



August 31, 2006

Ms. Jean Avnet Morse,
Executive Director
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
3624 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680

Dear Ms. Morse:

We received the fiscal and external reviewers' analyses of our Periodic Review Report earlier this month and have reviewed them carefully. We appreciate the thoughtful review of the PRR and other documents we submitted. We are gratified by the reviews' observation about "the breadth and depth of the PRR, which reflects well on the tremendous efforts of the 14-person steering committee, particularly during a time of transition." The committee was very thorough during the year the report was developed and inclusive of a great many members of the Gallaudet community.

As requested, I have included in this letter our institutional response to both the financial and external reviewers' reports. The response is organized as follows:

- Response to the four recommendations from the fiscal analysis
- Correction of a few factual errors in the external reviewer's report
- Response to the four recommendations by the external reviewers
- Response to the four suggestions by the external reviewers
- Comment on the external reviewers' conclusion that Gallaudet had "two similar scenarios in twenty years"

Response to Recommendations from Fiscal Analysis Reviewer

- 1. It is recommended that the University may look at their recruitment goals and broaden their efforts beyond their traditional plans given their niche in the market**

We agree with this recommendation and, in fact, have been moving in this direction for some time. In May 2005, the Board of Trustees approved the University's new strategic goals, two of which relate to the diversity in the deaf community. Goal #1 focuses on Gallaudet as an "inclusive deaf university...that recognizes the diversity among deaf and hard of hearing people—in cultural identification, language and communication choices,

audiometric measures, age of onset, use of amplification technology, school experiences—and in age, gender, disability, racial and ethnic background, religion, sexual orientation, and social-economic class.” Goal # 4 focuses on Gallaudet as “the university of choice for an increasingly diverse pool of potential students who are deaf and hard of hearing, and for hearing students who want to prepare for careers in the deaf community.”

We have studied the changing demographics of the deaf population and know that the vast majority of deaf students (86%) are now educated in public schools, not in residential schools for deaf students and that growing numbers of deaf children are receiving cochlear implants. Our Office of Enrollment Services has been developing strategies to recruit these students, as well as others of diverse background and experience. We are developing programs to accommodate their needs when they enroll at Gallaudet. We have an ambitious diversity action plan that has been reviewed in draft form by the Board of Trustees and is being discussed by the campus community. In addition, since 2001, the University has accepted a limited number of hearing students as undergraduate students, currently up to 5% of an entering class.

We also are planning for growth in graduate programs, an initiative related to Strategic Goal #6: “Gallaudet University values and promotes undergraduate and graduate education equally.” This represents a change from the vision of Gallaudet as primarily focused on undergraduate education. Recent additions in the Graduate School include Ph.D. programs in audiology and linguistics, and an M.A. program in international development. The Graduate School is also expanding online offerings and graduate certificate programs that attract working professionals and non-traditional students.

2. It is recommended that the University conduct a review of auxiliary operations to determine if expenses could be reduced and revenue enhanced to make these operations more profitable.

We do periodically review these operations individually and agree that the recommendation is well taken. We plan to initiate a comprehensive review involving several operations, such as food services and the residence halls that have not been reviewed recently.

3. It is recommended that the University continue to strengthen its overall financial management and control.

We agree with this recommendation and will continue to work to this end, especially in consultation with our external auditors.

- 4. It is recommended that the University continue to look for opportunities to diversify revenue sources to support and enhance operations and to reduce dependency upon federal funding. The University may find it becoming increasingly difficult to rely so heavily on federal appropriations in the future.**

Below, we describe in some detail our strategic planning aimed at reducing Gallaudet's dependence on federal appropriations. At the same time, however, it needs to be noted that our federal funding has been very reliable over time and has grown almost continuously since the institution received its first appropriation in 1858. It has received an annual appropriation in every year since and there is no indication that federal support is waning. We continue to recognize that growth in federal funding is affected by political and macroeconomic factors that are beyond our control, and we have, therefore, done extensive planning to diversify our resources.

