

Report to the
Faculty, Administration, Trustees, Students
of
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
by
An Evaluation Team Representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
Prepared after study of the institution's self-study report
And a visit to the campus on March 21 – 24, 2004

The Members of the Team:

Dr. Ruth J. Simmons, Team Chair, President, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912-9127
Dr. Arthur E. Bergles, Professor Emeritus, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, 180 Riverview Lane Centerville, MA 02632
Mr. Russell C. Carey, Vice President and Secretary, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912-9127
Dr. Peter Conn, Deputy Provost, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104
Mr. Dean W. Currie, Vice President, Finance and Administration, Rice University, Houston, TX 77005
Ms. Janet Smith Dickerson, Vice President for Campus Life, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-0015
Dr. Evelyn M. Hammonds, Professor of the History of Science and of African-American Studies,
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138
Ms. Sandra Johnson, Associate Dean of Residential Life and Advising, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027
Dr. Edward S. Macias, Executive Vice Chancellor and Dean Arts and Sciences,
Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130-4899
Dr. Michele Marinovich, Associate Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education and Director,
Center for Teaching and Learning, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, 94305-3087
Ms. Marilyn McCoy, Vice President for Administration and Planning, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60208
Ms. Marian Pagano, Associate Provost for Planning and Institutional Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027
Dr. Scott A. Strobel, Professor of Molecular Biophysics & Biochemistry & Chemistry, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520

Working with the Team:

Ms. Genevieve Segura, Senior Education Policy Analyst, Planning and Academic Affairs, Maryland Higher
Education Commission, Annapolis, MD 21401-1781

This report represents the views of the evaluation team as interpreted by the Chair, it goes directly to the institution before being considered by the Commission. It is a confidential document prepared as an educational service for the benefit of the institution. All comments in the report are made in good faith, in an effort to assist The Johns Hopkins University. This report is based solely on an educational evaluation of the institution and of the manner in which it appears to be carrying out its educational objectives.

AT THE TIME OF THE VISIT

President: Dr. William R. Brody

Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs: Dr. Steven Knapp

Chair of the Board of Trustees: Mr. Raymond A. Mason

I. Context and Nature of Visit

The Johns Hopkins University is a private, doctoral/research-extensive institution of higher learning located primarily in Baltimore, Maryland. It offers the following degrees: Baccalaureate, Certificate, Master's, Doctorate and First Professional. The University has no branch campuses but does offer instruction and carries out its mission at the following additional locations: Washington, DC; Montgomery County Center, Rockville, MD; BAE, Nashua, NH; ITU, Vienna, VA; Mitre, Bedford, MA; Booz Allen Hamilton Corporate Headquarters, McLean, VA; Southern Maryland Higher Education Center, California, MD; Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD; Columbia Center, Columbia, MD; Downtown Center, Baltimore, MD, Dorsey Center, Elkridge, MD; The Bologna Center, Bologna, Italy; Nanjing University, Nanjing, China; Higher Education & Applied Technology Center, Aberdeen, MD; and Villa Spellman, Florence, Italy.

The University, in preparation for its decennial accreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, elected a Selected Topics Model of accreditation. The resulting focus of their self-study, and the evaluation team's site visit in March 2004, was "The Challenge of Improving Undergraduate Education in a Research Intensive Environment." Approximately two years in advance of the site visit, President Brody appointed a Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE), consisting of faculty, students and staff, to examine and make recommendations regarding the University's undergraduate degree programs. The CUE Report was provided to the evaluation team in its entirety, along with a comprehensive self-study document which addressed the selected standards for each of the five schools offering undergraduate degrees: Krieger School of Arts and Sciences; Whiting School of Engineering; the Peabody Institute; the School of Nursing; and the School of Professional Studies in Business and Education.

Over the course of a three day visit, the evaluation team met with numerous members of the administration, students, and faculty from each of the five schools. The team as a whole met with some groups and five sub-groups of the team spent one-half day visiting the five schools. The team met as a whole with three members of the Board of Trustees as well as members of the senior administration, the Commission on Undergraduate Education (CUE) and the Accreditation Steering Committee. Individual team members conducted follow-up meetings as needed with various individuals knowledgeable about different aspects of undergraduate education. All documents compiled for the self-study were made available to members of the team.

The document review as part of the accreditation process was conducted in November 2003 and March 2004 by Dean Currie and Peter Conn.

The self-study process conducted by the University was comprehensive and inclusive. The team was impressed with the high degree of knowledge of the self-study by virtually all individuals interviewed.

II. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Eligibility Requirements

Based on review of the self-study, and other institutional documents, on interviews conducted and our first-hand observation during the March visit, the team affirmed that the Johns Hopkins University continues to meet eligibility requirements one through seven.

III. Compliance with Federal Requirements

The team affirmed that the Johns Hopkins University's Title IV cohort default rate is well within federal limits. No issues of concern regarding compliance with federal or state regulatory requirements were identified by members of the team.

IV. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

The Johns Hopkins University is an exemplar of excellence in research-intensive learning. Justifiably proud of its legacy as a graduate and professional level institution, it has identified overall excellence of the undergraduate experience as a needed area of improvement. Having identified this area of need, a cross-section of faculty, staff, administration and students have reviewed systematically the academic and social environment for undergraduates throughout the schools and the resultant findings and recommendations from that review constitute a clear and compelling analysis as well as an ambitious set of goals and strategies to advance undergraduate education to a new level.

The Committee to evaluate the University found the review as represented in the CUE Final Report to be a candid and self-critical analysis of the problems undergraduates currently experience in the Hopkins research-intensive environment and it points to many possible ways in which these problem areas can be addressed.

Our report will not address in detail all of the findings and recommendations of that report. Rather, we will comment on those that our team has agreed hold special relevance to the stated aims of the Commission's report. We address these findings first because they are applicable to the undergraduate programs across the University. We then address selected standards in relation to each of the five schools that offer undergraduate degree programs.

Significant Accomplishments

Of the many singular achievements of the University, the team took special note of the following:

- The Johns Hopkins University attracts excellent students who embrace the University's mission for learning through discovery. Indeed, evidence supports the assertion that the quality of the student body is on an improving trend and that the University is doing well in identifying and attracting students who are uniquely suited to and appreciate its research mission.

