

# Self-Study Design

## University of Maryland

### **Institutional Overview**

The University of Maryland's institutional identity is described in its mission statement: "A public research university, the flagship campus of the University System of Maryland, and the original 1862 land-grant institution in the State." It is a member of the Association of American Universities, a national organization composed of the leading research universities in the United States and Canada. As a land-grant institution, the University shares its research, educational, cultural, and technological strengths with the Maryland citizenry and other constituencies. Its collaborations with state, federal, private and non-profit partners promote economic development and improve quality of life. As a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University (classified as Very High Research Activity), the university ranks among the best public research universities in the United States, and strives for excellence in all of its activities, including academics, the performing arts, and intercollegiate athletics.

The full text of the University's most recent mission statement was approved by the University System of Maryland's Board of Regents in April 2014. It includes goals and objectives for undergraduate education, graduate education, research and innovation, diversity, outreach and community partnerships, and infrastructure.

The University of Maryland enrolls approximately 27,000 undergraduates, and over 10,000 graduate students. There are no branch campuses, but the university offers programs off-site at regional higher education centers as well as internationally. The curricular inventory includes 91 bachelor's degree programs, 104 master's programs, 82 doctoral programs, as well as certificates at all levels of instruction. Our sponsored research activity includes approximately \$450M in annual expenditures (FY14), with significant partnerships with a number of federal laboratories, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Institutes of Health, NASA-Goddard's Space Flight Center, the U.S. Department Food and Drug Administration, as well as several corporate partnerships.

Like most institutions of higher education, the University of Maryland is responding to a rapidly changing landscape. We have a growing number of professional master's degree programs, both face-to-face and through distance education. We are actively cultivating blended and flipped course offerings for the core curricula in undergraduate programs. Growing experiential learning, internships, and global education are priorities. The University is a member of the Coursera consortium, and offers a suite of Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs) as non-credit offerings. Like most "bricks and mortar" campuses, we must articulate our value to students, parents, to our Board of Regents, and to state legislators. And, like most public universities today, we face budget challenges, reduced public funding, and nearly continuous calls for demonstration of effectiveness and efficiency in support of our mission.

### **Model for Self-Study**

As a participant in the Collaborative Implementation Project, the first class of institutions using the 2014 Standards of Accreditation, we will use the comprehensive model for our Self-Study and have organized the Steering Committee and the Working Groups around this model. This is a significant departure from our 2007 Self-Study, in which the Special Topics model was used, organized around the two broad

themes of “Institutional Assessment, Planning and Resource Allocation” (Topic “A”) and “Educational Offerings and Effectiveness” (Topic “B”). However, we expect the new Standards will allow us to reflect on and continue to build on these two themes. This is reflected in the organization of the Steering Committee, in which we have grouped together Standards I and VI into an area similar to Topic “A” and Standards III and IV in an area similar to Topic “B.” Additional themes that will emerge throughout the document relate to our recent admission to the Big 10 athletic conference (and subsequent academic implications), and the currently ongoing Flagship 2020 initiative, both of which are described below.

## **Intended Outcomes from the Self-Study**

Our 2007 Self-Study was followed by a campus-wide initiative resulting in a Strategic Plan, finalized in May 2008 ([www.provost.umd.edu/SP07/StrategicPlanFinal.pdf](http://www.provost.umd.edu/SP07/StrategicPlanFinal.pdf)). This document served as the context for our 2012 Periodic Review Report ([www.provost.umd.edu/MS-PRR-12](http://www.provost.umd.edu/MS-PRR-12)). Now eight years later, the 2008 Plan continues to provide the fundamental benchmarks around which the university strives for institutional improvement. However, two recent significant initiatives that have broad impact on institutional planning and resource allocation will also provide context for this Self-Study.

As of 2014, UMD is a member of the “Big 10” athletic conference, through which the university has joined the parallel academic organization, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC). Acceptance into the CIC allows us to share best practices, engage in initiatives with a common purpose, and collaborate in a variety of ways that create efficiencies in achieving the common goals of public research universities. While we are still in the early stages of defining our role within the CIC, this relationship has created a new set of peers against which to benchmark our performance. This Self-Study presents an opportunity to reflect on our participation, to evaluate how and whether we are taking best advantage of this relationship, and to make recommendations for future participation.

