only complement, but also enhance student life inside the classroom.
- The students who thrive best in the University's undergraduate programs are those talented applicants who are mature and self-directed learners and who are able to take advantage of the extensive research and learning opportunities available here. The majority desire advanced study beyond the baccalaureate, and all, it is hoped, will take leadership roles in their professions. While Hopkins offers especially good preparation for these students, in order to have a vibrant intellectual environment, it must also welcome students who enter less certain of their focus but open to the joys of intellectual exploration.

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

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

CHAPTER 2

THE NATIONAL LANDSCAPE

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

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

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

In the fall of 1994, the University of Pennsylvania's 21st Century Project began with six committees that dealt with: "(1) the challenge of engaging freshmen and sophomores in research activities; (2) the academic standards and models for service-oriented academic programs; (3) the issue of advising; (4) the curriculum; (5) the issue of symbolic reasoning across the curriculum; and (6) enhancing internationalization."

In the following year, the Provost's Committee on Undergraduate Education (PCUE) set the stage for Penn's Undergraduate Experience Initiative. At the same time, Penn's Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) released a "White Paper on Undergraduate Education." In addition to a curricular restructuring of each undergraduate school, the SCUE paper proposed a holistic approach to learning and a common intellectual experience for all undergraduates. New course offerings in each of the three "Penn Sectors"—Community, Society, and Traditions—emphasize citizenship, cross-disciplinary study, and practical application of theory as well as writing, speaking, analysis, research, interpersonal skills, and technology.

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

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

In October 2001, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University embarked on an ambitious review of the undergraduate experience, with an emphasis on curricular and space planning. In March 2002, the faculty voted to reduce the number of Core Curriculum requirements, the first change since the Core was implemented in the 1970s. The review continues in 2002–2003 with four foci: concentrations, general education, forms of teaching, and students' academic experience, including extra-curriculars.

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

As states confronted tight budgets in the mid-1990s, a number of higher education reforms were initiated by their legislatures and implemented by their higher education governing bodies. Leaders in both Virginia and Illinois required colleges and universities to demonstrate that they were addressing issues of quality and productivity. As a result, Illinois cut over 200 low-priority and duplicative academic programs and reinvested more than \$100 million in undergraduate education and other priority areas through its “Priorities, Quality, and Productivity” initiative.

Virginia required campuses to develop plans for reducing costs and focusing their efforts on the highest public priorities, including an expected growth in undergraduate enrollment.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 3

THE COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

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

The charge to the Commission on Undergraduate Education was to identify the core values that should characterize a Hopkins undergraduate experience and to develop recommendations for specific actions

that would improve the quality of undergraduate education, both inside and outside the classroom, in all five Hopkins schools that offer undergraduate degree programs: the Krieger School of Arts & Sciences, the Whiting School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the Peabody Institute, and the School of Professional Studies in Business & Education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this report will form the centerpiece of the University's decennial accreditation by the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education during 2003–2004, as mentioned earlier. Each of the five Hopkins schools offering undergraduate programs will be asked to establish a small working group to prepare a plan to implement CUE recommendations within the School and to advise the Dean about School priorities.

CHAPTER 4

WORKING ASSUMPTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

To fulfill this mission, the Commission envisions an education that is characterized by excellent teaching and advising, opportunities for research and creative endeavor, a high degree of faculty- student interaction, curricular diversity, the opportunity for small group learning experiences, and the development of international perspective. The vision is that of an education that is, to the extent possible, both individualized and personal.

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER 5

COMMON VISION; COMMON CONCERNS; COMMON NEEDS

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

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

FINDINGS

The Academic Experience

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

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

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

Advising and Career Support

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

divisions to serve well the interests of those students not headed for graduate study. Coordination and good communication among the elements of the advising system have not been fully achieved. While we are now actively cultivating alumni involvement, we have not reached the level of engagement that represents the best practices in these areas.

Diversity

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

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

Student Life

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

Yet, Homewood undergraduate students report a feeling of fragmentation about their residential lives, and more generally a serious absence of community. They lack sufficient contact with faculty outside of purely academic settings; upperclassmen live off campus and therefore are too detached from campus social and intellectual life. They also lack spaces to socialize and to engage in group study. There are few shared rituals and traditions that would bind the community together. Many Peabody students feel a similar sense of isolation and feel disconnected from the rest of the University. Nursing students experience the effects of social space limitations and are concerned about safety and parking issues. SPSBE undergraduates have

special concerns about fragmentation, both with respect to the particular geographic dispersal of academic programs and also the demands on adults who balance full-time work with family and school. And, there is almost universal criticism of the food services on campus.

Common Needs

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

The single most important undergraduate need at Johns Hopkins is to strengthen the sense of community.

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

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

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

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

Strengthening our sense of community, then, may depend as much on what happens in the calculus class as whatever changes we may make in residential and student life, and however much we may spend. At

the same time, plenty of evidence suggests that improving residential and student life can go a long way toward breaking an endemic culture of competitiveness and complaint that has become a self-perpetuating expectation if not a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The needs for better integration of the elements of the undergraduate experience and for a healthier sense of balance find expression in a number of Commission recommendations.

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

A third need around which many of the recommendations cohere is the need for undergraduate education at Hopkins to be more personal.

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

One of the most disturbing findings by the Commission is the extent to which many students perceive that no one cares.

