



**RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS FOR
FULL FACULTY SENATE MEETING (NOVEMBER 13, 2019)
SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL: DECEMBER 4, 2019
Submitted by: Wayne A. I. Frederick, M.D., MBA
President**

Responses to questions for President Frederick Fall 2019 Full Faculty Senate Meeting

1. Regarding Morgan State University's capital campaign, it is important to understand the details of the ~ \$250 million-dollar capital campaign and how success was measured and publicly presented. Morgan State's campaign, as they defined it, took place over at least the three years of 2016, 2017, and 2018.

Their campaign total of \$254 M over the 3+ year period incorporates the following revenue categories as fundraising dollars:

- federal appropriations;
- state appropriations gifts from individuals;
- state grants and contracts;
- private grants and contracts;
- foundations; and individuals

It is unusual, and certainly not mainstream in professional fundraising to include federal and state appropriations, or competitive federal grants (the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, the Association of Fundraising Professionals [formerly NSFRE], or any major academic research center on philanthropy [the Lilly School at Indiana University, Vanderbilt, etc.]) as part of a capital or comprehensive campaign. If Howard incorporated the same categories (including federal appropriations and federal grants) as philanthropic revenue, Howard's three-year fundraising total would not have been one-tenth, as posited, but 400% greater than our HBCU counterpart with a total over one billion.

Morgan State reports that their two-year combined fundraising total from individuals was \$20.3 million. The federal tax filings for the Morgan State Foundation shows that the University generated \$6.1 million in contributions in FY16 and \$5.8 million in contributions FY15.

Howard University's contributed revenue cited in the question is a much more narrowly proscribed number of contributions from private, non-government sources including individuals, corporations, and philanthropic foundations. Those contributions are booked in accordance with GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles). The numbers of \$20.4 million and \$15.7 million should be compared to Morgan State's report of the same revenue categories as presented above.

Howard received nearly 20,000 individual contributions in the last fiscal year alone and recorded a ~ 27% increase in the number of undergraduate donors compared to the previous year (a metric included when determining the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings).

The timing, target, and leadership of any comprehensive campaign will be set by the Board of Trustees, including its faculty representatives, at the appropriate time. All fundraising goals and targets will meet industry standards for the definition of a capital campaign.



I look forward to continuing to work with the Faculty Senate in our commitment to shared governance as those targets are being drafted and are being met.

2. Colleges and Universities in DC are required to file an entitlements plan (“Campus Master Plan”) with the District of Columbia, typically on a 10-year revolving basis. This entitlements plan dictates what major real estate projects that the University is entitled to implement within the boundaries of our central campus. If a project is not shown on the Campus Master Plan, it cannot be implemented unless the Plan is amended or revised. The University most recently filed for an entitlements plan in 2011 yet was not required to file any correlated economic strategy to physically achieve the plan. Since this time, the University administration has changed, and we have undertaken an extensive strategic planning process, which resulted in the Howard Forward plan. The University has also been undergoing a 10-year capital planning process to plot out the diversification of revenue streams and prioritization of capital uses. Both efforts, along with the ongoing Middle-States Self-Study have positioned the University to embark upon an entitlement planning process that is well-informed by both the university’s overarching strategy and our financial realities.

The entitlements plan must be filed in March 2020, and shall be segmented into three components: discovery, synthesis, and documentation. During all three phases, the University will solicit feedback from University stakeholders in the form of town halls, focus groups, surveys, and other engagement mechanisms. The entitlements planning process was first previewed earlier this year at Community Advisory Committee (“CAC”) meetings. CAC meetings are inclusive, open gatherings which are held quarterly and typically includes a cross section of students, faculty, staff, alumni, local community members, and other interested parties.

The goal of the Discovery phase (currently under way) is to compile a comprehensive understanding of Howard University today. The discovery exercise includes data gathering, an inventory/assessment of physical and programmatic conditions, a review of planned and proposed projects, and identification of the university’s priorities, needs, and aspirations. The outcomes of this phase will inform subsequent planning and will establish a dialogue with the broader campus community.

The Synthesis phase will focus on the development of a Draft Campus Plan for the University by January 2020. The draft plan will include an illustrative plan and perspective graphics, and a narrative description of the critical elements of the proposed campus plan. This Draft will be submitted for review by the District of Columbia’s various agencies, the Advisory Neighborhood Commission(s), and the broader University community.

The Documentation phase will continue to develop the narrative and graphics for the Campus Plan based on the review and input from Howard University leadership, and stakeholders and targets a filing in March 2020.