- The leadership of the institution is doing an admirable job of focusing a research driven university on the importance of undergraduate education. The commitment and follow-through of University leaders in engaging the campus around this important subject is to be commended.
- One of the most distinguished in higher education, the Hopkins faculty, in exemplifying excellence, show evidence of broadly embracing the important goal of strengthening undergraduate education.
- Junior faculty, while facing the challenge of conducting research and gaining tenure, are committed to teaching undergraduates.
- The University has begun to acknowledge its obligation to the broader community and is exploring ever better ways to reinforce those partnerships.
- Excellent work has been done to improve the appearance of the campus as well as the utility of many of the common spaces. Hodson Hall and the new recreation facility have been well received by students and the latter is a vibrant and valued gathering place for them.
- The University is to be congratulated for assembling a team of deans and vice provosts who are committed to carrying out the ambitious undergraduate agenda. Paula Burger, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, is an articulate, effective and powerful voice for the undergraduate priorities Johns Hopkins has established for itself. Her appointment is, we believe, an important step in advancing the aims as stated in CUE.
- The review of undergraduate education as undertaken by CUE is realistic, comprehensive, and candid. Having studied the report, the Committee found in its meetings with faculty, staff and students over two and a half days that the report reflected well the issues identified by those groups with regard to the undergraduate experience at Johns Hopkins.
- The Trustees of the University are to be commended for their insistence on a commitment to excellence in undergraduate education on the same terms with graduate education.
- While the CUE report carefully lays out areas to be improved, the education undergraduate students receive today is excellent. Many of the practices and initiatives in undergraduate education represent best practices. Of particular note, the integration of independent and supervised research into the undergraduate curriculum is exceptionally well accepted and promoted throughout the undergraduate experience.
- The University has succeeded in incorporating instruction in the professional schools (notably in the medical and public health schools with regard to public health and neuroscience), into the curriculum for undergraduates, providing added depth to their experience. The engagement of undergraduates more broadly into the opportunities afforded by the professional schools should continue and be expanded.

- Johns Hopkins has moved beyond the widely presumed dichotomy between teaching and research and is succeeding in creating an environment in which both are mutually reinforcing dimensions of discovery.
- Most students report satisfaction with opportunities for internships, research opportunities, and study abroad. The opportunities to engage in academic experiences and off-site study are remarkable.

Suggestions for Improvement

While we agree that CUE recommendations 1 and 2 pertaining to structures will add greatly to reinforcing and implementing the aims of the Commission, we believe more should be said about the roles and financial responsibility of senior central administration in carrying out the goals of CUE. We acknowledge that the role of the Provost and the President is critical in achieving the aims of CUE and both evince a strong commitment to the improvement of undergraduate life.

While we believe there is much to recommend the regular review of degree programs, we would caution that such studies alone should not be seen as a substitute for important substantive change. (CUE Recommendation 3)

Johns Hopkins should be concerned about the level of cynicism expressed by faculty and students about the current teaching evaluation process. We suggest that the University dedicate significant effort to improving the low level of student response to the current evaluation. In addition, the University should address the confidence of the faculty in the fairness and relevance of the evaluation process, and the perception that little is done in response to the problems that have been identified. (CUE Recommendations 6 and 7)

Students and faculty on the Homewood campus freely admit that problems of academic integrity among students are serious. The processes for dealing with these matters are broken and need urgently to be fixed. While many, such as those serving on the ethics panel, appear to be committed to addressing this issue, there is an urgent need for more efficacious action by faculty and students and at the higher administration level. We recommend greater visibility and support of the Ethics Board that oversees academic infractions. (CUE Recommendation 8)

We congratulate the University for confronting the difficult issue of the current weekly course schedule. We believe it is important to change the course schedule to afford a greater variety of academic options for students across the several schools and to ensure a better overall academic experience. (CUE Recommendation 11)

We endorse Hopkins' efforts to strengthen the academic advising systems, career support efforts and the tracking of post-baccalaureate activities. (CUE Recommendations 13-20)

With regard to diversity, we found that some students and faculty are skeptical about the opportunity for success employing the plans spelled out under recommendations 21 through 26. The team makes some observations and recommends a set of steps informed by our conversations with faculty, students and staff (it should be noted that these comments apply largely to the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences and the Whiting School of Engineering):

- Minority students and faculty would like to see the senior-most leadership apply more aggressive and concrete steps to add to the minority presence on the faculty. The Presidential Professorships offer an opportunity for exemplary targets but some faculty feel the funding level is inadequate to bring about substantial change in the composition of the Hopkins faculty. Both minority and women faculty with whom we met complain of often feeling below critical mass and isolated within their

departments. They urge a more aggressive plan for recruitment than currently exists and the Committee agrees this should be among the most urgent priorities for the University.

- The most effective way to recruit faculty is from a base of satisfied faculty. We recommend that the University engage in a process to address the unique challenges that minority faculty face at Johns Hopkins. Minority and women faculty report that for reasonably small investments the university can demonstrate a commitment to improved relations with these faculty.
- We learned of some positive experiences (such as mentoring, retention efforts, and so on) that provide a good beginning for building ties between the administration and minority faculty. These are to be applauded.
- We urge that an educational program be created to inform departments about the importance of fostering a more hospitable and intellectually engaging place for women and minorities.
- Students recount extraordinary difficulty in securing funding that would make their extracurricular and social experience at Hopkins better. We recommend that the President and Provost allocate a sum that might be distributed through the schools to facilitate programming for groups that are especially at sub-critical mass, isolated and inclined to see their Hopkins experience as less successful than the Commission seeks to secure for all students.
- We recommend a commitment to training around diversity issues for all student leaders.
- We were surprised to find that the minority faculty and students reported limited knowledge and use of important administrative support services available to them. We suggest that the University undertake efforts to more clearly identify for the community and improve the visibility and responsiveness of the administrators and the offices available to address student and faculty concerns.
- We applaud efforts to address the content of the curriculum as it relates to diversity.
- The excellent strides Hopkins has made in the recruitment of minority students should encourage the University in its diversity efforts.

We commend the University for the recognition of the critical importance of the environment in which the University is situated. Hopkins, as the largest employer in the city, has a responsibility for providing leadership in the community in all dimensions and we encourage the University to continue its efforts to strengthen partnerships with the City and build a leadership community that is reflective of the strengths and diversity of Baltimore.

