



Middle States Commission on Higher Education

3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2680

Phone: 267-284-5000 Fax: 215-662-5501 www.msche.org

Team Report to the Commission on Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK

April 2-5, 2017

**The Evaluation Team Representing the
Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

Section A: Team Members, Titles, and Institutional Affiliation

Dr. Rodney Erickson, Team Chair
President Emeritus and University Professor
The Pennsylvania State University

Ms. Regina Austin, Esq.
William A. Schnader Professor of Law
University of Pennsylvania

Dr. Barbara Bender
Associate Dean for Academic Support and Graduate Student Services
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey

Dr. Marin Clarkberg
Associate Vice Provost for Institutional Research and Planning
Cornell University

Mr. Martin Dorph
Executive Vice President, Finance and Information Technology
New York University

Dr. Robert A. Mangione
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
St. John's University, New York

Dr. Manuel Pacheco
President Emeritus
University of Arizona
University of Missouri System

Dr. Beatriz Rivera
Assistant to the Vice President of Academic Affairs
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras Campus

Dr. Andrew Wolf
Coordinator for Educational Initiatives, School of Nursing
University of Rochester

Section B: Institutional Representatives at the Time of Visit

President

Dr. Wallace D. Loh
1101 Main Administration Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Chief Academic Officer

Dr. Mary Ann Rankin
1110 Main Administration Building
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Chair of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents

Mr. James T. Brady
University System of Maryland
3300 Metzgerott Road
Adelphi, MD 20783

Section C: Team Findings

I. Institutional Overview: Context and Nature of the Visit

Type of Institution and Characteristics

The University of Maryland, College Park, (hereinafter referred to as UMD) is a public research university and the flagship of the University System of Maryland, which includes eleven other institutions and two regional education centers. UMD was founded in 1856 as the Maryland Agriculture College, and in 1865, was designated as Maryland's Land Grant

University under the provisions of the Morrill Act of 1862. As such, UMD has long had a special bond with the citizens and other constituencies of the state to share its research, educational, cultural and technological expertise and collaborate with individuals and institutions across Maryland and beyond. It accomplishes this service mission, in part, through a program of Cooperative Extension using federal, state, county, and university resources and in collaboration with the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore, another institution in the University System of Maryland.

The University of Maryland, College Park, is located on a 1,250 acre campus in suburban Washington DC. In 2015-16, UMD enrolled over 38,000 students of which nearly 27,500 were undergraduates and about 10,700 were graduate students.

The University of Maryland, College Park, is classified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University (“highest research activity” in 2015), is a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities since 1969, and is a member of the Big Ten Academic Alliance (the academic consortium of the Big Ten Conference universities) since 2014. UMD is widely ranked as a top-20 public research university, with \$550 million in total research expenditures in FY2015. UMD is ranked among the top-10 in numerous metrics for public research universities without a medical school. In recent years, UMD has made significant strides in translating the results of research into a wide range of inventions, licenses, and startup companies to foster economic development in Maryland and beyond.

The University of Maryland, College, Park, has an annual operating budget that approaches \$2.0 billion. Approximately three-fourths of annual operating revenue is unrestricted, the remainder (restricted funds) accruing through a range of gifts, grants, and contracts. Of the unrestricted funds, approximately 32 percent was state appropriation in 2015-16, which as a share of the total UMD budget has fallen somewhat in recent years. Capital expenditures are funded by either direct state appropriation or debt issued by the University of Maryland System.

UMD is governed by a 17-member Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland, which was established in 1988 by the Maryland General Assembly to provide oversight of the state’s public higher education institutions. The Board of Regents, which includes one student member, is appointed by the Governor of Maryland for five-year terms. The Regents oversee the University System’s academic, administrative, and financial operations; formulate policy; and appoint the USM chancellor and presidents of each of the System’s institutions.

Approved Credential Levels

UMD is credentialed to offer educational programs leading to baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral degrees. The curricular inventory includes 93 baccalaureate degree programs, 105 master’s programs, and 82 doctoral programs, and includes numerous certificate programs. Graduate education has traditionally focused on doctoral research training, although professional master’s degree programs have gained increasing prominence in recent years.

UMD academic programs are delivered by faculty in 12 academic colleges and schools, encompassing the arts and sciences and a substantial complement of professional schools with the exception of law and medicine, which are offered by the University of Maryland, Baltimore. UMD has nearly 3,300 full-time faculty and over 1,000 part-time faculty. UMD's faculty are a distinguished cadre of educators, including its professional track and part-time faculty members, the latter of whom are drawn from a highly talented pool of teachers/researchers in the greater Washington/Baltimore metropolitan areas. Of the tenure-track faculty, 92 percent hold the terminal degree in their discipline. Among UMD's faculty are Nobel Laureates and numerous members of the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering, as well as members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Additional Program Sites and Distance Education

UMD has no branch campuses, however, UMD faculty deliver complete degree programs, or portions thereof, at 12 off-campus sites for the locational convenience and access of student audiences. A major off-campus delivery site is the Universities at Shady Grove (located in Montgomery County MD), a collaborative of nine partner public institutions where UMD delivers eight undergraduate programs to upper division students and ten graduate programs.

With respect to distance education, UMD, like most of its university peers, has significantly increased the number of degrees and certificates it offers in the online format over the past decade, focusing on Master's level programming and professional advancement. The University has policies that place the development and delivery of online programming within the same requirements for curricular approvals as traditional on-campus degrees and certificates for both existing and new academic programs.

UMD Approach to the Self-Study

UMD's approach to the self-study is articulated in its self-study design document dated June 23, 2015, and subsequently approved by MSCHE. As one of the first institutions to seek accreditation renewal under the new 2014 Standards of Accreditation, UMD chose to use the comprehensive model for their self-study, and organized their Steering Committee and Working Groups around this model. The previous 2007 self-study used the special topics model in which the broad themes of "Institutional Assessment, Planning, and Resource Allocation" and "Educational Offerings and Effectiveness" formed the basis of the self-study document. Although there are some differences from earlier Standards, UMD believes that the 2017 self-study builds upon those important themes in many respects.

The 2007 self-study was followed by the development of a campus-wide Strategic Plan the following year, the elements of which flowed into the 2012 Periodic Review Report to MSCHE. In its self-study design, UMD indicates that the 2008 Strategic Plan remains highly relevant in terms of its broad foundation for institutional improvement, and that two major recent initiatives are providing additional context for the self-study and direction for UMD

strategies for further enhancing the ability of the University to deliver on its mission of providing the highest quality of education, research, and outreach.