As of Spring 2015, President Loh has engaged the campus in a major strategic initiative to revise – but not rewrite – the 2008 Plan, along with a comprehensive review of our budget model and a focused effort to identify innovations and efficiencies that will position the University of Maryland as a “top ten” flagship university. This work, named the Flagship 2020 Commission ([www.umd.edu/flagship2020](http://www.umd.edu/flagship2020)), is underway now, and expected to be completed by Fall 2015. The Self-Study Design thus cannot directly reflect or speak to the outcomes, but the working groups will have a rich set of resource material that will connect very naturally with many elements of the new Standards of Accreditation. It is our expectation that the themes emerging from the Flagship 2020 Commission will be reflected and referenced throughout the Self-Study document, once complete. Very specifically, we anticipate that Standard I will be directly addressed through the update to our Strategic Plan.

## Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Working Groups

### Self-Study Steering Committee

Betsy Beise, Professor of Physics, and Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs (co-chair)

Sharon La Voy, Acting Director of Institutional Research, Planning & Assessment (co-chair)

Rebecca Ratner, Professor of Marketing, and Assistant Dean, R.H. Smith School of Business (co-chair)

Mary Ann Rankin, Professor of Biology, and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost

Alex Triantis, Professor and Dean of the R.H. Smith School of Business [Area 1 Chair (Standards I and VI)]

Lucy Dalglish, Professor and Dean of the Phillip Merrill College of Journalism [Area 2 Chair (Standards II and VII)]

Ben Bederson, Professor of Computer Science, and Associate Provost for Learning Initiatives [Area 3 Chair (Standards III and V)]

Linda Clement, Vice President for Student Affairs [Area 4 Chair (Standard IV)]

Gary Attman, University System of Maryland (USM) Regent, and President of FutureCare Health and Management Corporation

Nicole Pollard, Alumni Association Representative

Donald Webster, Marine Science Agent, 2014-2015 Chair of the University Senate

Donna Hamilton, Professor of English, and Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies

Chuck Caramello, Professor of English, and Associate Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

Mike Colson, Committee Staff

Lynn Mullineaux, Committee Staff

### Area 1: Institutional Assessment, Planning, & Resource Allocation (Standards I and VI)

Alex Triantis, Professor and Dean of the R.H. Smith School of Business (Chair)

### Standard I: Mission and Goals

Mary Ann Rankin, Professor of Biology, and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost (chair)

Bill Cohen, Professor and Chair, Department of English

Eric Denna, Vice President and CIO, Division of Information Technology

Angus Murphy, Professor and Chair, Department of Plant Sciences and Landscape Architecture

Robert Orr, Dean, School of Public Policy

Jenny Preece, Dean, School of Information Studies (the iSchool)

Kumea Shorter-Gooden, Associate Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Diversity and Inclusion

Adrienne Hamcke-Wicker, Assistant Director, Center for Leadership and Organizational Change

Note: the makeup of this work group is effectively the subcommittee charged with refreshing the University's mission and vision as part of the Flagship 2020 Commission's Strategic Plan update.

### Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

Cindi Hale, Associate Vice President for Personnel and Budget (chair)

Denise Clark, Associate Vice President for Research Administration, Office of Research

Warren Kelley, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs

Bob Reuning, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management

Doug Roberts, Associate Professor of Physics, and Associate Dean for General Education, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Bill Idsardi, Professor and Chair of Linguistics

Jeff Franke, Assistant Dean and Chief of Staff, the Graduate School

Mike Passarella-George, Assistant Director of Enrollment Policy and Planning, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA)

## **Area 2: Governance, Leadership, Administration, and Ethics (Standards II and VII)**

Lucy Dalglish, Professor and Dean of the Phillip Merrill College of Journalism (Chair)

### **Standard II: Ethics and Integrity**

Juan Uriagereka, Professor of Linguistics, and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (chair)

Diane Krejsa, Deputy Chief Counsel and Chief of Staff, Office of Legal Affairs

Adrian Cornelius, University Registrar

Andrea Goodwin, Director of the Office of Student Conduct

Jude Cassidy, Professor of Psychology

Daryle Williams, Professor of History and Associate Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

Marc Pound, Senior Research Scientist in Astronomy

Blakely Pomietto, Chief of Staff, School of Public Health

Andrea Goltz, Coordinator, Office of Faculty Affairs

### **Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration**

Steve Fetter, Professor of Public Policy, and Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (chair)

Willie Brown, 2015-2016 Chair of the University Senate, and Director of Office Automation, Division of IT

Charles Delwiche, Professor of Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics

Laura Stapleton, Associate Professor of Human Development and Quantitative Methodology