3. In a letter dated April 2, 2018, Dr. Ellie Fogarty, a representative of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, wrote, “As the Middle States Commission on Higher Education's staff liaison to Howard University, I am writing in response to recent coverage in the media related to misappropriation of funds within the University's office of financial aid. Therefore, on behalf of the Commission, I request that Howard University submit a supplemental information report (SIR) addressing recent developments and actions planned or taken by the University to ensure ongoing compliance with Standard II (Ethics and Integrity), Standard IV (Support of the Student Experience), and Standard VII (Governance, Leadership, and Administration). In addition, the University must continue to inform the Commission about any and all significant developments related to any internal or external investigations surrounding these concerns.”

Howard University sent a letter in reply to Dr. Fogarty’s correspondence on April 28, 2019. In part, it read “to that end, I have enclosed the Howard University Preliminary Investigation Report. As described in the report, the University's initial investigation uncovered problematic practices in the awarding of certain Howard University-provided financial aid grants. In response to this discovery, the University, through its leadership, including me, took immediate steps to initiate an ongoing investigation into this matter. These grants represented discounts and were not donor-funded or federal funds. The report sets forth the events underlying the University's decision to terminate six University employees for their misconduct related to this matter. The report also identifies additional steps that the University will be taking to improve our financial aid policies, processes, and procedures to ensure that issues like this do not arise again.”

This report was posted on the University website on April 9, 2018, and is still available; <https://newsroom.howard.edu/newsroom/article/8196/howard-university-preliminary-investigation-report>

The University Administration has and is addressing many of these specific issues by:

- Executing strategic hires including a new, permanent director of Financial Aid, an internal Financial Aid compliance officer, associate provost for enrollment, management and a University-wide chief compliance officer.
- Significantly increasing staffing in the Office of Financial Aid.
 - Associate Provost/Assistant Vice-President of Enrollment Management (Hired)
 - Director of Financial Aid (Hired)
 - University-wide Chief Compliance Officer (Hired)
 - Deputy Director/Financial Aid Compliance Officer (Hired)

There were additional staff hired into the office including financial aid officers, counselors, and other personnel

- Requiring that all awards of University grants be reviewed and approved by the Budget Office (for unrestricted institutional aid) and the Controller’s Office (for donor directed aid) prior to award by the Office of Financial Aid.
- Limiting access to the Banner financial aid module to a small number of vetted senior University employees, with adequate third-party review and appropriate segregation of duties.
- Retaining Financial Aid Services, an external firm that provides universities with student



financial aid services, to complete a comprehensive range of tasks related to the improvement of Howard's administration of financial aid including:

- Updating all student/family consumer information regarding Howard's student charges and financial aid policies, for posting on the Web;
- Updating Howard's Financial Aid Policies and Procedures Manual, covering rules for the efficient administration of both Howard-provided institutional financial aid and federal aid; and
- Training all Howard University Office of Financial Aid staff on the contents of the updated Financial Aid policies and procedures manual.

The University was removed from HCM2 status by the Department of Education (DOE) nine months after the penalty was imposed. This timeline for removal from HCM2 is unprecedented.

We have not received a preliminary report from DOE. Once we have received such a report, we will finalize our internal investigation report and release that to the community.

4. Results from the Budget Advisory Committee's (BAC) Compensation Study

The median base salary for Howard Professors increased by 12% since 2014. However, the median market base salary for professors and associate professors (excluding medical schools) in the Middle State Institution Comparator group also increased by 12%. While we have improved salaries overall, we are still making efforts to keep up with comparator institutions.

Furthermore, I agree with the recommendation of the BAC, and I am committed to the necessary adjustments to faculty compensation. This will be accomplished through continuing to provide annual merit increases, and possibly increasing the amount, as the budget and circumstances may permit. We will also reprogram some savings from administrative prioritization and academic prioritization towards increased faculty compensation. We have already implemented the second BAC recommendation to increase the amount of compensation for faculty promoted by rank to 6% of salary, with appropriate minimum increases.

Regarding Administrator Salaries, the comparator institutions used for the Faculty Compensation Study included:

- Case Western Reserve
- Emory University
- George Washington University
- Georgetown University
- St. Louis University
- Tufts University
- Tulane University
- University of Miami
- Vanderbilt University
- Washington University in St. Louis



A comparison of administrator compensation at those same institutions versus Howard University indicates that in every case compensation for our administrators is less than 60 percent of their peers and, in several cases, much less than 50 percent for the roles of Provost, Chief Operating Officer, General Counsel, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Vice President for Development.

5. Howard University's Pension Plan has a Funding Ratio of 91%. The "funding ratio" measures a pension plan's assets against the funding level required to fully fund all future promised benefits. Since benefits are paid out over a period of many years, it is not necessary for a pension plan to be 100% funded to be financially sound.