Given that the faculty and administrative members of CUE each agreed to serve out of a strong commitment to undergraduate education and that the President and Provost who launched the Commission, and the Deans who blessed the initiative, did so out of equally strong beliefs in the importance of undergraduate education and a determination to make it better, this is particularly troubling. Almost uniformly, other administrators not centrally involved in this exercise volunteered help. Some were even disappointed not to be included as Commission members. So, where is the disconnect? How is it that this level of interest and concern has not resulted in wider recognition that some, and indeed many, do in fact care? Certainly, there is a need to reconcile this gap between the perception of not caring and the reality that many do indeed feel passionately about the satisfaction and success of undergraduates.

Finally, the need to be more intentional about undergraduate education is a fifth need and focus of many of the recommendations.

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

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

CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

Recommendation 1

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

At present much of the vision of how the undergraduate experience should be organized is de-centralized. At Homewood, for example, departments are free to set requirements that are not directly related to the major. The faculty determines, without administrative consultation, whether a course will fulfill a particular distribution requirement. More central oversight can also ensure that problems with class size are identified and addressed. These problems are localized within the curriculum but severe in some cases when they occur. (We are doubtful that efforts to target an increase in the number of students to a particular course of study will sufficiently address this problem.) The senior level administrator designated with the responsibility for ensuring the quality of the undergraduate program would oversee and coordinate the review of

undergraduate programs called for below; work closely, collectively and individually, with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies called for in the next recommendation to continue the conversation and sustain the effort to enhance undergraduate education; and work closely with student affairs staff to better integrate student life with the academic experience. Some of the early foci of the senior administrator, working closely with faculty and with the directors of undergraduate study called for in the next recommendation, will be to create a “program review template” to guide the work of departments as they implement recommendation #3; to strengthen the quality, participation level, and effective use of the course evaluation system; and to review current grading practices and/or policies.

Recommendation 2

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

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

Recommendation 3

Conduct broad reviews of the quality of undergraduate degree programs on a regular cycle, in addition to, or as part of, existing reviews of academic departments.

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

These reviews, whether they are incorporated into existing review processes or are conducted separately, would examine such matters as the philosophy underlying the major requirements; teaching expectations;

the range of introductory, small group, and senior capstone experiences; the use of instructional technology; international opportunities for students; diversity in the curriculum; course evaluation systems; grading practices and/or policies; and data on the modal experience of students. It is assumed that the appropriate senior level administrator for undergraduate education in each division (see recommendation #1), working with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies, would create a “program review template,” oversee the administration of a review process, and work with departments on appropriate follow-up.

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

Recommendation 4

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

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

Recommendation 5

Expand the opportunities available to first-year students for intellectually engaging academic experiences in a small group format.

On many campuses, priority attention has been given to the quality of the first year experience as a means of setting the tone for the entire undergraduate program. Some of these successful experiments are reviewed in the text accompanying the Student Life recommendations, but they generally have in common the fact that students are challenged to be active learners. Unfortunately, the curriculum of many first year Hopkins students reflects the need to make early progress on pre-medical or engineering requirements, and there is precious little opportunity to experience seminar style learning. While we believe that small group experiences are especially critical for juniors and seniors, and thus should receive priority for resource

allocation, serious and creative attention should be given to developing ways to make it possible for first-year students to have a more personal academic experience. We believe that such opportunities reinforce healthy attitudes about academic exploration and that, were a critical mass of freshmen to have such experiences, it would improve the campus intellectual climate. The proposed departmental undergraduate program reviews should encompass attention to this issue with respect to departmental majors, but many freshmen are unsure of their choice of majors, and they, too, should have access to small group experiences, some of which may serve the purpose of exposing freshmen to diverse disciplinary perspectives.

Recommendation 6

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

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

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

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

Recommendation 7

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

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

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

Recommendation 8

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

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

Similar discussions about academic integrity are taking place on campuses across the nation. Like many peer institutions, some Hopkins divisions have developed programs to confront the issue, and these should be pursued vigorously. All Hopkins schools should have plans involving education about academic ethics,

clearly stated penalties for violations, and support for those TA's and faculty members who report situations of alleged misconduct.

None of the other aspirations that the Commission has for the undergraduate experience matter if the basic elements of an academic community are not in place, and surely academic integrity is chief among them.

Recommendation 9

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

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

Recommendation 10

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

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

Recommendation 11

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

As noted earlier, perhaps no proposed recommendation of the Commission generated more discussion than that to change the weekly course schedule for Homewood to a more standard format of Monday-Wednesday-Friday/Tuesday-Thursday instead of the current schedule which, loosely, operates on a

MTW/ThF format. The recommendation was proposed in the Commission's interim report because the Commission thought there would be significant benefits to spreading out three-meeting courses over five days and two-meeting courses over three days. A key benefit of such a change would be the facilitation of cross-divisional registration and inter-divisional collaboration in program development. Currently, the ability of Homewood students to take classes at the Bloomberg School of Public Health and at the Peabody Institute and of Peabody students to take courses at Homewood (where their presence would enrich student experience) is seriously constrained by the incompatibility of class schedules. In addition, this change was seen as having the potential to enhance students' ability to prepare for class, complete readings and assignments, and evenly distribute their academic course loads, thus providing time to absorb learning. Moreover, the revision offered the possibility of improved classroom utilization since the current scheduling convention results in less than effective classroom deployment.

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

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

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

And, while we had positive comments from students about proposed changes, we heard also a number of cautions. A common observation was that the current system makes possible entire days free of classes and

facilitates their ability to take advantage of research opportunities in East Baltimore or in Washington, DC. There were also students who, candidly, expressed concern that Friday classes would compromise the four-day weekends that they had come to enjoy and make Hopkins an even more intense environment.