Kanitta Tonggarwee, Assistant to the President

Carolyn Trimble, Deputy Chief Human Resources Officer, University Human Relations

Lindsey Templeton, Graduate Student in Higher Education

Stephanie Dolamore, Research and Assessment Analyst, IRPA

## **Area 3: Education and Academic Quality (Standards III and V)**

Ben Bederson, Professor of Computer Science, and Associate Provost for Learning Initiatives (Chair)

### **Standard III: Design & Delivery of the Student Learning Experience**

Steve Roth, Professor of Kinesiology, and Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence (chair)

Mike Colson, Senior Coordinator for Academic Programs

Michelle Appel, Director of Enrollment Policy and Planning, IRPA

Marcio Oliveira, Executive Director of Learning Technology Services, Division of IT

Chuck Wilson, Associate Vice President for Records, Registration and Extended Studies

Alex Chen, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, and Associate Dean of the Graduate School

Katherine Russell, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences

Lisa Kiely, Assistant Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Ralph Bauer, Professor of English

Jay Kaufman, Professor of Geology

Allison LaFave, Graduate Student in Higher Education

**Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment**

Ann Smith, Assistant Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies (chair)

Sandra Loughlin, Instructional Coordinator, Robert H. Smith School of Business

Chris Harvey, Lecturer, Philip Merrill College of Journalism

Jeffrey Herrmann, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering

Joann Prosser, Director of Assessment and Research, Resident Life

Jeffrey Lucas, Professor of Sociology

Mark Shayman, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering, and Associate Dean of the Graduate School

Scott Roberts, Lecturer and Director of Undergraduate Studies, Psychology

Emily Foley, Research and Assessment Analyst, IRPA

**Area 4: Support of the Student Experience (Standard IV)**

Linda Clement, Vice President for Student Affairs (Chair)

**Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience**

John Zacker, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs (chair)

Victor Mullins, Associate Dean, Robert H. Smith School of Business

Barbara Gill, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management

Kelley Bishop, Director of the University Career Center

Gary White, Associate Dean of the Libraries

Cindy Stevens, Associate Professor of Business, and Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies

Audran Downing, Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Humanities

Dave Eubanks, Associate Director, College Park Scholars

Wayne Taliaferro, Research & Policy Analyst, IRPA

**Charges to the Working Groups**

The charge to each of the working groups has common elements regarding the format and recommended focus of the work, as well as a short narrative with the specific elements related to the relevant standard. Each group is also provided with an initial list of documents from which to draw upon, as developed from the Document Roadmap. Rather than repeat all of the common elements that we will provide to each group, here we include only the standard-specific information. All working groups will receive full access to any available documentation through the Documentation Roadmap, however each group will be given a recommended set of starting documents for their specific work.

**Standard I: Mission and Goals**

This standard addresses the institution's mission, the mechanism by which it is approved and made public, and the degree to which its goals are consistent with its mission as well as its organization and structure as an institution of higher education. The elements look for evidence that there is a publicly available and clearly defined mission that is realistic and appropriate to higher education, that it is focused on outcomes, and that it is periodically reviewed. This standard offers an opportunity to highlight the complexities of a public flagship research university, including its goals of excellence in undergraduate and graduate education, in research and scholarship, and in service to the community, and to frame these within the context of membership in a state-supported university system.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

In addressing this standard, please include a brief discussion of the data that you reviewed and the inquiry undertaken to identify how the university addresses its elements, listed below. Examples of documentation that might be relevant to your analysis are also listed below, but you should feel free to call upon other sources as needed. Your analysis should include an evaluation of the university's strengths and challenges related to these elements, as well as recommendations for ongoing improvement.<sup>1</sup>

General comments about the working group reports:

1. Please limit the report to 10 pages if possible.
2. When possible, respond to an element of the Standard with reference to specific ideas and documents, rather than a lengthy discussion.
3. Please evaluate strengths *and* weaknesses, but a positive and factual tone overall will be most useful to the final document and to the external evaluators.
4. Consider progress and changes that have taken place over the last 10 years.
5. As appropriate, include comment on elements that you believe the campus could work to meet more effectively. We will use these as opportunities for improvement, and versions of these may become recommendations in our final document.
6. As appropriate, you may wish to refer to the 2012 Periodic Review Report, available at [www.provost.umd.edu/MS-PRR-12](http://www.provost.umd.edu/MS-PRR-12). You may also wish to refer to the 2007 Self-Study, which can be found at [www.ms07.umd.edu](http://www.ms07.umd.edu).