With regard to the recommendations surrounding student life (27 through 34), we recommend the University take some time and explore with their students what they perceive the most urgent needs to be. Students expressed other needs to the team that may be more pressing. They suggested improvements that may have more salutary effects (and be less expensive) than what is proposed by the self-study (examples include on-campus, late night food service and increases in social programming support). We strongly recommend broad, sustained engagement with students in the planning and decision-making processes to more precisely identify their concerns and priorities.

We encourage the University to examine opportunities for consolidation of support functions, some of which may be unnecessarily duplicated across schools and may thereby reduce resources and time for focus on academic and other priorities.

A persistent theme in our discussions was communication. We recommend the University explore the development of a structure(s) for more effective and sustained communications, particularly designed to enable Hopkins community members to convey their input and concerns on matters of import to them. Such a structure would address many of the communication challenges that faculty and students raised, which included inadequate knowledge among community members regarding:

- the locus of authority in relation to their needs;
- the overall governance process and structure;
- how to effect change or address issues;
- how to be entrepreneurial in relationship to overall strategic aims and
- how to access resources.

We recommend that the senior team, along with faculty leadership, assess, renew and enhance the nodes of communication across the University so that faculty, students and staff become more informed about how the University works. Internal communications models and best practices at peer institutions would likely serve as a useful starting point for such an effort.

We trust that the following summaries of the individual schools review will add context for the findings and recommendations above. We have not chosen to list all of the individual school recommendations in our summary. Rather, we have placed those of special importance in the foreground in order to assist the University in understanding the particular importance of those cited above.

Krieger School of Arts and Sciences

Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives

The mission, goals and objectives of the Krieger School of Arts and Sciences are clearly delineated on pp. 59-60 of the self study and meet the requirements of this standard. The faculty and administrators whom we interviewed were knowledgeable about the mission of the School and the University.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

Undergraduate admissions to Johns Hopkins University, including the School of Arts and Sciences and the School of Engineering, are coordinated by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. The institution meets the standard for accreditation. The self-study reports evidence of growth in the size, quality, and diversity of the applicant pool; some improvement in the yield of admitted applicants; and, in the Class of 2007, a record percentage of underrepresented minorities and women. One of the special challenges faced by Johns Hopkins is the goal of achieving a better balance among academic interests of admitted students. In the entering Krieger School Class of 2007, 24% have indicated an interest in the humanities, 29% in the social sciences, and 42% in the natural sciences. This represents significant progress over the University's historic profile for students interested in scientific and pre-medical training.

Institutional documents provided to the committee included current Admissions and Financial Aid applications and an array of viewbooks and other recruitment materials, in English and Spanish, that are intended to appeal to a diverse range of applicants. Policies and criteria pertaining to the admission of prospective students are concise and comprehensive. Longitudinal studies about student admission and retention are systematically collected and used for purposes of analysis and planning.

The University has established competitive need-based as well as merit-based scholarships and fellowships to attract highly talented students in targeted areas. Need-based financial aid is being met "to the extent the budget will allow," reaching approximately 95% of eligible applicants in each admitted class.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution is well organized to meet this standard effectively. As a result of a recent reorganization, support services for undergraduate students are coordinated by the Vice Dean for Undergraduate Education (also Vice Provost for Academic Affairs), whose purview includes those services overseen by the Dean of Student Life and the Dean of Academic and Enrollment Services. The goal of these offices is to provide integrated academic and co-curricular services so as to "see the student whole." The program of supportive services provided by these offices is comprehensive in scope, appropriate to the mission of the School, and customized to the needs and culture of this highly selective, cosmopolitan, intellectually independent, purposeful community of undergraduates. Documentation provided for the committee's review included an organizational chart, the Freshman Academic Handbook, the Compendium (student handbook), and a variety of brochures, reports, surveys, websites, newspapers, and departmental documents. Attention is given to students with special needs and interests, and the health and counseling

services and athletic and recreational programs available to students support the institutional mission and contribute to the balance and well-being of the population.

The Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE) is to be commended for its efforts to enhance the undergraduate experience of students by building on the freshman year experience, fostering innovation both inside and outside the classroom, and identifying strategies to strengthen the collegiate identity of undergraduates. Furthermore, recent improvements in amenities, such as the addition of several appealing cafes and common spaces, a recreation and fitness center, an Arts Center, and restored quadrangles and green spaces, have improved the quality of student life as well as the beauty of the campus.

The Krieger School self-study acknowledges areas where improvements are warranted, and this committee supports the key recommendations of the report: to explore strategies to improve the residential and dining experiences of students; to identify or build new communal spaces for interaction, especially late evenings; to continue to add to the diversity of the student body as well as to make the diversity of the Homewood community a resource for learning for all students; and to seek ways to provide capstone intellectual experiences for upperclass students.

These are a few additional suggestions for consideration by those working to enliven undergraduate student life:

- Work with student governance groups (Student Government, House Councils, RAs, cultural organization leaders, etc.) to create opportunities for meaningful participation and engagement in decision-making
- Improve infrastructure for communication between students, and between students and administrators
- Introduce new rituals and traditions to build school spirit and to reduce the culture of insularity and competition
- With the Alumni Office, engage alumni in campus activities to build community and to introduce students to networks for support and mentoring
- Provide more financial resources for the Dean of Student Life's office and for dissemination to student groups
- Continue to support students' civic engagement with local schools and neighborhoods, as well as other community partners
- Study further the proposed Charles Village project, to assure that this program will meet the demonstrated needs and interests of the students for whom it is to be built.

We acknowledge the concern of the CUE committee that undergraduate students express significant dissatisfaction with many elements of campus life, as evidenced by comparably low scores on the College Student Experiences Questionnaire report of student satisfaction, 2002. While this information provides a useful perspective on this issue, we encourage more in-depth

analysis of these questions through qualitative as well as quantitative research methods (i.e. focus groups, interviews, etc.) It will further benefit the community to present the findings from these studies and reviews in public forums for discussion and action.

Finally, we also recommend the establishment of a program of regular reviews for those administrative departments serving students, to encourage on-going assessment and to foster within the administrative units of the University the innovation and entrepreneurship so well evidenced in the Johns Hopkins faculty and student body.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The educational opportunities for students in the Krieger School span an academic breadth and depth that is extraordinary for a campus of this relatively small size and meets the standard for accreditation. The School of Arts and Sciences offers 38 majors. There is excellence in the scientific subjects for which Hopkins is renowned, and this standard extends into fields of humanities and social sciences.