In its self-study design approved by MSCHE for the 2017 review, UMD identified two initiatives that will have a major impact on the university in the future. The first is President Loh's 2015 initiative to update the 2008 strategic plan resulting from the work of the Flagship 2020 Commission, which was charged to develop a course of action for the ensuing five years to move UMD to a standing as a top-10 public research university. A second initiative identified was UMD joining the Big Ten Conference and its Academic Alliance in 2014. The BTAA provides UMD with a new set of outstanding university peers, a standard by which to judge its own progress, and importantly, a collaborative environment to share information and resources in ways that benefit the entire group of participating institutions.

The work of the Flagship 2020 Commission and its action plans, built around the efforts of five groups and an advisory council of faculty, staff, and students, was completed in early 2016. These working group reports fed directly into UMD's most recent strategic plan update entitled, *Equal to the Best: 2016 Strategic Plan Update of the University of Maryland*.

Within the general framework of a comprehensive review and under the overall direction of the Steering Committee, UMD organized its self-study effort within seven working groups corresponding to the seven MSCHE Standards for Accreditation. These working groups were charged to develop their respective sections of the UMD self-study with reports that would flow into the overall self-study document.

The final version of UMD's self-study, along with an extensive set of corresponding data and other information serving as a document roadmap, was made available to the review team in January 2017, providing sufficient time for preliminary review and some requests for further data. The site review of UMD took place from April 2-5, 2017 and covered all aspects of the seven standards, their respective criteria, and the requirements for affiliation.

Institutional Priorities of the University of Maryland, College Park

Equal to the Best provides clear insights into the institutional priorities of the University of Maryland, College Park. While acknowledging that the UMD mission and core values have remained unchanged, the plan looks to build on its underlying strengths and opportunities that are considered to be even more relevant by mid-decade, while remaining mindful of the weaknesses and threats facing higher education and the University of Maryland with respect to the stability of public funding for operations and capital needs.

The University of Maryland's updated 2016 plan reflects numerous major institutional priorities including: transforming teaching to improve learning and career readiness; improving graduate student support and success; attracting and retaining top faculty, addressing salary compression and facilities improvement; augmenting faculty resources in key areas of opportunity and collaboration; fundraising and new areas of opportunity and collaboration for the arts and humanities; deeper engagement with UMD's area communities;

a strong commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion; and administrative systems modernization.

Nature of the Review Process

The UMD accreditation review process began with a workshop on the new Collaborative Implementation Project (CIP) hosted by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) in September 2016 and attended by most members of the UMD Review Team; those team members who were unable to attend participated in an online tutorial concerning the CIP and the revised standards, criteria, and requirements of affiliation. Immediately following the workshop, the team chair traveled to College Park for the chair's preliminary visit to provide initial feedback on the draft self-study and its probable readiness to serve the Review Team, and to assess the suitability of the Team's working facilities, arrangements, and prospective scheduling at the time of the April 2017 site visit.

In addition to the on-campus review at College Park, other UMD delivery sites were reviewed. Because of a mid-March snowstorm, a site visit to the University of Maryland, Baltimore, with key academic and administrative leaders of UMD's MPower initiative, had to be accomplished using videoconferencing. Similarly, a site visit to the Universities at Shady Grove was accomplished using videoconferencing, and additional background data and information were provided to the Review Team.

Since 2003, UMD has offered a Master of Arts degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice in collaboration with Nanjing Normal University (NNU) in China, a three-semester and summer program with instruction by UMD and NNU faculty and study at both Nanjing and College Park locations. UMD has long encouraged and fostered student study abroad experiences as a part of their internationalization efforts. The largest group of its students typically studies in Italy, with UMD's collaboration in the International Studies Institute in Florence a major attraction for students. Given the importance of these two overseas programs, the team chair conducted site visits to review both the UMD-NNU and ISI-Florence programs in March 2017.

During the course of the MSCHE site visit, the Review Team had the opportunity to interact with a wide range of individuals who have been involved with the preparation of the self-study or who possess specialized information relevant for the Team's review, as well as discussions with the institution's senior leadership and key decision-makers. These meetings included opportunities to discuss educational issues with faculty, staff, administrators, and students. A summary of those individuals or groups consulted during the course of the site visit follows:

- *President Wallace Loh*
- *Senior Vice President and Provost Mary Ann Rankin and Senior Staff*
Betsy Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs
John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Bill Cohen, Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies
David Cronrath, Professor of Architecture and Special Advisor to the Provost

- Cindi Hale, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
 Bev Rodgerson, Executive Assistant to the Provost
- *Self-Study Co-Chairs*
 Betsy Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs
 Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning,
 and Assessment
 Rebecca Ratner, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Smith School of Business
 - *Working Group I: Mission and Goals*
 Mary Ann Rankin, Chair
 Alex Triantis (area chair), Dean, Smith School of Business
 Bill Cohen, Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education
 Eric Denna, Vice President and Chief Information Officer
 Angus Murphy, Professor and Chair, Plant Science and Landscape Architecture
 - *Working Group II: Ethics and Integrity*
 Steve Marcus (chair), Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering
 Lucy Dalglish (area chair), Dean, Philip Merrill College of Journalism
 Jude Cassidy, Professor of Psychology
 Andrea Goltz, Associate Director, Office of Faculty Affairs
 Andrea Goodwin, Director, Office of Student Conduct
 Diane Krejsa, Deputy Chief Counsel and Chief of Staff, Legal Affairs
 Marc Pound, Senior Research Scientist, Agronomy
 Daryle Williams, Associate Professor of History and Associate Dean,
 College of Arts and Humanities
 - *Working Group III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience*
 Steve Roth (chair), Professor and Associate Dean, School of Public Health
 Ben Bederson (area chair), Associate Provost for Learning Initiatives and
 Director, Teaching and Learning Transformation Center
 Michelle Appel, Director of Assessment and Decision Support, Institutional
 Research, Planning and Assessment
 Ralph Bauer, Associate Professor of English
 Alex Chen, Associate Dean of the Graduate School
 Mike Colson, Senior Coordinator for Academic Programs
 Jay Kaufman, Professor of Geology
 Lisa Kiely, Assistant Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Marcio Oliveira, Assistant Vice President for Academic Technology and
 Innovation, Division of Information Technology
 Katherine Russell, Associate Dean, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
 - *Working Group IV: Support of the Student Experience*
 John Zacker (chair), Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
 Linda Clement (area chair), Vice President for Student Affairs
 Kelly Bishop, Director of the University Career Center
 Audran Downing, Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
 Dave Eubanks, Associate Director, College Park Scholars
 Barbara Gill, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
 Victor Mullins, Associate Dean, Smith School of Business
 Cindy Stevens, Associate Professor of Business and Associate Dean,