### **Standard II: Ethics and Integrity**

This standard addresses the institution's commitment to its faculty, staff, and students to create a productive and welcoming work environment, and a fair, welcoming, and stimulating academic environment. The elements of this standard look for evidence through documented policies and procedures, through the functions of various offices that support the integrity and climate of the institution, and through decision-making and communication strategies. This standard offers an opportunity to highlight and document initiatives to support professional-track faculty, APT procedures, peer learning communities, equity and fairness in hiring procedures, and equity and fairness in student admissions.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

### **Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience**

This standard addresses the institution's commitment to its students to deliver a comprehensive set of rigorous courses taught by qualified faculty. The elements of this standard look for evidence of processes to ensure that appropriate courses are offered, that faculty and/or other professionals who

---

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph and the list below it will be in each charge, but is included only once here to avoid repetition.

are teaching our students are well trained, and that rigor is maintained across all modes of instruction. It also offers us the opportunity to describe new courses and programs across the graduate and undergraduate spectrum, including academic degree programs, General Education, research experiences, innovation, and our various initiatives that leverage blended and online formats.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

#### **Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience**

This standard addresses the institution's commitment to admitting, enrolling, educating, and graduating undergraduate and graduate students from all of our academic programs having experienced the appropriate support systems integral to promoting their success. The elements of this standard look for evidence of sound entrance processes and documentation of student achievement at both the undergraduate and graduate level. It also offers us the opportunity to describe the myriad of ways we support the student experience through programs parallel to and in concert with the academic mission.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups. Consultation is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

#### **Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment**

This standard addresses the institution's commitment to the assessment and review of academic programs, and the effect of those reviews on educational effectiveness. The elements of this standard look for the statement of educational goals across all levels of the student experience, and the assessment of student achievement to improve pedagogy and curriculum. It also allows us the opportunity to describe our assessment and improvement efforts across the graduate and undergraduate spectrum, including academic degree programs, General Education, and co-curricular experiences.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

#### **Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement**

This standard addresses the degree to which institutional planning and resource allocation are linked to the goals of the university and to continuing institutional improvement. It looks for evidence of accountability, financial planning, evaluation of resources and alignment with the goals of the institution, and deployment of human resources to support those goals. This standard will provide an opportunity to highlight the work of the Flagship 2020 Commission, progress on items in various institutional planning documents, and processes to support resource allocation such as those used by the Finance Committee, the Facilities Council, the Student Facilities Fee Committee, and others.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard I: Mission and Goals*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

**Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration**

This standard addresses the university's overall governance and organization and its relationship with the University System of Maryland, the Board of Regents, and the State of Maryland as a public institution. The elements of the standard look for evidence of shared governance and accountability, for evidence of the role of the Board of Regents, and evidence that the Chief Executive Officer has appropriate credentials, authority, and resources to serve the institution in an appropriate manner. It also offers us the opportunity to describe the participation of students and staff in our Senate and our interactions within the University System.

Some of your work may overlap with that of the other working groups, and most specifically with that of *Standard II: Ethics and Integrity*. Consultation with this working group is encouraged to avoid duplication of effort and to identify the appropriate linkages with this standard and with institutional priorities.

Self-Study Design

June 23, 2015

**Timetable for the Self-Study**

2015	April	Draft of Self-Study Design to MSCHE
	<b>April 27</b>	<b>MSCHE Liaison, Tito Guerrero, visits campus</b>
	May	Working Group charge and organizational meetings
	June	Revised Self-Study design to MSCHE
	Summer	Working Group documentation review
	September	Working Groups begin writing
	September	Working Group check-in meeting with Area Chair and Co-Chair
	Fall	Working Groups write and revise, and collect and analyze new data (if necessary)
	November	Working Group check-in meeting with Area Chair and Co-Chair
2016	January	Working Group 1 <sup>st</sup> draft reports due to Co-Chairs
	February	Co-chairs, Area Chairs, and Steering Committee provide feedback to Working Groups
	February	Evaluation Team Chairperson is selected by MSCHE in consultation with UMD leadership
	March	Working Group final draft reports due
	April	Initial first draft of Self-Study completed
	May	Steering Committee gives feedback on Self-Study
	June	Official first draft of Self-Study due to MSCHE
	August	Campus feedback on draft of Self-Study
	September	Steering Committee gives feedback on revised Self-Study
	October	Second draft of Self-Study due to MSCHE
	<b>November</b>	<b>Evaluation Team Chairperson visits campus</b>
	<b>December 12</b>	<b>Compliance Report completed</b>
2017	January	Final version of Self-Study due to MSCHE
	<b>Before April 15</b>	<b>Evaluation Team visits campus</b>

## Organization of the Final Self-Study Report

The basic outline of the report will be an Introduction, an analysis of each standard along with any specific recommendations, followed by an overall summary and conclusion. An Executive Summary will include a brief discussion of the major recommendations emerging from the Self-Study.