This Faculty of Arts and Sciences has shown commendable flexibility in the creation of new and very popular offerings to students, including programs in Neuroscience and Public Health that have engaged strengths and expertise in the Schools of Medicine and Public Health.

There is an adequate diversity of course offerings for students to meet their distribution requirements, independent of their chosen subject of emphasis. At the departmental level, the offerings are reviewed on an annual basis. They are adjusted to meet the needs of emerging disciplines and student needs. Because of the decentralized nature of the University's organization, there may be a temptation for departmental mandates on a student's training to conflict with goals of distribution and balance. The aspiring nature of the student body and the high academic standards established by the faculty engender an environment that fosters excellence. It also leads to a highly competitive environment that can compromise student morale.

The facilities for teaching have improved substantially with the recent construction of the Hodson Hall teaching center, which provides highly desirable and technologically equipped classrooms needed for effective teaching. This is in addition to several other venues across campus for instruction at the level of small groups and the large lectures. There is concern with the quality of these facilities, as some classrooms are quite antiquated. Plans for renovation are being considered, but it does not yet appear to be a matter of high priority.

The library occupies a central place on campus and is heavily used. The Sheridan libraries have over 2.5 million volumes and are among the top research libraries in the country. The library staff are attentive and appear readily available to help students identify resources for their projects and papers. The library and Information Technology staff also appear available for engagement with faculty in curricular development.

Transfer credit, though of relatively minor consequence as only a handful of students enter the program in this way, is appropriately awarded. Policies for student study outside the University are clearly specified.

The courses offered are in line with the student goals and interests. There is a long-standing culture of learning through doing that is ideal for student development. There are ample opportunities for students to participate in independent research projects that foster critical thinking, and the majority of students take advantage of these resources.

There is a danger facing the Krieger School. Growth of the undergraduate population without plans for accompanying growth in faculty size may further strain a system that is already maximally extended. Attention should be given to ensure there is adequate faculty and teaching assistant resources available to support any expansion in the student population. While there may be a relatively small number of majors in some humanities programs, professors teaching courses in these departments report classes that are oversubscribed. Some attention to departmental faculty levels where large general interest and service courses exist could be warranted.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Students select Hopkins in part because of the high rates of graduate and professional school acceptance of its students. The numbers are impressive and meet the standard for accreditation. More than 90% of medical school and 95% of law school applicants from the Krieger School are admitted. The University participates in COFHE surveys which show that 80% of graduates go on to earn advanced degrees within 10 years. An equally strong record of students going directly into the work force successfully is present.

The recently completed Commission on Undergraduate Education gathered and analyzed a large amount of data during the course of their self-study. While this data could be assembled, this process revealed that they may not have been consistently given focused attention to student learning assessment and outcomes. The CUE report process appears to have improved the climate for data collection and analysis. Several plans are being considered for outcomes assessment in the future, though these do not yet appear to be settled. A Director of Institutional Research has been appointed to manage this issue for the entire University.

In relation to student learning, the self-study report discusses efforts to promote academic integrity. During our visit, reports from several students and faculty suggest that violation of academic integrity is a pervasive problem that warrants greater attention. This should include reconsideration of the policy regarding how first violations are handled, and a redoubled effort to educate the students and faculty on what constitutes violations. The code of ethics, established in 1975, is administered by the Undergraduate Ethics Board. Added financial resources for the Ethics Board may be needed for added visibility of this effort on campus.

Whiting School of Engineering (WSE)

The School review was conducted by Dr. Arthur E. Bergles, Professor Emeritus, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and Marilyn McCoy, Vice President for Administration and Planning, Northwestern University. We met with the interim Dean, Andrew Douglas and the Dean's leadership team, with department chairs and program directors, WSE members of the Academic Council and heads of the departmental Undergraduate Directors, Whiting faculty in a number of different meetings, a large sample of undergraduate students, and staff in the Engineering Advising office. We also toured the Mechanical Engineering Laboratory and heard student presentations of the research and capstone projects. In the course of the visit, we saw other facilities in Engineering. We want to thank all members of the Whiting School whom we met. They were candid and professional and most importantly evidenced clear commitment to the goals and mission of the Whiting School. We are most appreciative of their support. We would also like to gratefully acknowledge the support given by Dr. Paula Burger and her staff. They were fully supportive of our work in preparing very extensive and useful materials to support our charge. They also were very responsive to requests for special meetings.

Standard 1: Mission , Goals and Objectives

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents including the recent External Review report as well as the ABET self study report, interviews with faculty, students, administration and staff, the team developed a number of conclusions. First, the School has actively embraced the culture and standards of academic excellence and innovation at Johns Hopkins University. The leadership of the Whiting School, the chairs of the departments, and the administrative staff of the School all communicated support for excellence and a commitment to involving undergraduates in the excitement of academic discovery. The Dean is an activist in his approach to his responsibilities, openly seeking best practices to apply at Whiting. The leadership of the WSE understands their current position (both strengths and weaknesses) and is committed to making the choices needed for focused improvement. They are making plans to leverage their resources in partnership with the very strong life science programs of the University and in particular the Medical School. They set explicit quantitative objectives and seek out information to monitor their performance.

Critical thinking skills and creativity—two basic tenets of the mission—are at the heart of engineering design, which dominates the senior year of WSE students. The other major components of the mission are a student's preparation for career, graduate education and lifelong learning. In the WSE Alumni survey, 91% of respondents for the class of 1997 and 2000 combined either agreed or strongly agreed that they had been well prepared for graduate/professional school. Sixty-eight percent agreed that JHU had prepared them well for the career they are now pursuing. (We believe this figure reflects that some of these same students are no longer in engineering.) A large majority, 79%, indicated they were well prepared for lifelong learning while at JHU.

As reflected in US News and World Report, Biomedical Engineering and the department of Geography and Environmental Engineering are ranked in the top echelon of such departments.

The leadership of the School is committed to a strategy of selective focus to move other units to this standard over time. Given the current resources of the School, such a strategy is appropriate. Many departments in Whiting are appropriately looking to link with other related strengths at JHU in the life sciences to build this excellence.