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

Recommendation 12

Give final examinations only during the final examination period.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING ADVISING AND CAREER SUPPORT SERVICES

Recommendation 13

Strengthen faculty engagement in advising by making expectations clear, by providing mentoring and orientation, and by more explicitly including effective service as an advisor as one of the considerations for salary and promotion decisions. This objective might be implemented in several ways: by including a discussion of advising responsibilities in hiring discussions with prospective new faculty; by creating an academic advising orientation for new faculty and a "reorientation and update" program for experienced faculty; by providing to new faculty senior faculty mentors known to be strong advisors; and by developing a mechanism to evaluate faculty mentoring and including that information among considerations for salary increases and promotions.

Recommendation 14

Improve communication and leverage activities among the career support services offices, departmental advising coordinators, academic and pre-professional advising staff, alumni offices' staff, and other related service providers.

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

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

Recommendation 15

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

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

Recommendation 16

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

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

Recommendation 17

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

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

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

Recommendation 18

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

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

Recommendation 19

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

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

Recommendation 20

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DIVERSITY

Recommendation 21

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

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

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

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

Recommendation 22

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

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

Students who want to succeed must be helped to do so. The pressure felt by undergraduates at Hopkins is well known. For ethnic minority students, the stressful environment may seem especially troublesome viewed through the experience of an ethnic minority. Many report feeling particularly isolated in the Hopkins

environment. An infrastructure must be developed that “programs” students for success, tracks progress, and intervenes to catch those who stumble, regardless of their race or ethnicity. Given the rigors of the admissions process, we should regard it as a failure of the system if there are differential rates of persistence to graduation between ethnic minority and majority students.

Recommendation 23

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

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

Recommendation 24

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

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

Recommendation 25

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

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

Recommendation 26

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

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

RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING STUDENT LIFE

Recommendation 27

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

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

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

as Wesleyan does each semester with its extensive program housing, to ensure that the academic and community objectives are being met.

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

Recommendation 28

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

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

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

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

To gauge just how many Hopkins students would consider university housing for their junior and senior years, and what sort of housing they would be looking for, a questionnaire was distributed in the 2003 spring semester. The results support student interest in university housing, with 90% percent indicating the likelihood of choosing university facilities. We want also to explore the possibility of accommodating Nursing, School of Professional Studies in Business and Education, and Peabody students in Homewood

residential options, something that we think would be mutually beneficial and would promote a greater sense of University-wide community. In addition, the increased opportunities for interaction among music, nursing, engineering and liberal arts students in their residences would enhance the educational experience for all.

Recommendation 29

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

Students tell us, and student affairs administrators confirm, that the first-year students most satisfied with their residential experience are those who live in the Alumni Memorial Residences, Hopkins’ most traditionally configured residence halls. Students consider the old AMR’s to be effective at building community, whatever their other drawbacks. A common eating environment, non-suite style living, and common bathroom facilities seem to actually encourage a sense of belonging. While this experience may be quickly outgrown as interest in privacy and comfort become more important, the fact is that first-year students find that communal living fosters strong bonds with classmates and effective exposure to diverse individuals, something that the Marines learned long ago. The Commission believes that all first-year students should be able to enjoy the same educational benefits of residential life and that an investment in making this possible would pay big dividends in student satisfaction and alumni loyalty as well.

The feasibility of housing all freshmen in the vicinity of the AMR’s should therefore be explored. Such a plan, bold as it is, would create a sense of esprit and facilitate programming that integrates the academic and social experiences of students, including engaging faculty in creative ways. By providing alternative housing for the freshmen now housed in McCoy and Wolman, more space would be made available to sophomores and juniors. A reformed residential system would thus provide a progression from a traditional residence hall experience for first-year students, to a semi-structured residential setting for sophomores where infrastructure and staff would be provided, to more independent living in university-owned and operated residential facilities such as Homewood and the new Charles Village development under consideration. See also recommendation #34.

Recommendation 30

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

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

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

Recommendation 31

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

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

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

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

Recommendation 32

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

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

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

Recommendation 33

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

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

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

Recommendation 34

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

During the public comment period in February and March, CUE received a number of questions and supportive comments about current efforts to enhance the Charles Village community—for both the citizens of Baltimore and faculty, students and staff of Johns Hopkins. Constituents suggested that expanding

housing and parking options, and strengthening pedestrian-friendly retail operations in the neighborhood to the immediate east of the Homewood campus, where many Hopkins students live, would not only help to develop the sense of community that seems to be lacking at Hopkins, but also would help to sustain it over the long term. A thriving, energetic “college town” that meets the needs of the citizens who live in Charles Village as well as those of the Hopkins community would be attractive not only to current undergraduates, but also to prospective students, graduate students, faculty/staff, and alumni. In addition, students from other Johns Hopkins campuses, such as Peabody and East Baltimore, would find it an increasingly attractive place to live.

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

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

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

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

Whatever the estimates, we expect that the costs of enhancing quality are not trivial. But, the Commission thinks that more substantial costs will be incurred by not addressing the improvement of the undergraduate experience. As noted in Chapter 2, in recent years, many of our peer institutions have focused significant

effort and resources to enhance their undergraduate programs. As a result, these universities have increased the quality of their programs and their attractiveness to prospective students.