Gallaudet's plan to reduce its dependence on federal funding dates to the early 1980's when the University was advised by staff at the Department of Education that it would be wise to increase its tuition rates, given the expectation that federal funding would become tighter as the federal budget deficit increased. Historically under an agreement with the Department, Gallaudet's tuition rate had been set at the mean for land grant universities, on the principle that Gallaudet functioned as the national university for the deaf. Under a new agreement setting Gallaudet's tuition in the upper quartile for land grant universities, the University began a long-term plan to increase its tuition rate so that it is now near the top of the range of public universities. Under its current agreement with the Department, Gallaudet's annual tuition increases during the 1990's and early 2000's, for many years ran at 7% per year. Beginning in 2005, the University reduced annual increases in tuition to 3%, due to concerns about the continued affordability of a Gallaudet education and general concerns in Congress about tuition increases that exceeded those of the CPI.

Beginning also in the mid-1980's and aided after 1988 by the federal endowment matching program, Gallaudet greatly increased its fund raising efforts. During my tenure, the endowment has increased from \$10 million to \$165 million, and operating investment income now exceeds \$4 million annually. Gallaudet's endowment income in 2005 exceeded the total value of its endowment principal in 1985.

As a consequence of these actions, Gallaudet's appropriation as a percentage of its total operating income declined from 81% to 67% between 1985 and 2005. Note that the 67% figure for FY 2005 does not apply institutional financial aid as a discount to tuition income, because that was not the practice in 1985. With institutional financial aid shown as a discount, the federal appropriation as a percentage of total operating income is 69% in 2005. In 1981, appropriated funds comprised 85% of Gallaudet's total operating income. The extent to which Gallaudet has reduced its dependence on federal appropriations has, thus, been dramatic. Note also that these statistics refer to the complete institution, including the Clerc Center demonstration schools and outreach programs, which are almost entirely federally supported. With tuition income discounted

according to current accounting practice, only 61% of Gallaudet's university level income was due to federal appropriations in FY 2005.

Before my presidency, all major construction programs on the campus were funded by federal appropriations. During my presidency all major construction has been funded either by cost sharing with the federal government, or, as in the case of the last two buildings constructed on the campus, by privately raised funds alone, including a recent 3 year capital campaign that resulted in \$40 million in donations. The University is currently in the midst of a capital campaign to fund construction of a new building to be named the Sorenson Language and Communication Center after its major donor. Because it has been able to raise these private funds, Gallaudet will have the opportunity to introduce a "visucentric" design philosophy in this building—that is, Gallaudet can experiment with architectural components based in communication and esthetic notions unique to the deaf community. In recent years, Gallaudet's overall strategy has been to seek private donations primarily for construction and endowments and to seek support for inflationary increases and limited program expansions from the federal government and income from tuition and fees. Gallaudet also provides funding for construction and deferred maintenance projects from its annual operating income.

Response to analysis of the Periodic Review Report

Correction of errors in the reviewers' report:

On the top of p. 3, in the section on *Strategic Planning*, the reviewers' report notes that *New Directions for Academic Affairs* is "modeled largely on the AACU's *Greater Expectations* document." That is not the case. The document describing the new vision for *Liberal Education at Gallaudet University*, is the one modeled on *Greater Expectations* (PRR, p. 14) and relates explicitly to the University's strategic goal #3: "At Gallaudet University, liberal arts is the foundation for intellectual development, ethical decision-making, career development, professional preparation, citizenship, and lifelong learning." In that document, we redefine our philosophy and principles of a liberal education, identify student outcomes, and describe the kinds of pedagogies needed to guide the teaching and learning process.