The undergraduates at Whiting are a very talented group of students that are very academically motivated and serious about their education. They were very pleased with their education and opportunities to work collaboratively with faculty on research, design and capstone projects. All groups we met with repeatedly emphasized their commitment to engage undergraduates meaningfully and creatively in research and related projects. A very large majority of the students participate in labs and research, with a stellar group achieving publication of their work. We agree with the decision to keep this an optional, usually non-credit program.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that the students at Whiting are an excellent and dedicated group of undergraduates. They are clearly qualified for the intense academic experience that awaits them. They place a clear priority on their academic experience. They seek out and embrace the special opportunities for research, design projects and capstone experiences. They feel effectively integrated with the faculty and research mission of the University.

Through the admissions process, a number of students are offered research support for their four years at JHU. This program is an effective mechanism for communicating the values of the faculty and institution as students apply for admission and prepares them to engage in these activities once they enroll.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that the students at Whiting are supported by an excellent and dedicated group of advisers, technicians (for fabrication of special designs) and others that support their educational and career goals as well as providing on site support for their research, design, and capstone projects. There are a variety of venues provided for both the conduct of this special work but also for presentation of it both on campus and in selected cases at professional meetings of the discipline.

The students do feel a great deal of pressure to maintain high GPA's given the predominant interest in medical or graduate school. This competitiveness in the student body has lead to reduced willingness to partner and support each other except in very narrow cliques. They report reluctance to share class notes for example. It has also lead to a concern about cheating and plagiarism that must be addressed.

“Community” is an issue in this school. Students in this school feel the academic pressure keenly and drop out of athletics, music and other activities because of this pressure.

Students were not wholly satisfied with career counseling and would welcome an increase in visits by engineering employers.

The facilities and infrastructure in this school needs continued attention and updating. The new facilities for BME are welcome but other areas need to develop a plan for improvement.

Standard 10: Faculty

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that faculty of the school conveyed an enthusiastic commitment to undergraduate education and involvement of students in research. They appreciate the intellectual capacities of the students and showed evidence of progressively intensifying and enhancing the type of educational and research experiences of the students as they build their abilities and experience. For a significant number of WSE undergraduates, the faculty mentor them to the point where they are able to perform as first author on a scientific paper and are taken to national conferences to do poster sessions and other forms of presentation. This is a wonderful experience for those students interested in graduate school.

The number of undergraduates that actually publish is very impressive.

This school like others at Hopkins needs to attract a larger number of minority and women faculty and continue to enhance efforts to make them feel supported. This initiative should be a central priority.

The faculty have been very motivated to work with students in research and design related efforts. We recognize that there are many claims on faculty time and we encourage the administration to weigh those demands carefully and perhaps make provision for faculty to continue these research and design experiences with undergraduates and then perhaps shift more advising responsibilities and other such activities to staff.

There is concern about the level of TA support available and a desire for clearer algorithms of their availability. The course evaluation instrument has been revised and the new survey will be implemented this spring. It is critical that this feedback is used to make changes and that faculty and students know that that these surveys are driving change and improvements.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that the educational offerings are appropriate in preparing students to participate appropriately in research and design efforts. The faculty of the school in all departments is actively engaged in an annual review of curriculum.

They also are very proactive in inviting students to participate in their labs, engage in design projects as well as capstone projects. They showed a keen awareness of the importance of providing students with meaningful and educational experiences in their labs. They also are effective in linking WSE students to opportunities in other schools at JHU, principally the Schools of Medicine and Public Health.

The Senior Design project is a two semester sequence taken in a student's senior year to provide a "capstone" design experience for students working in teams in which the student draws on earlier coursework. The fall semester is devoted to conceptualization and design, and the spring semester to the construction and testing of a prototype.

There remain questions about whether there are too many requirements in some programs and perhaps Whiting would benefit from a school wide review of engineering goals and departmental requirements. The frequency with which elective courses are offered and the level of enrollment in these courses should be assessed.

Some students did convey less satisfaction with the language skills of some TA's in the core math and physics courses and frustration with advising skills and knowledge of some of the faculty. They also would like more engineering examples in these courses. These reactions varied by department.

Standard 12: General Education

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that curriculum is attractive to students and we are told has met the requirements of ABET. This is a luxurious campus with many rich opportunities available to students.

The School is planning to phase out their part-time program and we are supportive of this change.

The faculty and administration of the school are supportive in the main of the proposed calendar change. The students however are very resistant to the idea of this change. Thus any change should involve very intensive discussions and consultation with these students. Interestingly, the students report that they generally spend this "four day weekend" on campus.

Some of the departments are very actively engaging students in their governance while for others it is more sporadic. A discussion with chairs on this topic to insure student engagement in the life of the department and discussion about changes would be useful.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The Whiting School meets this standard.

Based on review of the self study, other institutional documents, interviews with faculty, students, and administration and staff, the team concluded that the WSE is very proactive in assessing student learning, including their work in faculty labs, design and capstone projects. The preparation and presentation of research papers and poster sessions is one such example. Another is the weekly meeting time as well as formal written reports and oral presentation required as part of the senior design experience.

In the WSE, the following assessment data is collected and used to guide program changes:

- Assessment instruments appropriate for each individual course such as exams, homework assignments, and laboratory reports
- Senior capstone design projects which integrates the material from all prior courses
- Senior exit surveys
- Alumni surveys two and five years post graduation
- Other surveys at JHU asking students to self-report learning achievements.

The administration of the School would like to be supported by more sophisticated information systems to allow them to monitor student progress and issues. The institution is now engaged in implementing a new student information system and an expanded institutional research operation. These efforts are seen as very important to Whiting.

School of Nursing

The Johns Hopkins School of Nursing has established itself as one of the premier institutions for nursing education in the country. Perhaps it is the new building, which houses all of the school's activities, or the historic and necessary sense of caring that is inherent in the nursing profession. Of the five areas designated for improvement in the CUE report, none are invasive issues at the School of Nursing. There is a strong sense of community among the faculty, staff and students, and the undergraduate experience is well integrated. The undergraduate education is highly personal and there is a strong perception that not only do the faculty and officers of the school care about the students but they take action to make things better. Finally, the school is very intentional about undergraduate education – this is indeed the legacy and nature of the School. Although we acknowledge that the exquisite building and the history of the profession contribute to the extremely high quality of the undergraduate experience delivered at the School of Nursing, one could attribute its success to its extraordinary leader, Dean Martha Hill, and her exemplary staff and faculty.