Undergraduate Studies

- Gary White, Associate Dean for Public Services, University Libraries
- *Working Group V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment*
Ann Smith (chair), Assistant Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
Ben Bederson (area chair), Associate Provost for Learning Initiatives and
Director, Teaching and Learning Transformation Center
Emily Foley, Research and Assessment Analyst, Institutional Research,
Planning and Assessment
Chris Harvey, Director of Assessments, Philip Merrill College of Journalism
Jeffrey Herrmann, Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Sandra Loughlin, Instructional Coordinator, Smith School of Business
Jeffrey Lucas, Professor of Sociology
Joann Prosser, Director of Assessment and Research, Residence Life
Scott Roberts, Director of Instructional Excellence and Innovation,
Teaching and Learning Transformation Center
Mark Shayman, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering and
Associate Dean of the Graduate School
 - *Working Group VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement*
Cindi Hale (chair), Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
Alex Triantis (area chair), Dean, Smith School of Business
Denise Clark, Associate Vice President for Research Administration,
Division of Research
Jeff Franke, Interim Dean and Chief of Staff, the Graduate School
Warren Kelley, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
Mike Passarella-George, Assistant Director, Institutional Research, Planning,
and Assessment
Bob Reuning, Associate Vice President and Chief Facilities Officer
 - *Working Group VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration*
Chuck Delwiche (chair), Professor of Cell Biology and Molecular Genetics
Lucy Dalglish (area chair), Dean, Philip Merrill College of Journalism
Cynthia Trombly Allen, Consultant, Learning and Talent Development,
University Human Relations
Willie Brown, 2015-16 Chair of the University Senate, Director of Office
Automation
Steve Fetter, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
Laura Stapleton, Associate Professor of Human Development and
Quantitative Methodology
Lindsay Templeton, Graduate Student in Higher Education
Ann Tonggarwee, Assistant to the President
 - *Meeting with Students*
Adrienne Baer, Senior, Information Systems
Elexa Bocchino, Senior, Biological Sciences
Mohamed Boraie, MBA Student, Smith School of Business
Summer Brown, Senior, Theatre
Cory Martin, PhD Student, Atmospheric and Oceanic Science
Cory Ryan, Master's Student in Public Policy

- Courtney Steininger, Senior, English Language and Literature; Dance
 Lindsey Templeton, Ph.D. Student, Higher Education
 Camila Uechi, Senior, Individual Studies Program
 Gabriel Wach, Sophomore, Government and Politics
- *Administrative Modernization Team*
 Mariah Bauer, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Planning
 David Cronrath, Professor of Architecture and Special Advisor to the Provost
 Paul Dworkis, Chief Financial Officer
 Michael Eismeier, Director, Administrative Modernization Project
 Cindi Hale, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
 Natalie Weinstein, Project Manager, Administrative Modernization Project
 - *Budgeting and Planning*
 Paul Dworkis, Chief Financial Officer
 - *Division of Information Technology*
 Eric Denna, Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer
 - *Campus Assessment Working Group (CAWG)*
CAWG Chairs:
 Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
 David Eubanks, Associate Director, College Park Scholars
 Julie Dromkowski, Special Assistant to the Associate Vice President for Facilities Management
 Joann Prosser, Director, Research and Assessment, Resident Life
IRPA STAFF Support (and Members):
 Jamie Edwards, Research and Assessment Analyst, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
 Emily Foley, Research and Assessment Analyst, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
 Frank Rojas, Research and Assessment Analyst, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
 Alan Socha, Assistant Director for Assessment, Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment
CAWG Members:
 Robert Crane, Assistant Director, Student Affairs, Arts and Humanities
 Peter DeCrescenzo, Advisor for Retention Initiatives, Undergraduate Studies
 Nicole Roop, Assistant Director, Clark School of Engineering
Campus Data Users:
 Deborah Reid Bryant, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Studies
 Bob Infantino, Associate Dean, Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences
 - *Student Affairs Leadership*
 Linda Clement, Vice President for Student Affairs
 Mary Hummel, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
 Warren Kelley, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
 Sharon Kirkland-Gordon, Director, Counseling Center
 Brooke Supple, Chief of Staff, Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs

- John Zacker, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs
- *Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment*
 Bill Cohen (chair, undergraduate), Associate Provost and Dean
 for Undergraduate Studies
 Jeff Franke (chair, graduate), Interim Dean of the Graduate School
 Michael Ambrose, Clinical Associate Professor, School of Architecture,
 Planning, and Preservation
 Kathy Angeletti, Assistant Dean and Executive Director of Teacher
 Education, College of Education
 Betsy Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs
 Jamie Edwards, Research and Assessment Analyst, Institutional Research,
 Planning, and Assessment
 Coke Farmer, Associate Dean, School of Public Health
 Rachel Gammons, Head, Teaching and Learning Services, University Libraries
 Christine Harvey, Lecturer and Assessment Director, Philip Merrill School
 of Journalism
 Katherine Worboys Izsak, Undergraduate and Graduate Director, Program
 in Terrorism Studies
 Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning
 and Assessment
 Sandra Loughlin, Director of Transformational Learning, Smith School of
 Business
 Alene Moyer, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Humanities
 Joelle Presson, Assistant Dean, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural
 Sciences
 Oded Rabin, Associate Professor, Materials Science and Engineering
 Ratner, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, Smith School of Business
 Nicole Roop, Assistant Director, Clark School of Engineering
 Ann Smith, Assistant Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Alan Socha, Assistant Director for Assessment, Institutional Research, Planning
 and Assessment
 Cynthia Stevens, Associate Dean, Office of Undergraduate Studies
 Joe Sullivan, Associate Dean, College of Agriculture and Natural Resource
 - *Online Educational Programs*
 Ben Bederson, Associate Provost for Learning Initiatives and Director,
 Teaching and Learning Transformation Center
 Chuck Wilson, Associate Vice President, Records, Registration and Extended
 Studies
 Terrie Hruzd, Director, Programs, Office of Extended Studies
 Deb Mateik, DIT Instructional Design
 Sandra Loughlin, Director of Transformational Learning, Smith School of Business
 - *Faculty Diversity and Inclusion*
 Daryle Williams, Associate Dean, Arts and Humanities
 John Bertot, Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs
 KerryAnn O'Meara, Director, ADVANCE Program
 Sharon La Voy, Assistant Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning

and Assessment

Jamie Edwards, Research Analyst, Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

- *Athletic Academic Staff*

Sue Sherburne, Senior Associate Athletic Director, Academics and Student Development

Chris Uchacz, Associate Athletic Director and Director, Academic Support and Career Development Unit

- *Athletics*

Colleen L. Sorem, Senior Associate Athletic Director

- *Legal Affairs*

Michael Poterala, Vice President for Legal Affairs and General Counsel

- *Administration and Finance*

Carlo Collela, Vice President for Administration and Finance

- *College of Agriculture and Natural Resources*

Craig Beyrouthy, Dean, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources

II. Evaluation Overview

UMD has a unique mission within the University System of Maryland (and codified by the Maryland Higher Education Commission) as the state's flagship institution. This unique status among Maryland's public universities reflects its comprehensive nature as a *premier* research, teaching, and service university. In addition, as the state's Land Grant University, it has a special role to disseminate the results of its research and innovation to the people of Maryland and beyond. The Team finds that UMD has embraced its mission and has appropriate goals. Indeed, UMD appears to be a leader in defining the role of the 21st century Land Grant institution as it addresses urban, economic development, and other issues well beyond its traditional, but still-important, agricultural roots. Research initiatives such as MPower represent win-win propositions for UMD and the state.