On p. 5, the first paragraph under Curriculum, the reviewers' report states: "Following the recommendation of the Commission Team in 2001, the Freshman Year Seminar (FYS) became a required course in 2002, but that program was subsequently suspended in Fall, 2003. It will be re-instated in Fall, 2006." The FYS requirement was not suspended. It has continued since becoming a required course in 2002 and, in fact, we expect the entire first year experience to be enhanced by our participation in Foundations of Excellence which is beginning Fall 2006.

Our PRR (p. 12) discusses the Writing Enhanced Curriculum (WEC) that was introduced in 2001. As described on p. 12 of the PRR, WEC was temporarily suspended in order to develop "a more coherent plan for administrative oversight and assessment. The new

plan, which includes short-term assessment and a proposal for long-term assessment, has been approved...and the WEC graduation requirements will be reinstated for students entering in Fall 2006 and thereafter. Revised procedures for recruiting, training WEC faculty, and developing WEC courses will be implemented.”

In the middle of p. 6 of the report, the reviewers estimate Gallaudet’s cost per student as \$68,000. We do not know how this number was calculated, but Gallaudet uses a per student cost calculation for university level programs in its annual budget presentation to the federal government, calculated as total university operational expenses, including depreciation, minus those for auxiliary enterprises, research, and public service, divided by total headcount enrollment. On this basis, we reported an educational cost per student for FY 2005 of \$47,400.

Response to four recommendations

- ***It is recommended that a comprehensive and strategic learning outcomes assessment process be created as soon as feasible and documented through a progress report submitted to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education on April 1, 2008. The report should indicate how outcomes assessment is being conducted, how the data gathered are being shared, and how learning assessment results are utilized in decision-making.***

The University is in the process of interviewing candidates for an Assessment Coordinator. One of the initial tasks of the Assessment Coordinator will be to become familiar with current assessment practices at Gallaudet. After collecting this information, the Coordinator will be ready to initiate the task of developing a comprehensive and strategic learning outcomes process for the entire University. This will include a plan for sharing outcome data and using these data for programmatic and institutional improvement. As with all our strategic planning endeavors, this will be a process that is open and engages the entire community. The University looks forward to this process and the feedback it will receive after submitting a progress report to Middle States Commission no later than April 1, 2008.

- ***It is recommended that the Gallaudet University “review and act upon all recommendations contained in the 2001 Library Program Review Team Report” (from the Chair’s Brief of the 2001 Evaluation Team Visit) that have not hitherto been addressed. Of particular concern here is the library budget; Gallaudet has rejected the formulaic approach recommended by the evaluation team. It must therefore develop another funding approach that would meet the same objective—that of significantly strengthening the library’s resources for the years ahead.***

We agree that we must review and act upon the recommendations in the 2001 *Library Program Review Team Report* and with the new head librarian in place we are in a position to do so. Recommendation 6 in that report stresses that “[The Library] must

begin to evaluate its collections, its services, and its activities with respect to the contributions each makes to the mission of the university.” It also proposes using the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) *Standards for College Libraries*, particularly with respect to “inputs, outputs, and outcomes.” These two recommendations (with expansion of contribution to mission to include alignment with strategic plans) provide a useful framework for addressing all of the recommendations in the report. Assessment of Library collections, services, and activities will, of course, be linked with the “comprehensive and strategic learning outcomes assessment process” that the University will be developing. This Fall, the Library will pilot an adaptation of an assessment program, TILT, developed at the University of Texas to assess information literacy learning. It will be used each time a librarian teaches an FYS class or gives a workshop for FYS students. In the short-term it will be an assessment of the extent to which students achieved the learning objectives; in the long-term, data gathered will be used to improve the content and method for the classes and workshops.