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

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

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

The next steps of the process of particularizing the Commission’s final report to each of the five undergraduate divisions will be tied effectively to the University’s institutional self-study that is part of the re- accreditation process Johns Hopkins will undergo in the coming year. The Commission report is in essence the cornerstone of the focused examination on undergraduate education, and, in the next phase of work, school working groups will carry out the charge to refine priorities, formulate implementation plans, and develop outcome measures. They will also be asked to pay specific attention to linking these initiatives

and other extant programs and services to the demonstration of compliance with the specific standards required by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges and Universities National Panel Report. *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002.

Bowen, William G. and Bok, Derek. *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998. Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: Three Years After the Boyer Report*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2001.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Campus Life: In Search of Community*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1990.

APPENDIX A				
The Five Hopkins Schools that Offer Undergraduate Programs				
School	Faculty (Fall 2001)		Undergraduates (Fall 2001)	
	Full-time	Part-time	Full-time	Part-time
Krieger School of Arts and Sciences (KSAS)	300	11	2648	21
Whiting School of Engineering (WSE)	117	48	1275	5
WSE Part-time Programs in Engineering and Applied Science	0	434	0	88
Peabody Institute	65	81	301	16
School of Nursing	76	79	299	20
School of Professional Studies in Business and Education	59	676	41	371

APPENDIX B

List of Presentations to the Johns Hopkins Community

Krieger School Of Arts And Sciences (KSAS) & Whiting School Of Engineering (WSE)

Meetings with Faculty

KSAS Department Chairs
Friday, March 14, 2 pm
Shriver Hall Board Room

WSE Department Chairs,
ABET Chairs, and Undergraduate Coordinators
Thursday, February 20, 8:30 am
NEB 121

Homewood Academic Council
Wednesday, February 19, 3:30 pm
Shriver Board Room

WSE Faculty Assembly
Friday, April 4, 3 pm
Shriver Hall Clipper Room

Homewood Faculty Assembly
Tuesday, March 4, 3 pm
Arellano Theatre

Meeting with Staff

Homewood Student Affairs/Enrollment &
Academic Services Directors
Friday, January 31, 9 am
Levering Hall, Great Hall

Office of Academic Advising Staff
Wednesday, March 12, 9:30 am
324 Garland Hall

Meeting the Students

Homewood Student Council
Tuesday, February 4, 7:30 pm
Shriver Hall Board Room

Society of Women Engineers (SWE), HOMES
(Homewood Organization of Minorities in
Engineering and Science), Tau Beta Pi, and Student
Reps to WSE Curriculum Committee
Friday, February 14, 11 am
121 NEB

Graduate Representative Organization (GRO)
Monday, February 24, 4 pm
Levering Hall, Great Hall

Resident Assistants
Tuesday, March 25, 5 pm
AMR Multi-purpose Room

Post-baccalaureate Pre-Medical Students
Monday, March 31, 5 pm
Garland Hall, Room 275

Open Meeting

Homewood Town Meeting
Thursday, February 20, 5 pm
AMR Multi-purpose Room

Peabody Institute

Meetings with Faculty

Academic Council

Thursday, March 6, 2 pm

Director's Conference Room

NASM Self-Study Committee

Friday, March 14, 12 noon

Marbury Room of the Friedman Library

Undergraduate Committee

Tuesday, March 18, 12:15 pm

Marbury Room of the Friedman Library

Meeting with Students

Resident Assistants, Student Government, and Student Reps to Special Committee for Student Relations

Wednesday, March 5, 5 pm

206 Conservatory

School of Professional Studies in Business and Education (SPSBE)

Meetings with Faculty

Academic Policy Committee

Thursday, February 13, 9:30 am

Shaffer Hall 200

Meetings with Students

Alpha Sigma Lambda

Wednesday, February 5, 5:30 pm

Shaffer Hall 200

School of Nursing (SON)

Meetings with Faculty

Faculty Senate

Tuesday, March 11, 12:30 pm

217 SON

Meetings with Students

Class advisors, Student Reps to Curriculum Committee, and Student Reps to Admissions Committee

Monday, March 10, 3:30 pm

215 SON

Other University-Wide Constituencies

Council of Deans

Tuesday, March 11, 9:45 am

President's Conference Room

JHU Alumni Council Executive Committee

Saturday, March 1, 1:30 pm

Hodson Hall

Diversity Leadership Council

Wednesday, February 12, 12 noon

Levering Hall, Great Hall

JHU Parent's Association Representatives

Tuesday, March 18, 6 pm

Garland Hall, President's Conference Room

APPENDIX C

CUE MEMBERSHIP ROSTER

Paula Burger (Chair), *Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs and Acting Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education*

Sandra Angell, *Associate Dean for Student Affairs, School of Nursing*

Gregory Ball, *Professor, Psychological and Brain Sciences, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences*

Susan Boswell, *Dean of Student Life, Homewood Schools*

Aдриene Breckenridge, *Sr. Academic Advisor, Office of Academic Advising*

Amy Brokl, *Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Michael Carroll, *Alumnus, Whiting School of Engineering Wen-Shan Chen, Student, Peabody Institute*

Andrew Cherlin, *Professor and Chair, Sociology, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences*

Robert Cloney, *Student, School of Professional Studies in Business & Education*

William Conley, *Dean of Enrollment Services, Homewood Schools*

Chris Cunico, *Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Candice Dalrymple, *Associate Dean & Director, Center for Educational Resources, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences*

Steven David, *Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Political Science, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Michael David, *Student, Whiting School of Engineering*