## Editorial Style and Format (for the Working Group Reports)

The following provides information on how to prepare the Working Group reports so that they are most useful for the final draft of the Self-Study. The length of each report will vary, but in most cases a report of no more than 10 pages, written concisely, should allow for addressing the standard. Because the Working Group reports will be combined and reorganized into one document to sound as though it were written by one person, very little time should be spent by the Working Group authors on wordsmithing. Instead, focus on ideas and specific references; in some cases bulleted lists may even be appropriate. Whenever possible, please refer to an existing document. Use Times New Roman 12 point for the body of the report with single spacing (double space between paragraphs) and 1 inch margins.

1. Please begin each report with the name and title of the standard being addressed, its brief description, and the members of the working group.
2. Please provide a 1-page Executive Summary listing the major points, strengths, weaknesses, and whether or not we have met the elements of the standard. This can be in a bulleted format.
3. The body of your report should contain the following elements:

### **Purpose and Scope:**

The report should begin with an overview of the standard and the charge, along with your assessment of its scope, based on the specific underlying criteria for the standard.

### **Data and Documentation:**

Please provide a brief summary of the data used, documents reviewed, and questions posed to evaluate how the university is meeting the standard.

### **Relationship to Other Standards or Criteria:**

Please consider any connection between your charge and those of the other groups, and of any collaboration that took place between groups to organize your responses.

### **Analysis:**

How has the university changed since the last Self-Study, and/or since the last Periodic Review? Consider this analysis both within the context of the themes identified as intended outcomes as well as in relation to the specific criteria of the standard to be addressed. Where has the university made progress, and where do challenges remain? Focus on evidence, and identifying where decisions were made accordingly. Wherever possible, organize the material by each of the specific criteria.

### **Conclusions:**

Does the university meet the criteria of this standard? Where are the challenges? Are there areas in which additional data or processes are needed in order to assess? What are your recommendations for improvement?

4. As an appendix, please provide a list of all documents used to evaluate your standard. If you would direct the reader to more information on a website, please be as specific as possible. For example, avoid linking to the Undergraduate Studies home page website if your comment is referencing a Gen Ed requirement. Instead, provide a link to where the requirement is easily viewed; the reader should not have to search for the referenced information. If the document is available in electronic form but not on a web page, please send it to Mike Colson ([mcolson@umd.edu](mailto:mcolson@umd.edu)) and we will make it available on a web site.

## Profile of the Evaluation Team

The Chair of the assessment team should have executive-level experience with the operations of a public research university, and preferably a current or previous role at a flagship campus within a university system. The majority of the other members of the team should have experience at a large and/or public research institution, and/or experience at an otherwise complex or academically challenging institution. Team members from distinctly different institutions (i.e., much smaller or not research-intensive) should be encouraged to consider our mission as different from their experience.

### List of Peers and Peer Aspirants

Within Middle States, our peers are universities with the Carnegie sub-classification of “Very High Research Activity.” The following lists all of these within the Middle States region, separated into public and private institutions. For those that are public universities, they are additionally tagged as to whether they are the flagship campus (“f”), or a member of the Big Ten (“t”). Later in the summer or fall of 2015, a set of peer institutions from economic competitor states, referred to as “Bohanan” peers, will be finalized. This group will be used by the State of Maryland for peer performance evaluation. Once they are finalized, they can be added to this list of potential sources for team members as needed.

#### Public Universities

The Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York  
The Pennsylvania State University (University Park) [f, t]  
Rutgers University [f, t]  
State University of New York, Albany  
State University of New York, Buffalo [f]  
State University of New York, Stony Brook  
University of Delaware [f]  
University of Pittsburgh

#### Private Universities

Carnegie Mellon University	Johns Hopkins University
Columbia University	Princeton University
Cornell University	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
The George Washington University	University of Pennsylvania
Georgetown University	University of Rochester
New York University	Yeshiva University

Other institutions to consider, that are not within the Middle States accrediting region, but have characteristics similar to the University of Maryland are the following:

University of California – Berkeley [f]  
University of Michigan – Ann Arbor [f, t]  
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill [f]  
University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign [f, t]  
Ohio State University – Columbus [f, t]  
University of Minnesota – Twin Cities [f, t]

## Documentation Roadmap

The lists below are representative documents recommend for each of the standards. You may identify other documents beyond this list that would also be useful to address the standard in question. Links will be provided for any document that is available on the internet, and a secure electronic location will be provided for any document that is not publicly available.