Howard's 91% funding ratio is significantly higher than the 80% ratio outlined for a "healthy plan" as defined by the Pension Protection Act of 2006. According to Aon, Howard's retirement plan consultant and actuary, Howard's pension plan meets all the legal requirements and funding requirements necessary to be considered a "healthy plan."

6. The premise of this statement is false. In April 2017 – Provost Wutoh assembled the working group consisting of faculty members, the majority of whom were also members of the Faculty Senate, (Associate Provosts Joseph Reidy, Ph.D. and Angela Cole Dixon, Ph.D. served as coordinators) to develop a consensus document for the revised Handbook.

On February 9, 2018, Provost Wutoh submitted a final draft of the Proposed Faculty Handbook Revision (consensus document) to then Faculty Senate Chair, Richard Wright and requested response by April 1, 2018. On **July 5, 2018**, following incorporation of proposed edits by the Faculty Senate, Provost distributed a revised draft consensus document dated July 5, 2018 to the University Faculty and to the chair of the Faculty Senate with a request that Faculty Senate complete review and report results by September 4, 2018. On **January 31, 2019**, Dr. Sonya Sobrian submitted to Provost Wutoh changes from the Faculty Senate Council to the consensus version of the proposed faculty handbook revision including significant language not proposed in the consensus document. It was noted that these edits were approved by the Faculty Senate Council on January 30, 2019.

On February 8, 2019, Provost Wutoh submitted a letter to Dr. Sobrian acknowledging receipt of the amendments approved by the Faculty Senate Council for inclusion in the proposed Handbook revision. He also informed her that the Faculty Senate proposals would be submitted to me along with annotations outlining his concerns. Addressing specific concerns raised by the overwhelming majority of faculty and administrators, the revised 2019 Faculty Handbook is a significant improvement compared to the 1993 version with special focus on the following critical areas:

Reaffirmation of Academic Freedom – The Handbook notes "Faculty members are entitled to academic freedom in teaching, research, publication, scholarly activity, assembly, service, and in the generation and transmission of new knowledge.



Highlighting the Importance of Shared Governance – The Handbook defines shared governance “as the right and responsibility of Faculty to seek early and meaningful engagement with the Administration and the Board of Trustees in the development of policies and decisions that impact University-wide programs and the responsiveness of Howard University to achieve its unique contemporary mission. Shared governance ensures the right of Faculty to seek change and to participate in the governance of the University through direct interaction and dialogue with the Administration and/or the Board of Trustees, as set forth in the Constitution of the Faculty Senate.”

Protecting Tenure Rights – The Handbook reaffirms that “tenured faculty are senior faculty members whose records of achievement in their fields, as determined by peers, administrators, and external reviewers, have merited the award of indefinite tenure by the Board of Trustees of the University ... A Faculty member who has been awarded indefinite tenure has a continuous appointment made by the Board of Trustees that extends to retirement, death, or resignation, subject only to termination for just cause or for financial exigency, according to the guidelines specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

Additionally, the Handbook includes new protections for Faculty based upon changes in employment law and societal changes since the 1993 Handbook was approved. These protections include, but are not limited to;

- Inclusion of protections outlined in both the Federal and DC Family Medical Leave Act,
- Creation and delineation of the role of the Faculty Ombudsperson to assist Faculty in various matters,
- Formalizing the opportunity for Faculty to be engaged in the annual academic planning process for each school and college,
- The availability of tenure clock extensions for various personal circumstances, including the addition of a child for faculty of all genders, as well as “unforeseen circumstances that adversely affect the Faculty member’s ability to conduct scholarly work or fulfill other faculty responsibilities.”

7. The Board of Trustees and I fully support the election of an Undergraduate Faculty Trustee to serve on the Board. We also fully support the election of a Graduate Faculty Trustee. Marsha Echols, a tenured member of the School of Law, currently serves as the Graduate Faculty Trustee and provides the Board with the faculty perspective on Board matters. We hope that an Undergraduate Faculty Trustee will join our Graduate Faculty Trustee on the Board. As with all matters of the University, including the election of all general and affiliate trustees, the Bylaws of the University must be followed. Unfortunately, the past two faculty elections in the spring of 2018 and spring of 2019 for this position have not complied with the Bylaws, and the Board was unable to validate the election and welcome the new Undergraduate Faculty Trustee.

The Faculty Senate has not notified the Board of a date for a new faculty election to fill this open seat. The Board welcomes an election that complies with the Bylaws and looks forward to the seating of a duly elected Undergraduate Faculty Trustee at the faculty’s earliest convenience. The



Secretary to the Board welcomes any requests for clarification, or the interpretation, of the University bylaws.