Andrew Douglas, *Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Whiting School of Engineering*

Amanda Dusold, *Student, Peabody Institute*

James Eiszner, *Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Manish Gala, *Student, Whiting School of Engineering*

Ray Gillian, *Assistant Provost & Director, Equal Opportunity & Affirmative Action Programs*

Bayla Goldenberg, *Student, School of Nursing*

Siba Grovogui, *Associate Professor, Political Science, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences*

Bruce Hamilton, *Professor, Economics, Krieger School of Arts and Sciences*

Audrey Henderson, *Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Dana Jones, *Student, School of Nursing*

Wolfgang Justen, *Dean, Peabody Conservatory*

Ravi Kavasery, *Student, Whiting School of Engineering*

Rao Kosaraju, *Professor, Computer Science, Whiting School of Engineering*

April Land, *Student, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Robert Lawrence, *Associate Dean for Professional Education and Programs,
Bloomberg School of Public Health*

S. William Leslie, *Professor, History of Science, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Anuj Mittal, *JHU Alumnus*

Charles Reyner, *Student, Whiting School of Engineering*

Matthew Roller, *Associate Professor, Classics Department, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences
(on leave Fall 2002)*

Champlin Sheridan, *Chairman, Sheridan Press, Alumnus and JHU Trustee*

Artin Shoukas, *Professor, Biomedical Engineering, School of Medicine*

Walter Stephens, *Professor and Vice Chair, Romance Languages, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Adena W. Testa, *Attorney, Alumna and JHU Trustee*

Antoinette Ungaretti, *Assistant Dean and Director of Undergraduate Programs,
School of Professional Studies in Business & Education*

Dominic Wiker, *Director, Baltimore Main Streets, JHU Alumnus*

Meredith Williams, *Professor of Philosophy, Krieger School of Arts & Sciences*

Lea Ybarra, *Executive Director and Associate Dean, Center for Talented Youth Staff to the Commission*

Pamela Cranston, *Associate Vice Provost for Academic Affairs*

Barb Helmuth, *Assistant to Dr. Paula Burger*

Debi Rager, *Scribe*

APPENDIX D

WORKING GROUPS—SCOPES OF WORK

Tentative working groups outlined the following preliminary scopes of work. As the formal groups took shape, the work plans for several were refined and brought into alignment with realistic assessments of time, effort and data available.

1. Academic Experience: Teaching and Learning

Chair: Dr. Gregory Ball, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences,
Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

Part A: Undergraduate Teaching

Purpose:

The purpose of our subcommittee is to examine how the five Hopkins schools assess, support, reward and strive for excellence in undergraduate teaching.

Need to Address the Problem:

Undergraduate education is a core mission of the institution. Teaching is perhaps the most critical factor in undergraduate education. Our goal needs to be that we teach at the highest level.

Issues & Questions to be Addressed:

How do we currently assess, support, and reward undergraduate teaching?

Are these assessment, support, and reward structures effective and sufficient? If these structures are effective and sufficient, how can we maintain them?

If these structures are ineffective and/or insufficient, how can we enhance them? How is excellence in teaching fostered?

University Data Needed to Address these Issues:

General Information (for each School):

- Number of instructors by rank (including part-time faculty and teaching assistants)
- Teaching responsibility of each instructor
- Class size distributions

Assessment Information (for each School):

- How we currently assess teaching (course evaluations, peer evaluations, etc.)
- How we close the loop: teaching assessment – teaching improvement

Support Information (for each School):

- How instructors are recruited
- How new instructors are trained to teach
- How current instructors are apprised of new and effective pedagogy

Reward Information (for each School):

- How effective teaching is rewarded (salary, P&T)

Potential Collaborators:

There are no known groups, committees, projects or initiatives that have targeted undergraduate teaching. (If we add curriculum to our mission, we would be overlapping with curriculum committees -- presumably one in every department of the school.)

Comparisons/Outside Resources:

We hope to obtain much of the above data for small, private research institutions such as the non-Ivy COFHE institutions (MIT, Northwestern, Tufts, Rice, Swarthmore, Wesleyan, Wash. U. of St. Louis, Duke, et al). It is unlikely that we'd receive reward information, however. COFHE may have already collected some of this data from our peers.

Tentative Work Plan:

The first step is to see how we assess, support, and reward undergraduate teaching. This is the data-gathering task outlined above. The second and third steps will be done in tandem. To determine whether our current structures are sufficient, we will conduct our own analyses as well as survey students, faculty members, and administrators through questionnaires and/or interviews and focus groups. At the same time, we can ask participants how to maintain (if found sufficient) or improve (if found insufficient) these processes. Another way to do this is to consider the same data from our peers.

Resource Considerations:

The Subcommittee on Undergraduate Teaching would need to have the support of an institutional research person who could get comparative institution data and the support of each of the five undergraduate degree granting divisions to research and report on their procedures and data. For questionnaires, we would need financial remuneration for costs incurred, data-entry assistance, and cooperation from the Schools for questionnaire distribution and collection. For interviews/focus groups (which might be less costly than questionnaires) we would require time from a number of Hopkins community members representing a wide spectrum of participants (from students to faculty and other instructors). We would need to hire a graduate assistant to conduct any interviews and organize the data.

Additional Issue to be Considered:

Should this group consider knowledge base/skills and curriculum issues?