Similarly, when considering the CUE priorities for improvement, the School of Nursing is a paragon of how these priorities can be implemented and integrated into the very physiology of a school. There are intensive capstone experiences for every student, and the student body is diverse in a number of ways. The School does not guarantee housing for its students, but the student body, with an average age of 27 and most with a bachelor's degree in hand, is not looking for a residential life experience.

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

The institution meets the standard. The faculty, staff and students embrace the mission of the School of Nursing and of Johns Hopkins University. The mission and philosophy of the School are to provide leadership to improve health care and advance the profession through education, research, practice and service. The people who teach, learn and serve at the School are devoted to their work in a rare, refreshing and optimistic way.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

The institution meets the standard. The students at the School of Nursing are exemplars of the mission to “provide leadership to improve health care through education, research, practice and service.” The students at the School are extraordinary people who will be providing front-line health care. The faculty describe them as future leaders who have very strong undergraduate and life experiences and who enrich the classroom experiences for all. The faculty are “thrilled to be working with them” because of their vitality and enthusiasm. They would like to admit more students but physical space is limited (there are certainly more qualified applicants than there are spaces in the class).

The school is clearly one of the most competitive in the country. It competes for students with Penn, Yale, Duke, the University of North Carolina, Columbia, and the University of California at San Francisco. We do think it would be helpful for the school to complete a more systematic overlap analysis of its peer schools so that they may better identify the factors that contribute to an accepted student's decision to attend Johns Hopkins School of Nursing or go elsewhere.

One of the School's biggest challenges is providing enough financial aid to students. On the average their students are graduating with \$32,000 in nursing debt alone. Since many are going on to master's programs, the debt may continue to increase. Although this is somewhat abated by the demand for nurses and an accompanying rise in nursing salaries, the magnitude of the debt is daunting. There is hope that state, federal, hospital, and agency loan repayment programs will continue to grow as the nursing shortage becomes more acute.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The institution meets the standard. Sandra Angell, Associate Dean for Student Affairs coordinates student support services at the School of Nursing. By all reckoning Dean Angell and her staff are caring, thoughtful, and responsive to students and they are to be commended for the work they do. Indeed, when students were given an opportunity to talk about the school and the support they received (or failed to receive) from faculty and staff, not a single complaint was heard regarding an instructional or administrative officer of the School. Instead, unsolicited praise was offered for the way Dean Angell and her staff listened and responded to student needs.

A few issues were raised by the students for the administration to consider as possible enhancements to student life at the School of Nursing. There were various reports of concerns about the coordination and communication of housing options for incoming students. This was especially true for students who were coming to the school from across the country. Students attending the same orientation event had differing reports on what possibilities were presented to them for seeking housing or roommates. This effort could be improved, but most students were eventually very satisfied with their housing situation. The students would be interested in a university owned apartment option either near the school or in the Fells Point/Canton area. They spoke with excitement of this option for future students but also with caution about imposing on the JHU neighbors in the East Baltimore area. Some were dismayed to learn during our open forum that applications from nursing students would no longer be accepted to the Reed Hall residence in East Baltimore. The evaluators were told that this is predominantly a medical student resident hall but a few nursing students were able to get in every year. Apparently this arrangement is now changed to the detriment of the nursing students, but the evaluators would like to note that they have no secondary confirmation of this change.

There were reports of inadequate funding of student activities. The inadequate sum of \$500 is made available to the School's Student Government Association and an additional \$500 is made available to each of the three class governments. The students certainly had more than \$500 worth of ideas for events that would bring students together from across the classes and create more social opportunities for their interactions. A student activity fee of \$25 would create \$7,500 to be divided among the student groups, and this money would help fund diversity and cultural weeks as well as the school-wide dinner they hope to attend some day.

There was also dissatisfaction regarding the computers in the school, in particular that the computers were slow and the printing resources were inadequate. Although it may be that in the future students will all be working on their curriculum-loaded PCs in a completely accessible wireless building, some immediate improvements are warranted to address this problem.

Standard 10: Faculty

The institution meets the standard. The faculty at the Johns Hopkins School of Nursing are accomplished professionals who are devoted to furthering the boundaries of their field by guiding the development of the next generation of health care leaders. Students were quick to comment on the faculty's initiation of classroom discussions on cultural diversity and their perceived "celebration of the diversity and background" of each student. The students clearly felt that the faculty "like to get into the mix and synergy" generated by the diverse student backgrounds.

Faculty in the School of Nursing are on either a practice-education or research-education track. Only those on the research-education track are eligible for tenure. Of the forty-two full-time faculty only five are tenured. The faculty expressed concern that sabbatical leaves were not available except with tenure and suggested that this sabbatical policy should be reviewed. On several occasions in past years faculty were granted sabbaticals in order to complete their doctoral studies (a doctorate is required for the highest teaching ranks in the school,) but the team heard concerns that this hadn't happened for several years. The faculty would like an opportunity for sabbaticals for research or to pursue further training at another institution.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The institution meets the standard. The educational offerings at the School of Nursing were determined by two nursing accreditation agencies to be adequate and excellent (National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission – NLNAC and the CCNE – the Collegiate Commission on Nursing Education.)

The students, faculty and administration were particularly proud of the opportunities students have to participate in nursing opportunities outside of the classroom. These included such programs as Birth Companions where students are matched with a pregnant woman (perhaps usually a young, single mom) and they assist her through the prenatal period, birth and post-partum period. There is also the Senior Citizens Program where nurses direct healthy seniors in a wellness program. The School has a long list of exciting and innovative opportunities for students to engage in the breadth of nursing activities outside of their class requirements. The students view this as an ideal way to gain insights into the variety of nursing options.

All students are required to complete a capstone experience in their senior year where they are placed with a preceptor nurse in a clinical setting and work with that nurse for over 30 hours a week. This gives the student a chance to actually try out a placement that they might consider for full-time post graduate work. The placement agencies and hospital find this to be their most efficient and least expensive recruiting tool.

Students have opportunities to participate in the Minority International Research Training Program (MIRT). This program provides "international opportunities for underrepresented minority undergraduate and graduate students to participate in health promotion research." Both faculty and students were very excited and proud of the continued success of this program.