One of the major recommendations concerning the library from the 2001 MSA visiting team was that expenses be increased to at least 4.6% of educational and general (E and G) expenses (understood to mean total operating expenses for the institution, not including auxiliary enterprises and depreciation, a term of art no longer employed in the IPEDS annual financial survey). This percentage was said to be the national average.* In our Periodic Review Report, Gallaudet indicated that we did not consider this percentage approach an appropriate way to plan and budget for our library, and we are gratified that the MSA reviewers have accepted our position. At the same time, we recognize the value of comparative study in setting benchmarks for library funding. We would begin by noting that in FY 2005, total library expenses at Gallaudet, including library operations, acquisitions, and membership fees in the WRLC totaled about \$2.6 million, about 2.9% of educational and general expenses as defined above. Following some preliminary research, we have concluded that there is considerable diversity among American colleges and universities with respect to library funding as either a percentage of total budget or on a per student basis. For example, the Association for Research Libraries has tracked total library expenses as a percentage of E and G expenses for 40 university libraries and finds that the average for these libraries declined from about 3.7% in 1984 to about 2.5% in 2002 (www.arl.org/stats/eg/chart40.pdf).

* This percentage appears to have come originally from a survey of 9 small, elite, liberal arts colleges conducted by Gallaudet’s Office of Institutional Research in 1990. The range of percentages for these 9 institutions was from 3% at Barnard College (roughly equal to Gallaudet’s percentage during the period from 1990 to 2005) to 7% at Bryn Mawr. We note that Barnard College enjoys a situation similar to that of Gallaudet, in that its students have access to two major library systems, those of Columbia University and the New York Public Library. Our students have access to the Library of Congress (the nation’s largest library, located less than one mile from the Gallaudet campus). In addition, Gallaudet’s membership in the WRLC gives our students access to the more than 2,000,000 items in the WRLC library collections, which can be requested online and are usually delivered within two days.

In our response to this recommendation in the Periodic Review Report, we suggested, because we have high overall per student expenses and a consequently large total budget, that it would be useful for us to look at total library expenses per student. Here we also find considerable diversity in American higher education. Comparative data from more than 50 universities posted on the website of North Carolina State University show a range in per FTE library expenses from a low of \$471 (Virginia Tech) to a high of \$5,819 (Yale) in 2004. Gallaudet's per FTE library expenses in 2004 were about \$1,680, roughly equal to those of the University of Pennsylvania and higher than the expenses at the University of Virginia, the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, Michigan, and NYU, among others (www2.acs.ncsu.edu/UPA/peers/current/research_intensive/expandft.htm). We were also able to obtain information concerning two liberal arts colleges with enrollments similar in size to Gallaudet's: Lawrence University, located in Appleton, Wisconsin (http://www.lawrence.edu/about/lu_factsheet.pdf) and Haverford College in suburban Philadelphia (www.haverford.edu/ir/p36_library.pdf). Here again, we find considerable diversity. In 2005, Lawrence University spent \$1,197 per FTE student for library services, and Haverford spent \$2,873 per FTE student in that year. Finally, a national study of all American higher education institutions found average library expenses per FTE student in 2000 of about \$417 (nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004317.pdf). Our goal will be to construct a benchmark from among these widely varying possible comparative statistics that fits our unique situation.

In this regard, we continue to note that we reside in an extraordinarily library-rich environment and, as noted earlier, our membership in the WRLC gives our faculty, staff, and students access to an extremely large collection of materials. Membership also entitles us to deep discounts on many electronic resources that we could not otherwise afford. It also provides us with computer systems and staff expertise that our library alone could not match. In FY 2006, we borrowed 6,830 items from WRLC libraries. Having said this, we continue to express concern about the adequacy of our acquisitions budget, and, in this regard, we are exploring ways to implement a plan to increase this budget by about \$250,000 during the next two fiscal years by seeking additional external funding or reallocating existing resources from other parts of the University. The Library plan for use of these additional funds includes: new books, updates of reference books, serials and periodicals (print and databases), microfilming of archival materials, and conversions of old videos related to deaf issues that need to be converted to digital or other analog format.