The Review Team finds that the institution operates with a high degree of ethics and integrity with appropriate policies and practices in place to ensure continued success; nonetheless, UMD leaders are encouraged to develop more effective ways in which to share information about key policies. Like many of its peers, UMD continues to be challenged by the imperative of creating a more diverse student body and faculty representative of the characteristics of its state and regional demographics. UMD's overall graduation rates are relatively high and comparable to peer public institutions, but the significant gap between four-year graduation rates for underrepresented and majority students will require continued attention.

The University of Maryland, College Park, appears to deliver an appropriate array of academic programs with a well-qualified faculty. UMD has made substantial progress in incorporating a growing number of professional (non-tenure) track faculty into its instructional and research ranks. Its approach to evaluating, developing, and recognizing this important group of faculty is laudable. Living learning communities at UMD are proving to be very successful, and the new General Education program is a model for universities in its focus on educational outcomes and engagement with the faculty. UMD's online programming is growing with

incentives for further development, but remains relatively diffuse across the campus and would benefit from greater cohesion and visibility.

The Review Team finds that there are solid programs in place to support the student experience through student admission, orientation, advising, counseling, and transfer programs. Athletic programs are governed by similar principles and procedures as other programs. UMD has made substantial progress in the assessment of its educational effectiveness with centralized, college-based, and program-level assessments taking place. Although there is considerable progress being made in assessment, there is still room for improvement.

UMD, like most of its public university peers, faces an increasingly challenging budget environment with a relative decline in state financial support even as its costs of operation have risen. The University's budget and planning systems, as recognized by UMD itself, are seriously inadequate to meet the current and future challenges of efficient and effective financial operations. It is essential that a more robust and transparent system be implemented for decision-making on resource allocation. In addition, the array of growing data needs for all aspects of University operations, including support of the student experience, require a modern enterprise information system that is both necessary and costly. Although the UMD campus has benefitted from a significant list of state- and donor-supported new facilities, the large and growing backlog of deferred maintenance should be addressed with the help of the System and state government to keep UMD from falling further behind.

UMD appears to have appropriate management and governance systems in place with a strong cadre of administrators. Its University Senate is a vital and widely representative group that interacts well with the UMD administration, engaging in numerous joint efforts with generally good lines of communication.

In terms of overall governance, the Review Team wishes to reinforce the importance of the unique position of UMD as Maryland's flagship institution. Without minimizing the important role played by the University System of Maryland and the Maryland Higher Education Commission, we believe that there is room for greater autonomy for UMD. More autonomy would lead to greater ability to initiate change at the campus level and to employ management systems and decision-making that would be more effective, efficient, and responsive.

III. Compliance with Accreditation Standards

Standard I: Mission and Goals

The institution's mission defines its purpose within the context of higher education, the students it serves, and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals are clearly linked to its mission and specify how the institution fulfills its mission.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

UMD has a broad and robust mission statement that is in alignment with and support of its Strategic Plan. The Team recognizes that the University leadership appears to have clearly understood and provided direction for the 21st century Land Grant university mission.

The assessment processes designed to review the mission statement are collaborative, including the University Senate, and are conducted in an appropriate time interval of every four years.

The Strategic Plan and its 2016 Update guide the development of goals and inform planning, and guide decisions. The goals are generally realistic and many are being implemented successfully. After the initial assessment of the Strategic Plan, a number of key strategic goals were strengthened. However, current financial strains make it more difficult to achieve all of the espoused goals.

Programs have evolved with an institutionally appropriate focus and new initiatives have been designed to meet UMD's mission; examples include the "MPowering the State" initiative and UMD's successful planning, implementation and accreditation of the new School of Public Health, which will help to address unmet needs in this critically important area.

The UMD Extension Program's strategic plan is a forward-looking document that both incorporates and builds on the institution's planning, thus honoring the Land Grant status of the institution.

UMD has successfully moved its athletic and associated academic affiliation to the Big Ten Conference and its Academic Alliance partnership. There are expectations of significant benefits to accrue to UMD as a result of this affiliation, especially in the academic realm. The affiliation has provided UMD with a new set of benchmarks to compare itself to a group of outstanding peer public institutions.

STANDARD I

In the team's judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Review Team commends the University of Maryland for its forward-looking commitment to a bold paradigm for a comprehensive research university that is committed to employing its resources and talents to solving a wide range of social, economic, health, and global problems, and the ways in which it has strongly embraced its Land Grant mission.

- The Team commends UMD for the successful development of the “MPowering the State” initiative in collaboration with the University of Maryland, Baltimore. This partnership has yielded scientific, licensing and new educational initiatives while leveraging institutional and state resources.
- **Suggestions:**
 - UMD’s ability to continue to meet its mission depends on its ability to fund its programs and personnel. The Team concurs with the concerns raised in the Self-Study regarding the institution’s ability to thrive in an unpredictable funding environment. We suggest that new mechanisms be identified to assist with resource allocation and financial planning.
- **Recommendations: None**
- **Requirements: None**

REQUIREMENT OF AFFILIATION 7

In the team’s judgment, the institution appears to meet Requirement of Affiliation 7.

Standard II: Ethics and Integrity

Ethics and integrity are central, indispensable, and defining hallmarks of effective higher education institutions. In all activities, whether internal or external, an institution must be faithful to its mission, honor its contracts and commitments, adhere to its policies, and represent itself truthfully.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

The University used the opportunity provided by the Self-Study to reflect on the degree to which its policies, procedures, and practices reflected the ethics and integrity required of all institutions of higher education and by its unique core mission with regard to its relationships with faculty, students, staff, and the citizens of Maryland. The University identified several areas that warranted focused corrective action and formulated for itself several recommendations, some of which were further developed by the Review Team. Areas of concern include the review and dissemination of policies and procedures, the effort to hire and retain underrepresented minority faculty, and the institutionalization of the role of professional track faculty and permanent status librarians.