The faculty engaged in a brief discussion of the Hopkins class schedule. Although the School of Nursing also follows the MTW/TF schedule, this was not the hot button issue for them as it has

been for other Hopkins schools. Although the schedule works very well for the School (they take classes MTW then do clinical assignments on TF) they are open to discussions about other scheduling systems. The faculty did seem to understand that if the schedule changed it might yield some decompression in the use of classroom and laboratory space.

The faculty are also looking for innovative ways to use technology to deliver some of the curriculum. Dr. Kay Cresci presented her ideas on the use of Problem Based Learning to the visiting team as the beginning of an exploration in the School as to what is essential for the students to know.

Standard 12: General Education

The institution meets the standard. Students come into the School of Nursing with either a bachelors degree or with two years of required prerequisites which include both general education and science requirements. The curriculum at the school is focused on delivering the highest quality professional training. In general, students do not require additional work in general education due to their earlier work.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

The institution meets the standard. The stated educational outcomes for students completing their study at the School of Nursing are critical thinking, effective communication, and therapeutic nursing interventions. Upon completion of the program, nurses are required to take and pass the nurse licensing exam (NCLEX.) For the most recent year, the first-time pass rate for Hopkins nurses was an amazing 97.4% -- the highest in the five years for which the school provided data. This is impressive.

Students are required to provide feedback on each course they take. This information is saved in a teaching portfolio for every instructor. The school would like to explore how they might use peer evaluation of teaching to enhance their pedagogical skills.

Peabody Institute

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

It is the conclusion of the team that the Peabody Institute meets the standard.

Together the Peabody Conservatory and the Peabody Preparatory combine to form the Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins University, a complimentary organization with a long tradition of excellence in the music performance community. Peabody's affiliation with the Johns Hopkins University is entering its thirtieth year and the Institute is poised to move forward in tandem with the University in its efforts to enhance the undergraduate experience of their students. A revised mission statement was formulated by the faculty, administrators and staff of Peabody and approved by the Dean and the Director in May of 2003. The mission, goals and objectives of Peabody run parallel to the mission, goals and objectives of the Johns Hopkins University within the spirit of seeking "knowledge through discovery."

During the team visit to Peabody our interactions with the various members of the community echoed the vision of the stated mission and goals. The leadership of the Institute is primed to move forward with enhancements while continuing and maintaining a challenging and supportive environment for both faculty and students to grow and develop as accomplished leaders in the music world. Each of the components that form the structure of Peabody are in a position to realize the overall goal of becoming one of the top three music schools in the country. Some of the observations in relation to the mission, goals and objectives of the Institute include:

- A clearly defined, articulated and widely distributed mission statement that outlines the unique function of the school and its relation to the disposition of its students and faculty for life long learning and a strong commitment to excellence.
- Recognition and dedication to instruction and learning in a caring environment that supports the growth and development of all members of the community.
- Allegiance to the integrity of the profession and its importance in our society

Standard 8: Student Admissions

There is no doubt that the Peabody Institute has met this standard of excellence.

It was a delight to meet with the highly talented and engaging students of the Peabody Institute. They are a community of artists that take pride in being "Peabody students". Articulating their identity in this manner demonstrates the success of the Admissions process. Students indicated that they came to Peabody with a clear understanding of the rigor of the program, as well as, the appeal of having the option to engage in studies of a more liberal arts nature.

Guidelines of the admissions process are clearly stated in materials provided by the school and students can easily access information regarding curricular options, credit loads, graduation requirements and tuition and fees. The Peabody Institute has identified a need to provide more robust financial aid packages and is pursuing a course of action in this area.

Currently the school is at optimal enrollment and is positioned to be even more selective in its admissions in many of the programs (i.e. voice performance and piano in particular). A pledge

to increase the population of African-American students is experiencing success as a result of the efforts of the Admissions office, the hiring of African-American faculty and the implementation of the Jazz studies program. The population of international students is strong and is drawn primarily from the countries of South Korea and Taiwan.

Recently the institute was visited by the accreditation team for the National Association of Schools of Music who noted that selectivity was strong and that the school should examine the possibility of a slight increase in enrollment with the addition of new practice rooms, a rehearsal hall, a concert hall and a state of the art recording studio. In addition, the effective use of technology would not only assist in marketing outreach efforts, but would streamline the paper end of the admissions process.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

The Peabody Institute has demonstrated compliance with this standard.

Although it is affiliated with Johns Hopkins University, the Peabody Institute maintains its own student support services except in clinical and psychological health services. Staffs in the student support services area are highly committed to the overall development of the students at Peabody. Students report being cared for by the school and are comfortable in bringing issues to the attention of the Dean. It should be noted that students spoke highly of staff and in particular Dean Justen.

Academic advisement services are optimal with one on one mentoring by faculty and the availability of students to take advantage of focused mentoring with master teachers at the school. Faculty and administration share in the advisement of the entire student body and frequently interact to assist a student experiencing difficulty. There is a formal process for addressing special needs and circumstances and providing necessary support that may include a temporary leave from the school.

Student records are maintained both in paper and electronically by the Registrar of the school. There can be some confusion in the registration processes for those students taking classes at the Homewood campus. Students reported not having a clear understanding of the process and finding themselves going from one office to another without getting clear instruction.

Students report that their experience outside of classroom instruction is driven by the programs in the residence hall (for first year and sophomore students) or within the larger Peabody community. Most students find their academic schedules to be rigorous with little time for outside activities. Some note a tendency among some international students towards strong intra-group interaction that creates challenges for a sense of overall community in the School. Efforts made by the international student advisor are commendable and we applaud the outreach initiatives to both the faculty and student populations on cultural awareness.

However, the overarching sentiment of the students, faculty and staff was that Peabody embodied a “family atmosphere” and everyone shares in the development of the community of the school with a strong sense of pride and ownership.

Standard 10: Faculty

The Institute has an outstanding and dedicated faculty. Full time faculty are defined by a teaching load of 12 hours. Many full time faculty also have active performance careers. The students seem to accept this and to understand that their contact with their teacher must accommodate the professor's schedule.

There are no faculty ranks or tenure. Salary is negotiated at hire, after which there is no evaluation, recognition, reward, or promotion. The faculty seems split on the question of evaluation. The Dean and the Director are highly respected and trusted. Perhaps it is possible to combine a necessary system of evaluation balanced by a commitment to longer term contracts.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

The excellent credentials of the faculty and the testimony of the students attests to the quality of the conservatory instruction for the various instruments. It is not clear that the ensemble offerings meet the same high standard.