- ***It is recommended that the University once again explore how to create an “early” or “honorable” exit strategy for undergraduate students who may not succeed in an open admissions environment. The creation of articulations agreements to assist in the transfer of students to Gallaudet does not adequately address the needs of students who may need a transfer from Gallaudet.”***

As discussed in the May 2006 Periodic Review Report to the Middle State Commission, the University community agreed that developing “early” or “honorable” exit strategies

in the form of degree or certificate programs was not in the best interest of Gallaudet. Resources from existing programs would need to be redirected to support such a costly endeavor. What the University believes can be done when it is determined that a student cannot benefit from the Gallaudet experience is to develop a transition program to bridge students to the next phase of their life whether it be work or another educational program. The structuring of a transition program is in the early conceptual stage. Gallaudet recognizes its responsibility to every student who is admitted to the university.

A transition program would introduce students to opportunities outside of Gallaudet. We envision that this transition program would provide a student with career exploration opportunities, training in how to conduct a job search and understanding the job market, basic skill development in reading, business writing, math, and problem solving. By the next full accreditation process in 2011, Gallaudet expects to have a transition program in place that enables a student to exit Gallaudet honorably with a plan for his/her future in hand.

With respect to articulation agreements, a major goal of these agreements is to reduce the number of under prepared students at Gallaudet and through the agreements have community colleges offer developmental courses comparable to those offered here so that more students will enter Gallaudet better prepared than at present. The goal is not simply to assist in the transfer of students to Gallaudet but rather increase the number of students who are better prepared for college and enter as transfer students. Over time we expect that this strategy will increase the percentage of our students who persist to graduation. We know from long term tracking of entering undergraduate cohorts that students who transfer to Gallaudet are more likely to graduate than students who enter as first-time students.

- ***It is recommended that the University seriously and promptly address the excessive general education requirements of the undergraduate programs. The reviewers were disappointed that this recommendation from the 2001 Visitation Team had not been appropriately or adequately addressed. Either the Task Force on Liberal Education or some other such body should be assigned responsibility and given the authority to introduce changes in a very timely manner.***

We acknowledge that the University's general education requirements must be addressed beyond what has been achieved thus far. At the same time, we think it is important that changes in general education requirements are guided by our strategic plans. New University strategic goals were approved by the Board of Trustees one year ago and strategic goal #3 led to re-visioning liberal education at Gallaudet. The task force on liberal education (co-chaired by one of the co-chairs of the Academic Affairs Planning Committee and the chair of the Council on Undergraduate Education with membership comprised of faculty, staff, and students) developed the document *Liberal Education at Gallaudet University*. Consistent with AAC&U's *Greater Expectations*, our vision of liberal education focuses on an integrated curriculum (general education, majors, and

electives) that will employ educational strategies designed to enhance students' abilities to achieve expected outcomes.

A draft of the *Liberal Education* document was discussed widely during the spring semester and feedback from those discussions will be incorporated into a revised, final document early this fall. Overall, the document was very well-received and a great deal of the feedback had to do with questions about how the new vision will be implemented, implications for curriculum, and recognition of the need for professional development related to new pedagogies and assessment. Recognizing the need for extensive professional development for successful implementation of the new vision for liberal education as well as for other aspects of strategic planning and assessment, the provost has made funding for professional development a high priority in her budget planning.

We think it is most appropriate to make substantive changes in the general education requirement (as well as other curricular changes that may be appropriate) after we have completed the work on student outcomes for a liberal education at Gallaudet and then proceed to make changes within the context of the comprehensive assessment plan we will develop in accordance with the recommendation from the PRR reviewers. The administration and the faculty will, of course, have ongoing discussions about these important changes.

Our president-designate, Dr. Jane Fernandes, is committed to responding in a timely fashion to the general education recommendation and all recommendations and suggestions proposed by the fiscal review and the review of the PRR. As provost she led the major strategic planning efforts that are underway, thus, we know there will be continuity and support for these plans. At the same time, we are in a period of transition. Dr. Fernandes will assume the presidency on January 1, 2007. During the fall semester, as president designate, she will focus on addressing issues that were in the forefront when she was selected as president in May . She will also initiate a national search to select a provost. Until such time as a person assumes that position, an interim provost will have administrative responsibility for Academic Affairs.