A large number of representatives from the administration, faculty, and staff took part in the self-study process. They used it as an opportunity to critically assess the University in light of the standards and criteria for accreditation. They created a document that included numerous recommendations that the team endorses that what will serve as a strategic plan for action. For this, the team applauds the University.

The University has succeeded in maintaining a learning environment for the students and a working environment for the faculty and staff that is characterized by equity, diversity, and inclusion. A climate that respects academic freedom, intellectual freedom, and freedom of expression is maintained by an emphasis on communication and consultation that is reaffirmed in the face of challenges through the strong and direct leadership of President Loh and Provost Rankin. Shared governance is institutionalized through the University Senate.

The hiring and retention of underrepresented minority faculty has posed a challenge for the University. The institution's past history with racial segregation and the state's increasingly diverse population, which is beginning to be reflected in its student body, has generated a renewed effort to increase minority tenure track faculty. See "Transforming Maryland: Expectations of Excellence in Diversity and Inclusion." Statistics about faculty diversity are dispersed in several places on the University's website which makes it difficult to determine levels of integration, but there are schools where minority inclusion is nonexistent or at token levels. Responsibility and oversight for minority faculty hiring is shared by a panoply of positions, offices, and committees that variously report to the President, Provost, and University Senate and seem to share oversight and responsibility for a handful of initiatives aimed at recruiting senior faculty, entry-level faculty, and post-doctoral fellows through enhanced funds or unbiased search procedures.

The University has made tremendous strides with regard to developing written policies for the appointment, promotion, and permanent status of faculty who are on the professional instructional and research track. A general policy for the University has been adopted and colleges/schools are formulating policies tailored to their unique circumstances. The policies will be vetted by the University Senate as part of the adoption process. The process of institutionalizing the professional track includes according the professional track faculty a larger role in governance and in personnel decisions. The administration recognizes that funding is the biggest hurdle to full integration of these non-tenure track faculty.

Grievance policies and mechanisms for asserting and seeking redress of complaints exist for faculty, students, and staff although the regulatory environment is such that the procedures, particularly as they relate to students, may be subject to revision.

The University recognizes that it must regularly review its policies and procedures and modernize its methods for updating their communication in order for the University to maintain its integrity and ethical principles with regard to its internal communications. The Review Team itself found the web presence hard to navigate and important links inoperable. The University is in the midst of updating its website for student users.

STANDARD II

In the team's judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Team commends the University for its commitment to the creation and implementation of fair and impartial practices for the hiring, evaluation, and promotion of professional track faculty. Its effort is exemplary.
- **Suggestions: None**
- **Recommendations:**
 - Create a process for the timely review of all policies and procedures and for the timely and effective electronic dissemination of policies and procedures that are user-friendly and provide practical guidance, particularly for students.
 - Develop an action plan for the recruitment and retention of underrepresented minority faculty that delineates clear lines of responsibility for results and is supported at the highest levels of the administration.
 - Continue to integrate and clarify the roles of tenure track and professional track faculty and librarians and develop strategies to redress salary compression.
- **Requirements: None**

Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience

An institution provides students with learning experiences that are characterized by rigor and coherence of all program, certificate, and degree levels, regardless of instructional modality. All learning experiences, regardless of modality, program pace/schedule, and setting are consistent with higher education expectations.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

The University of Maryland (UMD) offers a wide variety of academic programs across a range of disciplines, leading to baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees as well as post-baccalaureate and post-master's certificates. Proposals for new academic degree/award programs, renaming of programs, curricular changes and requests to introduce new modes of

course delivery are all subject to careful review and evaluation at various levels (i.e., department, college, Graduate School—if relevant, University Senate, and in certain circumstances the Board of Regents, and the Maryland Higher Education Commission) with the goal of ensuring the educational integrity of the program and curriculum. Other committees also provide review and recommendations as part of this process contributing to a culture of careful evaluation and assessment.

The majority (i.e., 73%) of the UMD instructional faculty are full-time employees either in tenured or tenure-track positions or in long-term instructional appointments with 92% of the full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members possessing the terminal degree in their discipline. Students are provided with the opportunity to complete course evaluations online for all courses at the completion of an academic session. The data that are generated through these evaluations are provided to instructors, chairpersons and deans and are utilized in promotion decisions. Promotion policies for tenured and tenure-track faculty members also include a teaching portfolio including examples of instructional plans, course evaluations, and peer (i.e., faculty) evaluation of teaching. The inclusion of a teaching portfolio in promotion decision demonstrates the institution's commitment to effective teaching and assessment of student learning, and has increased faculty interest in developing teaching skills through activities within the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center. Tenured faculty members are reviewed periodically (no less than every five years) to facilitate continued professional development including in areas associated with teaching.

Sufficient resources are provided for instructional faculty members' professional growth through various offices including the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center and the Division of Information Technology's Academic Technology group. The Teaching and Learning Transformation Center offers a comprehensive range of faculty development opportunities which are designed to encourage evidence-based practices in instruction. The Center will be moving to the new Edward St. John Learning and Teaching Center, which includes several new classrooms with innovative designs which are flexible and enhanced by technology, to enable instructional faculty to embrace active learning strategies.

The University reports significant improvements in communicating degree and program requirements with the four-year plan website as an example. They do, however, recognize that challenges remain due to the use of various academic databases that are not yet integrated across the campus. The planned introduction of campus-wide customer relationship management software is designed to enhance academic advisors' potential to assist their students. The Team endorses the Self-Study recommendation to provide more standardized information on student utilized websites that is both easily assessable and utilized.

The Provost and the Office of Undergraduate Studies have modified several procedures associated with academic planning in the last 10 years to enhance student retention and their timely graduation. These changes have had a favorable impact; however, it is noted in the Self-Study that better integration and communication of student support services is an area in need of attention.

In 2012, the University launched an initiative to transform General Education, with all components guided by defined learning outcomes. The learning outcomes for each category of the new program were developed by faculty boards considering both field specific outcomes and expectations regarding skills and knowledge that students in all majors should acquire. This transformation included the integration of learning outcomes into the over 1,000 approved General Education courses, including the innovative I-series courses aimed at supporting synthesis of knowledge and critical analysis across disciplines. It is noteworthy that learning outcome assessment rubrics have recently been developed for each category providing the basis for formal assessment across the entire program. Although the graduate learning outcomes assessment process is less developed than the program for undergraduate courses of study, attention has been focused on improvement in this area.

The University has seen significant growth in online and blended programs over the past decade. This growth is primarily driven by opportunities to expand the reach of the University to educate students in a global marketplace, and to meet the needs of local working professionals. Online learning is also being used for educational innovation of in-person classes, through blended and flipped classroom approaches. Online graduate degree and certificate programs have been developed in the Smith School of Business, the Clark School of Engineering, and by a variety of individual departments, often with administrative support from the Office of Extended Studies.