Standard 12: General Education

The few required credits in liberal studies are taught entirely by Institute faculty. The recent (February 2004) reaccreditation of the Institute by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), while overwhelmingly positive, noted, and we concur, that the liberal studies courses were not especially broad and are uneven. A major problem for the faculty is the dramatic range in the preparation of conservatory students for liberal studies courses. Some students have excelled in Advanced Placement courses in addition to their excellence in instrumental training. Others may be challenged to write a paragraph. Still others do not have the necessary command of the English language. In this environment, it is almost impossible to structure a course that is satisfying to the faculty and students of the Institute, much less to the undergraduates of the other schools of Johns Hopkins.

Because of the teaching schedule currently used by the Schools of Arts and Sciences and Engineering, it is extremely difficult for student to take courses in Arts and Sciences. In addition to the difficulty of the schedule, the bureaucratic steps necessary for registration are said to be opaque.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment is a constant fact of life in a conservatory environment. Auditions, rankings, chair positions, and competitions are an integral part of student life. We found it encouraging that, in spite of this competition, the students seem to have a welcoming and supportive community.

On the other hand, there is no effective evaluation of the student learning process. Student evaluations of teaching are returned only to the student's teacher/mentor. There is no basis for faculty improvement or celebration. The faculty do not share teaching strategies. They are not aware of each other's teaching styles. Some collegial review of teaching successes and challenges is recommended.

In a conservatory education there is a direct measure of educational success: Does the student graduate into a successful performance career? There appears to be no systematic research of this question. There is anecdotal evidence that a high percentage of Institute graduates earn more than 50% of their income from performance. It may be useful for the Institute to study the evolution of performance careers for the purpose of informing the admission and instruction of their students.

School of Professional Studies and Business Education

Standard 1: Mission, Goals and Objectives

The official mission statement is as follows: “SPSBE seeks to improve the quality of life in the Baltimore-Washington region – and beyond – through the creation of exemplary models for university support of business and educational institutions and activities.”

One of SPSBE’s senior administrators summarized the mission as providing “a first-class opportunity for a second educational chance” to adult learners who wanted to pursue degrees in a range of professional subjects. Everything we read and observed (as the comments below will indicate) demonstrates the remarkable success this school has had in carrying out that task. Note that total enrollment in the school is about 4,500, of whom only about 500 are undergraduates; we restricted our inquiry to the undergraduate programs. We found that the School meets the standard.

Standard 8: Student Admissions

With the exception of a few international students, every prospective applicant is urged to talk to an advisor, to determine whether an application to SPSBE makes sense. Quite a few students are advised to apply elsewhere (e.g., community college) in order to reach the appropriate level of readiness. Required application materials include transcripts of all previous academic work, an essay, and an interview. Applicants are also closely questioned about whether they have the support of their family and work place since pursuing this kind of degree program will require the understanding of family members and bosses. Standardized testing is not required.

We were impressed with the deliberative nature of the admissions process. As our comments below will indicate, the success of students in the program seems to support the effectiveness of the process. This area meets the standard.

Standard 9: Student Support Services

Given the dispersal of SPSBE across five different campuses, we expected to find some deficits in this area. On the contrary, it is clear that the staff have developed creative and quite personalized mechanisms to address student needs across the whole horizon of support, from academic advising to career services. We met with most of the senior student services personnel and found them to be uniformly engaged, articulate, and enthusiastic about their students. These impressions were confirmed by the students themselves, in a separate meeting. These dozen or so individuals, representing all of the undergraduate programs, were vociferous in their praise for the services to which they had access. Of special interest is the new Center for Teaching and Learning, which provides on-site assistance to both students and faculty who want support in improving the quality of their work.

Since it is so central a theme of the JHU self-study, we want to put a particular emphasis on the remarkable feeling of community that these students affirm. We had expected that in such a challenging learning environment, with part-time and non-residential students, there would be complaints of isolation or disconnectedness. On the contrary, the students we met testified energetically that one of the principal strengths of their education at SPSBE was the robust bonds they developed with others in their programs. The creation of these bonds is the result of a

carefully crafted and well thought-out cohort system that SPSBE administrators have set up to cluster students in small groups for the duration of their studies. One young alumna, to give a single example, said that the fifteen students in her cohort stayed together throughout the two-plus years of the academic program, and have continued to be close friends – all fifteen of them – in the year or two since graduation.

Standard 10: Faculty

Most of the faculty of SPSBE are adjuncts, drawn from the large pool of practicing professionals in the Washington-Baltimore corridor. We met with about fifteen of them, drawn from all the school's undergraduate programs. Here again we were struck by the unanimous enthusiasm these individuals expressed for their students and for the SPSBE programs. They are not especially well-paid (\$3,000/course), but they are enthusiastic about the opportunity to teach highly-motivated adult learners. Though they all work on annual contracts, many of the faculty have taught for quite a few years, which provides an admirable degree of stability for students and staff alike. Given the unique needs of the School, this standard is appropriately met.

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

SPSBE requirements combine general education with particular professional mastery in one of the major fields in the program. The range of offerings in each major program is subject to continuous review and improvement. The senior staff welcome proposals for new courses (and, at least in one case, for an entire new program) from the faculty.

All SPSBE courses include a mid-term evaluation and an end-of term evaluation (the IDEA form). The former permits students to signal requests for adjustments in an informal way. The IDEA form permits the instructors to rate a list of criteria in order of importance to each course. This listing is then correlated with student responses to reach judgments about the quality of instruction.

Standard 12: General Education

General education is guided by an outcomes-based inventory of ten “undergraduate competencies”: oral and written communication, critical thinking and problem-solving, human relations, leadership and change, value-based decision-making, technology proficiency, historical and global perspectives, aesthetic appreciation, a sense of lifelong personal and professional development, and information literacy. It is not clear what level of command each student reaches; it is clear that the senior staff and the faculty take these competencies very seriously as they design and implement new courses, and evaluate and re-design existing curricula.

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

SPSBE faculty have taken considerable initiative in aligning their pedagogy with a student outcomes perspective. This began with a pilot program led by the Director of the Undergraduate Business Program, and is now being systematically introduced into curricula throughout the school. Courses now incorporate explicit statements of goals and the relevant indicators. Again, in this regard, SPSBE may be a model for student learning-focused course design across the university.