8. The Provost has issued nearly 10 communications and updates regarding the Prioritization process since 2017; the most recent on October 16, 2019. The Prioritization process was open and participatory throughout all phases. A community-based participatory research approach was taken for every aspect of the process--to determine what to study, how to study it, the criteria, the instruments, and the evaluation.

The Task Force consisted of faculty, staff, and students from all 13 Schools and Colleges, spanning over 40 administrative and academic units. Dozens of people (students, faculty and staff) participated in focus groups to refine the data collection instruments.

All 13 Schools and Colleges were visited by the Program Prioritization Task Force (PPTF) to provide an overview of the process, and resources to help programs develop their self-studies. Further, training was provided on Taskstream, the self-study process, and how to facilitate faculty engagement in this process.

Multiple modalities were used to communicate with the University, including in-person and video presentations, online and hands-on trainings, and dedicated staff to provide technical assistance. There were multiple opportunities for input in developing the research instruments before they were used. Finally, as with the Taskforce, the PPTF Evaluation Committee hailed from across the university. All 13 Schools and Colleges were represented, with more than 50 staff and over 100 faculty from over 50 academic departments and 40 administrative units. Details regarding each Key Performance Indicator, and resultant scores have been provided previously, and are also available on the website of the Office of the Provost [here](#).

Consistent with our *Howard Forward* strategic plan's goals and objectives, the Provost is preparing a list of recommendations regarding academic programs, including; strategic investment areas, areas for academic focus, new program approval process, an academic innovation fund, online instructional opportunities, and programs proposed to sunset.

In the event there are programs recommended for closure, there will be good faith efforts made to employ tenured faculty elsewhere in the university, where possible. In the past, when decisions were made regarding program changes or mergers at Howard University, these decisions were guided by previous strategic plans, e.g., the Strategic Frameworks for Action I and II, and efforts at academic review or renewal, e.g., PCAR. Middle States requires the University to undertake periodic assessments of the effectiveness of its planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal processes, and availability of resources. This is done to respond to opportunities and challenges and to improve its programs and services. Our current strategic plan, adopted by the Howard University Board of Trustees, calls for us to develop a more focused academic portfolio, with the vast majority of programs in areas of high demand to ensure students receive the highest quality, most rigorous instruction and have the skills they need to be competitive in the workforce of the future.



The PPTF scores are important, because relying on them is consistent with our accrediting body's expectation that we make decisions based on assessment results. However, these scores are not the only basis for these decisions. Rather, decisions about what to include in and how to resource our academic portfolio are based on a variety of factors, including: mission alignment, enrollment, graduation rates and time to completion, level of demand for the program, and ability of the program to attract and retain faculty who are leaders in their fields.

9. Through events including my annual state of the university address and president's report to the Faculty Senate, in addition to regular communiques such as an annual report, monthly *Bison Beat* newsletter, a weekly community newsletter, *Howard Magazine*, and myriad other strategies, my administrative team and I are committed to transparency across the University enterprise. We maintain ownership of the land that previously housed the School of Divinity. As we reimagine our path forward, the future of the hospital is a priority. As concrete plans are solidified, they will be shared with the entire Howard community. There are no plans to close the renowned Howard University Hospital, cease the unique services rendered there, and replace it with condominiums.

10. Regarding the U.S. News and World Reports (USNWR) rankings, while the overall score difference was only one point (51 vs 52), several peer institutions retained their scores, and a few improved. There were 7 institutions tied at #84, 6 tied at #91, and 7 tied at #97. We were tied with 13 institutions at #104.

Some measures that were different between the 2019 and the 2020 rankings included; freshmen retention rates, alumni giving, proportion of faculty with highest degree in their field, and the graduation rate for Pell Grant recipients. Also, the USNWR provided less weight in 2020 to some indicators of social mobility that were introduced in the 2019 process. Other notable rankings are provided below;

Howard University Rankings (USNWR) 2019

- #104 in National Universities (tie)
- #69 in Best Colleges for Veterans (tie)
- #61 in Best Undergraduate Teaching (tie)
- #119 in Best Value Schools
- #4 in Top Performers on Social Mobility (tie)
- #2 in Historically Black Colleges and Universities

Other Selected Rankings

- Social Work #25 (USNWR)
- MBA # 67 (USNWR)
- School of Business #38 (Bloomberg Business Week)
- Education (Graduate School) #93 (USNWR)
- Department of Art "Top Graphic Design School" (Graphics Design USA)