### Standard I: Mission and Goals

- MHEC approved institutional mission statement, vision statement
- Institutional strategic plan and any available updates from 2015
- Board minutes indicating the Board has approved the mission statement
- Faculty handbook
- Major initiatives in support of the mission, special task forces or ad-hoc president's commissions
  - President's Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics
  - CIC/BigTen integration
  - Task Force on Cybersecurity
  - MPowering the State (College Park – Baltimore partnership)
- Spin-off documents related to the Strategic Plan
  - College strategic plans
  - Strategic Plan for Diversity
  - Transforming General Education
  - Division of IT Strategic Plan
- MHEC State Plan for Post-secondary education
- USM Strategic Plan

### Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

- Student grievance policy and practice
- Faculty and staff grievance policy and practice
- Search and selection policy and practice
- Faculty and staff work environment policies and practices
- Conflict of Interest, Conflict of Commitment policy and process
- Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) policy
- Programs that support faculty development and retention (ADVANCE, CIC leadership, Teaching fellows, etc.)
- Student discipline policy and practice
- Policies on classroom climate and sexual misconduct
- Commissions and committees to address diversity and inclusion in the classroom and across campus

- Web sites and policies related to Admissions, Financial Aid, Transfer Credit
- Graduate and Undergraduate Catalogs, Faculty handbooks
- IRB, AALAC Accreditation
- ADA policies

**Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience**

- Program approval procedures
- Faculty appointment and development procedures
- Program review procedures
- Course assessments
- Communication across modalities and locations
- Learning outcomes
- Four/two-year plans
- Course offerings
- Faculty credential data
- Evidence of sufficient faculty
- Library and lab resources
- General Education outcomes, plans, and assessments
- Student survey results
- Degree audits
- Program websites (FIRE, Academy of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, TLTC, UG Studies, General Education, iSeries, Living Learning Communities)

**Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience**

- College catalog
- Financial aid website
- Consumer information website
- Admissions website
- Bursar's office website
- Student on-line resources such as Canvas and Testudo
- Code of Conduct
- Student handbook
- Student support-annual reports
- Faculty handbook
- Taskforce on advising report
- Closing the Achievement Gap report
- Programs of Cultural Diversity report
- Program reports on Four-Year Plans
- Student orientation
- Student surveys (e.g. National Survey of Student Engagement, Campus Assessment Working Group)
- Student government process
- Description of living/learning communities
- Placement/testing results

- Clubs/organizations
- Athletics (including Board of Regents and NCAA reporting)
- Review of comparability of policies in all modalities/settings

**Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment**

- Web site for Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment
- Annual report on the review of Living Learning and Special Programs
- Annual Reports of the Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment: Undergraduate Committee and Graduate Committee
- Annual Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes Assessment reports (which summarize outcomes, assessments, results, and plans for change)
- Graduate Program Learning Outcome Assessment Reports (which include plans, attachments and reports)
- General Education learning outcomes and assessment processes (including rubrics)
- Curricular documents
- Academic program reviews
- Career Center Graduation/First Destination Survey Report
- Curriculum maps
- Student Learning Outcomes Assessment reports from Student Affairs units

**Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement**

- Institutional Strategic Plan and Facilities Master Plan
- Activities of the Facilities Advisory Committee and Facilities Council
- Activities of the Finance Committee
- Teaching Facilities Committee Reports, Activities, and Outcomes
- Annual funding for General Education ("Planning Cycle")
- Presidential Task Forces and Outcomes
- Institutional Advisory Committees, Reports, and Outcomes
- Any Flagship 2020 Commission documents and recommendations
- Research expenditures and funding annual report
- Strategic research initiatives (resources/infrastructure)
- Capital Projects planning documents (CIP, SFCP)

**Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration**

- University Plan of Organization
- College Plans of Organization
- Organizational charts for executive level offices
- Board of Regents Policies
- President's Policies
- Board of Regents committee structure and recent agendas and minutes.
- Higher Education portion of the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR)
- COI policy
- CEO and Administrative staff credentials