Response to Four Suggestions

- **Recognizing that the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has accepted the progress reports from the University regarding governance concerns expressed by the 2001 Visitation Team, the reviewers nonetheless suggest that these discussions continue with a view toward streamlining the committee structure and nurturing healthy relationships between faculty and administrators.**

With respect to committee structure, the reviewers' note the addition of committees or task forces. We want to point out that ad hoc committees and task forces have been added when it has been deemed important by both the administration and faculty governance to establish tasks forces/committees comprised of faculty, staff, and student

representatives. Most often they have been related to strategic planning efforts and these collaborations have been viewed by all groups as facilitating, not impeding the work of the University. Discussions about relationships between faculty and administrators have been ongoing and will continue.

- **The University should continue and strengthen its efforts to recruit a more diverse faculty pool, including a larger percentage of faculty members with no previous connection to Gallaudet. Vibrant institutions need to find a balance between continuity with the past and the infusion of new ideas and perspectives.**

The efforts we have undertaken to have a diverse faculty will continue. We have a strong commitment to diversity among faculty and staff (and students as well) and we have a strategic plan for diversity for the University. We also point out that the chart in the PRR for the years 1997 – 2005 shows a dramatic increase in the percentage of deaf and hard of hearing faculty appointed whose highest degree is not from Gallaudet.

It is important to understand that as a university whose mission is to educate deaf and hard of hearing students, we seek to have as many deaf and hard of hearing faculty as possible. As the world's only liberal education university in the world whose mission is to educate deaf and hard of hearing students, it is highly likely that many of our deaf faculty will have baccalaureate degrees from Gallaudet.

- **It is as yet unclear the level of commitment the University has toward literacy and English competency programs nor what form those efforts will take in the following years. It would be helpful with the next review opportunity to read that these efforts have been strengthened, stabilized, and successful.**

The University's commitment to literacy and English competency programs has always been a constant and is demonstrated by the substantial fiscal and human resources dedicated to English and math literacy programs. Historically, the University offered a Preparatory Program for a full year to under prepared students. In the mid 1980's the University opened the School of Preparatory Studies on a satellite campus to provide a more intensive, holistic approach to increasing literacy among its students. As a result of a decline in numbers the satellite campus was closed ten years after it opened and responsibility for literacy and literacy programs was assumed by the English and Mathematics departments. This decline in numbers was related primarily to the virtual elimination of deafness caused by maternal rubella. In 2000 in an effort to strengthen and develop a more centralized approach to literacy instruction, the University established a Developmental Program with a director and \$200,000 operating budget. This Development Program has now been transformed into the Department of Applied Literacy, an academic department with tenure track and tenured faculty. Faculty from the English Department as well as newly hired faculty were selected as members of the

Department of Applied Literacy because of their interest in working with this population, their academic background, and their experience in teaching literacy skills to students not prepared for college level course work.

Gallaudet's commitment to literacy and English competency programs has taken many shapes and forms. One of our more successful approaches has been first year learning communities that link developmental English classes with an FYS class. Assessment of these learning communities over the last three years indicates that students in these linked courses outperform those not in linked classes. Evidence of the success of the linked English and FYS class has led to an increase in the number of linked courses, greater reinforcement of literacy across courses, and a growing number of faculty at ease with an interdisciplinary approach to developing literacy skills. As more and more faculty receive Writing Across the Curriculum training and develop writing intensive courses, students have the opportunity to develop their English competencies through an ever increasing number of courses. All freshmen are required to take an FYS class that has been designated "writing intensive course."