If we ask whether our students are learning, what we want them to learn (ABET criteria for the WSE, for example), we cannot link this issue to teaching without also considering the curriculum. For example, we cannot consider whether we teach quantitative skills well without examining the quantitative coursework in engineering classes. We note that teaching is very different from curriculum.

For any subcommittee to look at curriculum, it would be necessary to add the following items to the above list:

General Information (for each School):

- What do we expect our graduates to have (specific knowledge bases, skills, etc.)?

Requirements for every School and major!

- Syllabi for every course.

Assessment Information (for each School):

- Examples of tests, homework assignments, papers, etc. for every course.

Part B: Mentored and Small Group Learning

Purpose:

A key ingredient in undergraduate education is the sustained and active engagement in an intellectual problem, research project, or critical inquiry under a professor's supervision. This can be achieved in a variety of ways, but the most familiar are the small seminar, the collaborative laboratory project, and the individual thesis. All Hopkins schools offer these traditional kinds of small group learning in some form. The purpose of our subcommittee is to determine just what kinds of small group learning are available to our undergraduates, to assess the adequacy of what is currently on offer, and to make recommendations (if necessary) for ways to enhance, modify or supplement current practice.

Issues and Questions:

The central issues are the following:

- What kinds of small group learning, and how many, are currently in place in Hopkins five undergraduate programs?
- Recognizing that subject matter and goals differ among the schools, what kinds of small group learning are appropriate to each school?
- Are there ways in which the traditional forms of small group learning (seminar, laboratory research, and individual thesis) could be enhanced, supplemented or even changed more substantially?
We need to identify and assess new pedagogical strategies that are being developed, including the following: student run collaborative projects, different pedagogy for the discussion seminar, use of the internet and ethernet, interactive teaching programs.

- What should be the relation between introductory level lecture courses and small group learning? This concerns not only the relation between the lectures and discussion sections of a single lecture course, but also the relation between these introductory or core lecture courses to small group learning. This issue will involve not only a fresh look at the value of lecture courses but also consideration of radical alternatives to introductory lecture courses in some areas, e.g., substituting interactive computer-based learning for lecture courses.

With respect to these four issues, the subcommittee must be sensitive to the differences among the schools and among departments within schools in its evaluation and recommendations. We do not expect to arrive at a uniform set of recommendations.

University Data Needed:

We need the following information from each of the five schools:

- Over the last five years, what is the total number of undergraduate courses given, how many of these were small courses (enrollment under 20), and what is the percentage of small courses to total number of courses?
- We need this information to be broken down by department along with the faculty size of each department (indicating the number of regular faculty members and the number of adjunct faculty, term contract lecturers, etc. (exclusive of teaching assistants)).
- Over the last five years, how many tutorials, student run collaborative projects, and/or theses has each department (or school, if that is the appropriate unit) given? The data should be presented by year.
- Over the last five years, how many students were enrolled in some form of small group learning? It would be useful to have this information broken down not only by school, but also by semester.

This data is crucial if we are to evaluate just what problems Hopkins actually faces. An initial crude set of data on the number of small classes given with the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences reveals a high percentage of small classes (with the exception of a couple of departments, notably, Biology and Psychology). See attachment 1.

Comparative Data with Other Institutions:

We need data about strategies for undergraduate education that peer institutions are pursuing.

- What kinds of small group learning are used at peer institutions (including Brown, Chicago, Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Yale) as well as a selected number of elite liberal arts colleges (e.g., Swarthmore, Wesleyan, Williams)?
- What is the evidence of the success of innovative teaching strategies?

New strategies for undergraduate education, both pedagogical and technical, that we will be considering for Hopkins have been introduced at other institutions. We need to know what these strategies are, and even more importantly how successful they are in enhancing the undergraduate's learning experience.

Potential Collaborators:

It might prove useful to draw on the resources of the following CUE subcommittees:

Student Life Subcommittee: One possibility for small group learning would be to introduce residential seminars or colloquia.

Undergraduate Teaching: Recommendations concerning small group learning would have implications for what role the Center for Educational Resources might play at Hopkins.

Tentative Work Plan:

It is too soon to specify a timetable for the work to be done, but the logic of the problem is clear enough.

- Collect data on current practice at Hopkins and assess what the problems actually are at each of the schools.
- Collect data from other institutions in order to maximize the range of possible strategies that Hopkins might introduce in its undergraduate education.
- Report on our hypotheses as to the problems each school faces and make tentative suggestions for addressing those problems.

2. Advising and Career Support

Chair: Ms. Sandra Angell, Associate Dean for Academic and Student Support, School of Nursing

Purpose:

This sub-group would evaluate the mechanisms, both formal and informal, existing within the University for student academic advising and career development. Academic advising and career development are separate but intertwined phenomena worthy of evaluation to maximize faculty, staff and alumni resources that could contribute to informed decision-making about “end-game” issues among undergraduate students.

Need to address the problem:

Homewood undergraduate students, especially those whose goals for post-graduate work or study are uncertain, express the desire for academic advisors who take a holistic approach to advising, i.e. who can discuss potential careers outside their own area of specialization. Students report the lack of a formal structure for academic advising and few opportunities to participate in mentored relationships in some large academic departments. All schools represented on this committee (AS &E, Nursing, Peabody) recognize a need for evaluation of academic advisor preparation and support.

Career counseling services are more developed in some schools (A&S) than others (Nursing and Peabody; SPSBE not represented). Schools lacking formal career counseling centers cite insufficient financial resources for these services. All schools represented expressed the need for better communication about existing resources.