At this time, there is no University strategic plan for online learning, which leads to decentralized leadership, resources, and support. Support for online learning is available for all University programs through the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center providing pedagogical guidance and faculty development, and the Division of Information Technology providing instructional design and technical support for online and blended courses. There is informal collaboration between these units, but this organizational structure may undermine a common approach to online learning driven by best practices in teaching. All online courses are developed and approved through the same processes in place for in-person classes. Quality of online instruction is guided by a set of best practices and a rubric, but there is no uniform system of accountability across the university to ensure all faculty and programs are adhering to these principles. The approval process for newly developed or revised online courses is the same as the process for in-person courses, which ensures that there are equivalent learning outcomes and rigor across modalities.

The online Master of Business Administration program is the only UMD degree program that utilizes a third party provider (NCS Pearson, Inc.). UMD reviews all course materials before they are delivered and hires the instructors of record for each course. The University's Programs, Curriculum and Course Review process requires identification of third parties at the time of program approval, providing a level of assurance of the evaluation of new programs; however, it is noted in the Self-Study that "the policy of review of such third party-supported programs after approval requires clarification."

The Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment provides leadership and organizational procedures for the assessment of undergraduate and graduate programs primarily through two committees (i.e. a committee dedicated to each level). The Provost's Committee on

Living-Learning and Special Programs annually reviews all living-learning and special undergraduate programs. Departments, institutes, and centers are reviewed approximately every seven years according to policies established by the University System of Maryland. The work of various committees and related activities provide evidence of the UMD's strong commitment to the assessment of all programs offered.

The off-site delivery of the Robert H. Smith School of Business' part-time MBA is a creative and innovative approach to serving students who might not otherwise be able to pursue an advanced degree. Such an approach, combined with the Smith School's placement programs, will be useful benchmarks for other institutions.

The review of UMD's study abroad program in Florence, Italy, indicates that this is a very strong program that relies on a highly qualified core faculty of the International Studies Institute, supplemented by UMD faculty and those of other prestigious peer universities who are part of the ISI consortium. The curricular options revolve around a focused array of courses that take advantage of the Florence setting, e.g., art, architecture, Italian history and language, etc., as well as numerous general education offerings. Good quality housing, excellent teaching and laboratory facilities, and a wide array of student support services are provided, along with numerous opportunities for students to engage with local communities and organizations for internship and volunteer experiences.

The review of UMD's collaborative master's degree in Criminology and Criminal Justice (CCJ) with Nanjing Normal University's law school faculty indicates a high-quality and sustainable program. The first semester is taught by a well-qualified NNU law faculty and the second semester is taught by UMD faculty either onsite in Nanjing, via Skype, or some combination thereof. The final six months are taught at College Park. Nearly 250 students have graduated since the program's inception in 2003. The program has clearly defined mission and goals, excellent facilities, and suitable student support services in both Nanjing and College Park. The CCJ could serve as a model of collaborative graduate programming with an international partner university.

STANDARD III

In the Review Team's judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Team commends the University for significant progress made in improving the quality of undergraduate instruction, including the development of a cohesive plan for the continuous improvement in the quality of instruction as exemplified by the Transforming General Education initiative.
 - The Team commends UMD for its active participation in the Universities at Shady Grove, an innovative approach to utilizing Maryland's educational resources. The

courses and their delivery at Shady Grove are effectively serving an enrollment of almost 4,000 students.

- **Suggestions:**

- Measures to improve the graduate learning outcomes assessment process should continue to be strengthened through ongoing review.
- It is noteworthy that the University has committed to increasing both the 4-year and 6-year graduation rates. While improvement has been achieved when considering the entire undergraduate student population, the University acknowledges that students from historically underrepresented groups continue to graduate at lower rates than other students. Therefore the University is encouraged to continue to regard closing this graduation gap as a high priority and provide the planning efforts and resources needed to achieve this goal.
- Based on the interest of Shady Grove students who hope to pursue graduate study in health-related professions, the University may wish to consider group video conferencing with the health professions advisor in College Park, or other additional mechanisms to help student prepare their medical/dental and health-related applications.

- **Recommendations:**

- The team recommends that the University develop a strategic plan for online learning, with consideration to the organizational structure, infrastructure, resources, supports, and policies consistent with the University's mission.

- **Requirements: None**

REQUIREMENTS OF AFFILIATION 8, 9, 10, and 15

In the Team's judgment, the institution appears to meet Requirements of Affiliation 8, 9, 10 and 15.

Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience

Across all educational experiences, settings, levels, and instructional modalities, the institution recruits and admits students whose interests, abilities, experiences, and goals are congruent with its mission and educational offerings. The institution commits to student retention, persistence, completion, and success through a coherent and effective support system sustained by qualified professionals, which enhances the quality of the learning environment, contributes to the educational experience, and fosters student success.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

Overall, UMD recruits and admits students who have the capabilities to succeed at a flagship campus. UMD has a wide range of programs to foster student retention and completion to degree, providing a wide range of enrichment opportunities through student research, study abroad, community service, and other forms of experiential learning.

The clarity of information provided on websites and the development of programs for Pre-Transfer advising, the Pre-College Program and the Student Success Office are designed appropriately for UMD's mission and goals. Similarly, the Summer Transitional Program and Academic Achievement Programs provide critically important information and support to facilitate student persistence to the degree. The University has comprehensive information for prospective and current students, their families, and various stakeholders.

The new student orientation programs are organized and implemented in a fashion to help facilitate students' adjustment to UMD. In addition to UNIV 100, a new student course, the websites are helpful in providing information to students and their families. Clearly, these endeavors combined with the programs and services provided by multiple offices, are helping to support students' persistence to the degree.

The staffing model, supported by professional development opportunities, is well-designed; those who provide direct support to students have the appropriate credentials and backgrounds for their positions. The staff with whom we met are clearly dedicated to their work and we congratulate them on their work with students.

The various academic policies that oversee admissions and matriculation are well-reasoned and developed in an ethical fashion to provide fairness and flexibility for students.

The student fee proposal systems for the support of selected Student Affairs operations work effectively with the continuing input of student government organizations.

The review of student affairs units meets best practice expectations across the profession. Student learning goals are considered, student satisfaction with services is studied, and practices are changed as a result of these assessments.

The annual Graduation Survey has an extraordinary 92% response rate and helps inform institutional decision-making regarding students' job attainment.