Another successful program aimed at literacy has been the integration of academic support services from the Tutorial and Instructional Programs (TIP) into the classroom experience. The TIP tutoring program has been certified by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA). CRLA certified tutors work as Teaching Assistants in the class, tutors outside the classroom and as tutors in the English lab. These tutors have one-on-one tutoring sessions as well as group sessions. Students taking the first two levels of developmental English participate in structured tutoring as a part of their course work. Assessment data comparing the success rate of students participating in this program with those who did not documents an increased pass rate and a decrease in the number of students required to repeat the first level developmental course, English 50. The assessment data led to revisions of the curriculum for the second level, English 70. Now both English 50 and English 70 integrate TIP services and the classroom experience.

The Department of Applied Literacy also has a Walk-in Tutoring Lab for students taking developmental English and math. These tutoring labs have online tutorials as well as tutors physically present to assist students. The academic performance of users will be compared with those of non-users to determine if students using the walk-in service outperform those who do not.

These are just a few of the literacy programs that have been assessed and produced evidence of the success of students who participate in them. Other programs, such as the Video Supplemental Instruction (VSI), Common Summer Readings, and the Turn-A-Page Together program sponsored by Multicultural Student Programs have all contributed to the literacy of our students. In each instance, the University has provided financial support and human resources. The VSI received funds to pilot and assess the learning potential of this pedagogical approach to instruction in developmental math. For the Common Summer Reading, books are purchased for all incoming students. The summer reading is enriched by classroom discussion in English and FYS classes; the

president participated in a panel discussion for the summer 2004 reading; the author of the book always comes to campus and spends a day doing presentations, book signings, and small group discussions. Faculty also have the opportunity through the Summer Institute to participate in training aimed at increasing and changing their pedagogical approach to working with students who need to develop literacy competencies in English and math.

Based on student responsiveness and success with our approaches to developing literacy, the University intends to stay its course. This means keeping abreast of current trends, best practices, and research in literacy development. This means providing an organizational structure that recognizes the importance of developmental education to our mission. This means developing assessment based programs and using data from the assessment of student learning outcomes to guide our decisions about future literacy initiatives. The integration of the classroom experience, academic support services, and co-curricular activities has proven to be a formula that works. *English Works!* has more hits than any other website at the University. This is attributed to the internal and external success of this program in providing literacy support and instruction to students. The University has made a strong commitment to literacy and literacy programs and it will continue to be one of the cornerstones of Gallaudet's academic community.

- **It is suggested that the University create a coherent university-wide mentoring program for new faculty members and hire a faculty development coordinator to provide leadership to this and other development efforts.**

We recognize the need to strengthen mentoring of new faculty and professional development for all faculty. There is a professional development coordinator in our Human Resources Department and we will explore expanding the role of that position as well as other means for addressing this important area.

Reviewers' observations about "two similar scenarios in twenty years"

We think it is important to clarify that despite the appearance of similarities between the "Deaf President Now" movement in 1988 and the reaction to the appointment of Gallaudet's 9th president in 2006, these are very different occurrences. In 1988, the University community was virtually unanimous in its objection to the appointment of a hearing president when highly qualified deaf candidates were two of the three finalists. That was a civil rights issue, when after 124 years a university whose mission was to educate deaf and hard of hearing students, never had a deaf president. In 2006, all of the finalists were deaf. There is no comparison between these two scenarios.

Most assuredly, we share the reviewers' perspective that it is important "that the internal issues that have been brought to the fore by this appointment will be adequately and appropriately addressed in the months ahead, with the intention that the University will emerge as it did after the appointment of Dr. Jordan—stronger, healthier, and more

energetic.” The Board, Dr. Fernandes and I agree that one of her chief responsibilities this fall as president-designate will be to take steps to address the issues. Attached to this response to the reviews of our PRR are copies of a letter Dr. Fernandes sent to the campus community on August 21 and my memorandum of August 27. These communications convey what we are doing to address the issues as well as move forward with other important endeavors at the University.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the review of our Periodic Review Report. We look forward to hearing from you later this fall concerning the Commission’s action.

Sincerely,

I. King Jordan
President