Students requested more involvement of alumni in providing opportunities for internships, mentoring and job networking. There appear to be opportunities for better cross-fertilization for career potential among the schools—i.e. international studies majors at A&S with SAIS, nursing majors with public health, musicians with computer science, etc.

Issues & Questions to be addressed:

What is academic advising? Does it need to be redefined to better meet the needs of undergraduates? How are academic advisors assigned, how are they prepared for this role and how are they evaluated? Is there any reward for being a good advisor? What is the student's responsibility in the academic advising process and how is that communicated?

What are the formal services in place for academic advising (some schools have offices for advising; most do not)? How do these offices work with the academic advisors?

Career counseling offices and services should be evaluated to determine what is currently available and how services are communicated to students. A broader sampling of students should be asked what services would be helpful to them in making career decisions. The distinction between career counseling and job placement must be made and a decision made about the scope of any future services to provide the latter.

Are there opportunities for schools to share services? How do we better tap the rich resources of our alumni?

University Data Needed to Address these Issues:

An evaluation of current resources and practices for both academic advising and career development among the undergraduate divisions is necessary. Data about percentages of students who continue directly to graduate school would be helpful along with information about what other graduates do (very difficult to collect). An evaluation of alumni activities in the area of career development is needed. There is a subcommittee of the Alumni Council on this topic. Some schools have divisional alumni offices as well. In all cases, examples of successful programs and best practices should be shared.

Potential Collaborators:

Academic deans responsible for academic advising in all schools; student focus groups in all schools; collaboration with recent alumni (? mailing), Campus Ministries, Offices of Academic Advising and Career Counseling where they exist or interviews with persons responsible for those functions in other schools.

Comparisons/Outside Resources:

Search for successful examples of academic advising and career development in other institutions or among our faculty, staff and students who have experienced successful practices in other institutions.

Tentative Work Plan:

Gain approval for this subgroup issue as part of the larger self-study. Determine what data needs to be collected, how, when and by whom.

Resource Considerations:

Any mailing to alumni would be expensive. Could we access HopkinsNet to gain information from alumni? Student membership in this committee will decrease with graduation. New student members need to be added.

3. Diversified Undergraduate Community

Chair: Dr. Robert Lawrence, Edyth Schoenrich Professor of Preventive Medicine and Associate Dean for Professional Education Programs, Bloomberg School of Public Health

Part A: Racial and Ethnic Diversity

Purpose:

To explore in what ways Johns Hopkins current diversity profile, structural diversity (student, faculty and staff), curriculum and student life enhances or hinders the quality of the collegiate experience for Johns Hopkins undergraduates.

Need to Address the Problem:

In an article entitled “The Benefits of Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Higher Education,” authors Jeffrey Milem and Kenji HaKuta in their opening paragraph state: “Many colleges and universities share a common belief, born of experience, that diversity in their student bodies, faculties, and staff is important for them to fulfill their primary mission providing a quality education.” The article continues by stating ... Affirmation of the value of diversity is also evident in the following statement endorsed by the presidents of 62 research universities (including eight Ivy League institutions and more than 30 public research universities).

We speak first and foremost as educators. We believe that our students benefit significantly from education that takes place within a diverse setting. In the course of their university education, our students encounter and learn from others who have backgrounds and characteristics very different from their own. As we seek to prepare students for life in the 21st century, the educational value of such encounters will become more important, not less, than in the past.

A very substantial portion of our curriculum is enhanced by the discourse made possible by the heterogeneous backgrounds of our students. Equally, a significant part of education in our institutions takes place outside the classroom, in extracurricular activities where students learn how to work together, as well as to compete, how to exercise leadership, as well as to build consensus. If our institutional capacity to bring together a genuinely diverse group of students is removed—or severely reduced—then the quality and texture of the education we provide will be significantly diminished (Association of American Universities, “On the Importance of Diversity in University Admissions,” *The New York Times*, 24 April 1997, p. A27).

Project Scope:

The committee will determine the level of diversity in the faculty, staff and students, the diversity in the curriculum, ethnic minority students’ perception of their Hopkins experience, and how diversity is incorporated in the non-classroom experiences of undergraduates. The following questions will be addressed:

- Do we have adequate diversity in the student body to enhance the classroom discussions?
- Does the non-classroom Hopkins experience enhance or hinder the opportunity for diverse students to interact?
- Is the faculty sufficiently diverse to provide the undergraduate with exposure to different ideas?
- Are Hopkins undergraduates exposed to faculty mentoring from diverse backgrounds?
- What are the experiences of ethnic minority students?
- Is the curriculum diverse? Do students have opportunities to explore other cultures and ways of thinking and assessing information?
- Do our graduates have a full understanding of and appreciation for diversity?
- Are our graduates capable of leading and managing a diverse workforce?

University Data Needed to Address the Issue:

Enrollment data by gender / race

Faculty and staff data by race and gender

Number of diversity-related courses offered each semester / year

Diversity-related programs

Potential Collaborations:

Diversity Leadership Council

African American Studies Program Committee University Committee on the Status of Women Office of Multicultural Student Affairs

Tentative Work Plan:

The Committee will review pertinent data, seek the advice of experts, assess the campus climate for ethnic minority students (survey—focus groups), and consult with campus officials to determine the current status and needs.

Part B: International Dimensions of Undergraduate Education

Purpose:

The purpose of this group is to carry out the mandate of the Board of Trustees that charged CUE with expanding international opportunities for Hopkins undergraduates in the areas of curriculum, advising, and study abroad.