STANDARD IV

In the Team's judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Review Team commends the University for its well-planned programmatic efforts to support the student experience, including the extensive living learning program.
 - The Team commends the Division of Student Affairs and student services offices for the effective development and implementation of programs that serve students from enrollment to graduation and their focus on assessing their efforts.
- **Suggestions:**
 - The Team concurs with the self-identified suggestion that “a thorough review of financial information, policies and procedures for students who are undocumented or with disabilities should be undertaken in order to inform these two populations.”
- **Recommendations:**
 - As the University standardizes its data governance practices at the steward, manager, and user level, it should give due regard to legal regulations, ethical considerations, and the need to balance the strategic and operational goals of the University with the interests of those whose data is being aggregated.
- **Requirements: None**

Standard V: Educational Effectiveness Assessment

Assessment of student learning and achievement demonstrates that the institution’s students have accomplished educational goals consistent with their programs of study, degree level, the institution’s mission, and appropriate expectations for institutions of higher education.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the Self-Study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

The University of Maryland has clearly stated goals at the institution and degree/program levels that are interrelated, with relevant educational experiences, and with the institution’s mission. Learning outcomes are developed and shared for all programs and courses in the undergraduate program. The General Education program was developed in 2012, with learning objectives developed by a representative committee of faculty, as well as senior staff from the Office of Undergraduate Studies. Learning programs across campus also have well developed

student learning outcomes, which align with General Education, program, and institutional goals. Learning outcomes are less well developed in some undergraduate and graduate programs. This is recognized in the Self-Study.

The University has processes for organized and systematic assessments of student achievement conducted by faculty, and a thorough process for developing student learning outcomes for new or revised courses or programs. These processes are led by the Associate Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the Interim Dean of the Graduate School, and faculty representing each school and college, which together make up the Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment. Each school and college submits assessment reports on an annual basis. The General Education program has a well-developed system using rubrics to directly measure student learning outcomes, and there are some programs relying on exams aligned to learning objectives. However, some other programs rely solely on indirect measures of student learning outcomes, such as grades or course evaluations. The need to expand the use of direct measures of student learning outcomes across all programs is recognized in the Self-Study.

Assessment processes have informed innovations in teaching and program design, most notably in undergraduate programs. Assessment data informed the development of the new General Education program, and course and curriculum changes in professional programs. Although there is a system for reporting and analyzing assessment data, the processes for systematically using data to inform program improvements is inconsistent across the University.

Assessment processes are themselves evaluated on an annual basis within the Provost's Commission on Student Learning Outcomes. The evaluation of undergraduate assessment processes is guided by a rubric, which has informed improvements in assessment at the program and course level. However, assessment of graduate programs and courses is less well developed.

STANDARD V

In the Team's judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Team commends UMD for the effective collection, analysis, and use of assessment data to inform and continually improve the General Education program. Student learning outcomes assessment within this program is exemplary, and we applaud how the University is leveraging this success to improve assessment processes across other components of the undergraduate program and to inform innovations and teaching.
 - The Team commends UMD for achieving high faculty participation in the assessment of student learning efforts.
- **Suggestions:**

- The University should facilitate discussion of assessment results and widely publicize best practices, thereby creating a motivational and practical tool for faculty.
- **Recommendations: None**
- **Requirements: None**

Standard VI: Planning, Resources, and Institutional Improvement

The institution’s planning processes, resources, and structures are aligned with each other and are sufficient to fulfill its mission and goals, to continuously assess and improve its programs and services, and to respond effectively to opportunities and challenges.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the Self-Study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

The University of Maryland developed a Strategic Plan in 2008 which was designed to serve as its roadmap and guide for resource allocation. A few of the initiatives identified in the Strategic Plan, such as downsizing of graduate programs, were undertaken successfully. However, the subsequent economic downturn effectively derailed both the Plan and the tracking of implementation and assessments.

Beginning in 2013, the President and Provost initiated a new round of strategic assessment, culminating in the formation of the Flagship 2020 Commission and the 2016 Strategic Plan Update. These initiatives, some of which are still underway, are now the basis for assessments, planning, and resource allocation in support of Maryland’s strategic plans and objectives. These assessments include the Facilities Master Plan and the Flagship 2020 Commission, coupled with the external consultant’s review of best practices to enhance revenues, identify efficiencies, and review allocation strategies.

Clearly UMD is experiencing challenges in providing the financial resources necessary to adequately fund its academic and related infrastructure obligations as a premier institution of higher education. Increasing costs and decreasing state support have required reallocation of resources and elimination or merging of academic programs in past years and recent reduction of athletic opportunities for students. To its credit, UMD appears to be able to rely on its Strategic Plan to identify its priorities and a credible planning process to address the issues. To its further credit, program quality seems to be the driving criterion rather than “across the board” reductions to achieve clearly difficult goals. Nevertheless, it may not be possible in the long run to continue to “squeeze” the existing resources to achieve future goals and invest in new initiatives. Furthermore, the suspension of the detailed tracking of progress cited in the Self-Study points to a worrisome result of these pressures. The University is striving to fund staff and faculty

positions, and critically needed improvements to information technology and facilities. These ongoing efforts to create and find new revenue sources for UMD are commendable. However, the “invisible crisis” in infrastructure renewal requirements may overwhelm the quest.

The University has evaluated the condition of its buildings and infrastructure in its Facilities Master Plan. Estimated deferred maintenance has increased by 20% over the past ten years from \$750 million to over \$900 million, indicating that insufficient resources are being applied to maintaining the condition of its fixed assets. The annual budget for deferred maintenance is \$18 million, far short of that required to support the needs of the institution. As a result, critical projects are dependent upon project-specific approvals.

Information technology is a critical tool in the functioning of an institution of higher education. The University has identified needs with regard to an integrated customer management system, data governance systems and practices, enterprise systems, data and information security, network and Wi-Fi operations, and telephony; the total cost of which is projected at approximately \$150 million. However, at this time the University has not yet prioritized these needs nor identified possible sources of funding beyond that able to be sourced out of the existing information technology department budget.

The University’s leadership remains committed to improving its resource allocation processes and implementing most of the opportunities for improvement identified by the Flagship 2020 Commission in order to put in place a long-term structural solution to these financial pressures. This effort is now being led by the Administrative Modernization Program (AMP). AMP is staffed by a highly competent team of academic and administrative leaders. The working group is currently undertaking over a dozen specific projects with the goal of improving the quality of administration processes, expanding or finding new sources of revenues, maximizing the efficiency of University processes and assets, and improving the use of data and the quality of decision-making, including the development of a new budget and resource allocation model to help support the strategic decisions of the University. The AMP working group’s approach includes careful planning, data gathering, process analysis, collaboration and facilitation with stakeholders, project monitoring and oversight, and outcomes measurement—all critical elements of high quality change management efforts.