Record of Arts and Sciences:

The Krieger School has the largest contingent of undergraduates who are engaged in international study both in the US and abroad.

RE: Curriculum:

International Studies is the largest major at the Krieger School, surpassing even biology. It includes requirements in political science, economics, history and foreign language. In addition, non-International Studies majors take a wide variety of courses with international content across many disciplines including anthropology, sociology, literature and philosophy. Distinctive to the Krieger School are ties to the Schools of Public Health and the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies where undergraduates take courses with some formally enrolling in academic programs.

Advising:

The Krieger School has an Office of Study Abroad run by Ruth Aranow where advice on international study is provided. There is also a website.

Study Abroad:

189 students studied abroad last year. This includes 78 in Hopkins Programs in France, Cuba, Ecuador, Italy and Germany. This is an increase from last year's total of 136 and represents about

25% of the junior class. Engineering had 13 students traveling abroad this year (an increase from 6 the previous year).

Information to be Gathered:

The Committee agreed that the following information would be useful to learn: statistics from all schools re curriculum and study abroad; how schools deal with sending students to unstable areas; where students are going (both countries and schools); international courses re the environment; how study abroad programs are evaluated; how international courses can be encouraged across the curriculum, and what other universities do in these areas.

Outcomes:

To see whether the schools are making progress in international education we will look at the number of professors hired who teach in international areas compared to earlier periods, the amount of resources devoted to advising for study abroad; and the change in percentage of students enrolling in Hopkins Study Abroad programs.

4. Student Life: Integrating the Intellectual and Social Lives of Undergraduate Students

Chair: Dr. S. William Leslie, Department of History of Science and Technology,
Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

Purpose:

The purpose of this sub-group is to examine ways the intellectual and social lives of undergraduate can be better integrated and make recommendations of activities, facilities and models that might best accomplish this for each undergraduate division.

Need to address the problem:

Homewood undergraduates report a feeling of disconnection between their academic and social lives, a feeling of fragmentation about their residential lives, and more generally a lack of sense of collective endeavor. They tie these feelings to several specific, concrete issues: a lack of contact with faculty mentors and teachers outside of purely academic settings; a structure of residential life that puts upperclassmen off campus and therefore detaches them from the social and intellectual life of the campus; the lack of a fully satisfactory gathering place (or places) for working and socializing; the lack of any events or rituals that are widely shared among undergraduates and that might serve as a touchstone of collective experience and identity. SPSBE recognizes problems of fragmentation that are based on issues that are unique to them, such as 6 campus locations and adults who balance full-time work with family and school. They report some success, however, with creating program cohorts to form many learning communities. Many of Peabody's concerns revolve around the need to be more connected to Homewood services; a more closely aligned social connection would be desired as well. SON reports systemic space limitations, circumscribing students' access and sociability; it also report security, transportation, and parking issues.

Issues and questions to be addressed:

For Homewood students, can broader and more robust contacts between faculty and undergraduate students be forged, especially in extra-academic settings? Can residential life be (re)structured in ways that bring upperclassmen back into the community, better integrate the four classes, and generally help to forge a sense of community and collective endeavor among at least some subgroups of undergraduates, or indeed across the entire student body? Can some or all of these desiderata be achieved or enhanced in other ways? Can appropriate venues for student gatherings be created? What can be done to create a feeling of collective endeavor across the student body as a whole? Can SPSBE's successful model be generalized across the schools? Can more systemic connections between Peabody and Homewood be developed (i.e. enhanced shuttle service)? How can SON's space and transportation issues be resolved (again, perhaps in part by expanded/enhanced shuttle service)?

University data needed to address these issues:

A broader and deeper understanding of students' feelings about these issues—their sense of what works and what doesn't, where problems lie and how they might be addressed—is entirely necessary. We believe that holding focus groups of undergraduates, selected to represent different living situations and divisions, would bring some clarity to these matters. Any data that has been collected by the various divisions may be of use; e.g. the CSEQ survey, which has recently been administered at Homewood.

Potential collaborators:

The issues considered by this subcommittee run up against the work being done by a variety of other entities within the university. The most obvious and important of these is Residential Life (if Dean Susan Boswell serves on this subcommittee, she could presumably serve as liaison, keeping both sides informed of the other's brief). Any examination of residential life and of appropriate venues for student gathering would also impinge on the work of the Bookstore Committee, and/or the successor committee that will plan the remainder of the development that includes the bookstore; the consultants who are working on a master dining plan; perhaps also the Charles Village Improvement Association, if any concrete proposals include developing or acquiring property on the east side of Charles.

Comparisons/outside resources:

For Homewood, examining in greater detail the structures of student life at universities like ours (private institutions with the great majority of undergraduates living either in university housing or renting through the local private housing market) would be edifying. Peer institutions might include Stanford, Penn, Chicago, Princeton, and Yale. For the other divisions, appropriate other divisions will vary.

Tentative work plan:

Collect data/conduct focus groups; collect data from peer institutions; generate proposals.

Outcome Assessment:

Qualitative: We must monitor student satisfaction over an extended period. A survey, like the CSEQ, administered university-wide (with customizations for each divisions' needs) must be developed.

Quantitative: Monitoring student usage and demand for any new facilities (e.g. restructured or newly constructed dorms, or a Student Union) would indicate their success or failure. Count and seek to increase the number of events involving informal student/faculty contact. Monitor usage on new or enhanced shuttle routes.