STANDARD VI

In the Team’s judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Team commends the Administrative Modernization Program initiative and believes that this effort deserves the full support and engagement by the University community.
- **Suggestions: None**

- **Recommendations:**

- The Team recommends that the University develop a long-term funding plan for deferred maintenance.
- The Team recommends that the University develop a long-term information technology strategy that prioritizes and sequences projects, provides a long-term stable funding source for these projects, and provides the basis for ongoing system and hardware replacement and upgrade.
- The needs identified in the first two recommendations under this standard are indicative of an underlying issue which has been forthrightly identified in the institution's Self Study. The Team recommends UMD restructure its budget model in order to improve the quality of budgetary decision making and to facilitate the allocation of resources to the institution's highest priorities.

- **Requirements: None**

REQUIREMENT OF AFFILIATION 11

In the team's judgment, the institution appears to meet Requirement of Affiliation 11.

Standard VII: Governance, Leadership, and Administration

The institution is governed and administered in a manner that allows it to realize its stated mission and goals in a way that effectively benefits the institution, its students, and the other constituents it serves. Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, religious, educational system, or other unaccredited organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose, and it operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.

Summary of Evidence and Findings

Based on a review of the self-study, other institutional documents, and interviews with faculty, staff, students, and others, the Review Team developed the following conclusions relative to this standard:

The University of Maryland is distinguished by a vital University Senate comprising elected representatives from faculty (tenure-track as well as professional-track), students and nonacademic staff. A primary function of the Senate is to steward the institution's official policies, subject to presidential approval. In this capacity, the Senate and its committees are actively engaged in some of the core administrative processes of the University.

Evaluation of the governance and leadership occurs partly through performance review processes. With respect to the president, for example, the annual performance review with the system Chancellor is supplemented by an in-depth review with the Board of Regents every five years. In the most recent such review, President Loh shared his 28-page reflections document publicly—a laudable gesture towards transparency.

A broader examination of existing administrative processes and structures has developed over the last few years (such as through the work of an external consultant), and is continuing to unfold through the Administration Modernization Program. In addition, the Senate is actively engaged in a review of campus-wide policies with an eye to improving communication efforts around policies, the currency of policy documentation, and the consistency of policy application across campus. These systematic, large-scale evaluation efforts are essential elements of continuous institutional improvement.

The University of Maryland is subject to a number of external pressures, as are most institutions of higher education. These pressures include universal issues such as the cost of higher education and affordability, assessing and assuring student success in the workplace, flexibility to respond to the changing demands of students and other stakeholders, and prudently managing expenses. UMD faces the additional pressure of managing finances in the face of a relative decline in funding from state government—as do most other public universities.

The structure of the State of Maryland’s higher education system creates its own issues. As a flagship campus in a state university system, the University of Maryland operates under layers of oversight, including the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC), the University System of Maryland (USM), and the University System of Maryland Board of Regents. The Board of Regents appoints the President of UMD, and regularly evaluates his performance. The USM Chancellor and his staff serve as staff to the Board of Regents. Although the lines of responsibility and accountability are clear, it is notable that the University of Maryland’s President does not report to a Board solely responsible for overseeing the University; in fact, the Board of Regents that oversees UMD also has the responsibility for overseeing the eleven other institutions and the regional centers that comprise the University System of Maryland. This structure inherently requires that the Board of Regents balance the specific needs, activities and plans of the University of Maryland—despite UMD’s role as the flagship—against the interests and imperatives of the other institutions.

These factors--both the external pressures and the structural framework--have resulted at times in the University becoming subject to actions and mandates that constrain UMD from achieving its goals and flagship mission in the most effective and efficient manner. Among these actions and mandates are mid-year cuts in state appropriations requiring unanticipated program and personnel adjustments; limited capital budget funding, particularly for deferred maintenance; state involvement in compensation and benefit structures; and, overall reductions in state operating funds.

The Review Team believes that the University’s President should be granted greater autonomy over the management of the institution’s fiscal and academic affairs. The President’s powers should be consistent with that of a chief executive officer, delegated authority and responsibility for the administration and management of the University, and responsible for

meeting the mission, goals, and needs of the University, subject to the policy direction and oversight of the Board of Regents and the laws of the State of Maryland.

STANDARD VII

In the Team’s judgment, the institution appears to meet this standard.

- **Significant Accomplishments, Significant Progress, or Exemplary/Innovative Practices:**
 - The Team commends UMD for its shared governance practices. The University Senate at Maryland is distinctive among its peers in several respects, including the broad representation of campus constituencies, the clarity of its role vis-à-vis the organizational decision-making processes, and the collegial working relationship that it maintains with the President and other university leaders.
- **Suggestions: None**
- **Recommendations: None**
- **Requirements: None**

REQUIREMENTS OF AFFILIATION 12 and 13

In the Team’s judgment, the institution appears to meet Requirements of Affiliation 12 and 13.

Section D: Verification of Compliance

I. Affirmation of Continued Compliance with Requirements of Affiliation

Based on a review of the self-study and accompanying materials, interviews, and the Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations, the Team **affirms** that the institution continues to meet all of the *Requirements of Affiliation*.

II. Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations

The Team **affirms** that the institution meets all accreditation-relevant federal regulations, which is based upon the review of the self-study report, accompanying materials, and the Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations and the evaluation visit.

Section E: Verification of Data and Student Achievement

I. Verification of Data and Self-Study Information

The Team *confirms* that data and other information provided by the institution are reasonably valid and conform to higher education expectations.

II. Student Achievement

After interviewing institutional stakeholders, the Team **confirms** that the institution's approach to its student achievement goals is effective, consonant with higher education expectations, and consistent with the institution's mission.

Section F: Third-Party Comments (if applicable)

Not Applicable

Section G: Conclusion

The MSCHE Review Team wishes to extend its appreciation to all members of the faculty, staff, and students of the University of Maryland, College Park, for their diligence in preparing for all aspects of the visit including the facilities and assistance that were made available to team members while at the University. The Self-Study was an excellent document from which the Team could undertake its review, and we appreciated the self-reflection and the opportunity UMD took to analyze and think about potential future steps that might be taken to achieve the University's goals.

We hope that the institution will be open to the ideas contained in this report, all of which are being offered in the spirit of collegiality and peer review.

As a reminder, the next steps in the evaluation process are as follows:

1. The institution replies to the Team Report in a formal written Institutional Response addressed to the Commission.
2. The Team Chair submits a Confidential Brief to the Commission, summarizing the Team Report and conveying the Team's proposal for accreditation action.
3. The Commission's Committee on Evaluation Reports carefully reviews the institutional Self-Study document, the Evaluation Team Report, the institution's formal response, and the Chair's Confidential Brief to formulate a proposed action to the Commission.
4. The full Commission, after considering information gained in the preceding steps, takes formal accreditation action and notifies the institution.

