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I. Executive Summary

This Periodic Review Report follows the format recommended in the twelfth edition of the Commission’s Handbook. This Executive Summary includes an overview of the institution, including some basic facts about academic programs, faculty, students, and staff. We discuss our approach to preparing the report, major institutional changes since the 2007 Self Study, and highlights from the report. We begin this Executive Summary with a description of the University as captured in its mission statement and in its most recent Strategic Plan, developed just after completion of the 2007 Self Study.

I.A. Overview of the Institution

The University’s institutional identity is well described in its mission statement, as “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, an 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 mission statement, approved by the Maryland Higher Education Commission in January 2012, can be found in Appendix A and online at http://www.provost.umd.edu/Documents/UMCP-Mission-Statement-Final-2011.pdf.

The University’s mission, goals and objectives are expressed most clearly in its newest Strategic Plan. Its development began while the University was completing its Self Study, with the appointment of a Strategic Plan Steering Committee in Fall 2007. The University’s culture of shared governance, open campus-wide discussions, and review of drafts all contributed to building consensus and a commitment that ultimately allowed the campus to embrace it in an overwhelmingly positive vote by the University Senate in May 2008. The end result, Transforming Maryland: Higher Expectations, is included as Appendix B and can be found online at http://www.sp07.umd.edu/StrategicPlanFinal.pdf. It has set the University on a new course to increase its rank among world-class, preeminent institutions of higher education. Four institutional priorities are the essential elements of the Strategic Plan:

- Undergraduate Education: Offer an outstanding educational experience, attracting a high achieving and diverse student body which completes its studies on a timely basis;
- Graduate Education: Provide the highest quality graduate and professional education, training students for leadership in their fields;
- Research, Scholarship, and the Creative and Performing Arts: Advance faculty research, scholarship, and other creative works to the highest levels in their respective disciplines;
- Partnerships, Outreach, and Engagement: Expand engagement of students, faculty and staff in activities addressing important issues in the community, state, and worldwide.
The Strategic Plan also rests on the University providing critical enablers: an outstanding faculty and staff, an infrastructure that supports learning and working at the highest level, an innovative and consultative process for allocating vital resources, and a vigorous external relations program to effectively promote dialogue between the University and its stakeholders. The Plan includes a 2% reallocation of the University’s state support operating funds each year, to promote new initiatives that advance goals of the Strategic Plan.

An annual assessment of progress towards its implementation is maintained on the Provost’s Web site (http://www.provost.umd.edu/implement.cfm). Because this new Strategic Plan is now the most important guiding document for the University, numerous references to it and to progress on its implementation are made throughout this Periodic Review Report.

I.B. Organization and Personnel

The University offers 81 doctoral programs, 101 master’s programs, and 90 bachelor’s degree programs, along with a relatively small number of certificates at the undergraduate and graduate level. Programs are offered through 12 academic colleges or schools. There is one fewer college than in 2007: in 2011, the two colleges with natural science programs were merged into a College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, making it the largest unit on campus. The College of Health and Human Performance became an accredited School of Public Health in 2010, driving a substantial number of changes within its organization.

The academic colleges are home to 1500 tenured and tenure-track faculty, another 900 teaching faculty not on the tenure track. There are also more than 1500 faculty whose duties are predominantly in research and scholarship, largely supported by external funding. Approximately 5000 staff members support the university’s mission in various ways, about 300 of whom are part-time.

Sponsored research expenditures at the university have grown substantially in the last five years, from $325M in FY 2004 to over $450 M in FY 2011. Much of this growth is due a deliberate effort to target large grant opportunities and to create partnerships with federal organizations. More discussion of the growth in research activities can be found in Section II.B.1 and in Section III.C.3.

As of Fall 2011, the student body includes over 26,000 undergraduate students and over 11,000 graduate students, with about 6200 and 3300 new students each year, respectively. Typically, about 25% of undergraduates come from outside the state of Maryland, and about 2% are from outside the U.S. About 30% of new undergraduate students in a given year transfer in from other institutions, most commonly from Maryland community colleges. Graduate students are recruited both nationally and internationally, with about 25% coming from outside the U.S. About 22% of new graduate students enter into doctoral programs.

I.C: Governance and Administration

The University of Maryland, College Park (hereafter UMCP) is one of 11 degree-granting institutions, one research center, and two regional instructional centers within the University System of Maryland (USM, http://www.usmd.edu). The presidents of each USM institution report to the Chancellor of USM, who reports to a governing Board of Regents appointed by the Governor. The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC, http://www.mhec.state.md.us) overseas all higher education throughout the state, and is led by the Secretary of Higher Education who is appointed by and reports to the Governor. Essentially all major institutional planning is carried out in cooperation with USM and the state. For example, proposals for new academic programs are vetted first by the University Senate, then the Board of Regents and the Chancellor, and then MHEC, before they are open for admission.
The administrative core of UMCP includes the President and six vice presidents who preside over the institution. Within Academic Affairs, led by the Senior Vice President and Provost, the next level of administration includes deans of each of the 12 colleges, a Dean of the Libraries, a Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Dean of the Graduate School, with the two latter also given the title of Associate Provost. The campus has a strong tradition of shared governance, with a University Senate with representation from all sectors of campus. The Senate’s Executive Committee advises the President, and works closely with both the President and Provost on all matters of interest to the campus community. The University’s Plan of Organization is on the University Senate’s Web site, http://www.senate.umd.edu/governingdocs/Plan_of_Organization.pdf.

I.D: Major Institutional Changes

I.D.1: Administration

UMCP has undergone several changes in its key leadership positions since the decennial report of 2007. President Wallace D. Loh arrived as the institution’s 33rd President in 2011, replacing President C. D. Mote. Dr. Ann G. Wylie assumed the position of Senior Vice President and Provost in 2011, following Dr. Nariman Farvardin, who held the position from 2007 to 2011. Other changes include three new vice presidents, many new associate provosts and associate vice presidents, and seven new deans with two more searches in progress: an accounting of these recent changes is found in Appendix C. The Strategic Plan has been effectively used as a stable set of guiding principles for university-wide institutional planning and assessment throughout these changes in leadership.

I.D.2: Substantive Changes and New Program Offerings

Three Substantive Change Requests have been successfully completed since 2007, each for the listing of a new Additional Location:

1. (January 2011) the People’s Police Academy, Conhue, Tu Liem, Ha Noi, Vietnam, for delivery of a Master of Professional Studies in Justice Leadership;

2. (January 2011) the Regional Higher Education Center, 312 Marshall Avenue, Laurel, Maryland, for delivery of graduate-level instruction for the College of Education’s Masters Degree in Education with Teacher Certification for students wishing to become public school teachers;

3. (August 2011) the Valetta Campus of the University of Malta, along with a contractual agreement with the University of Malta to deliver a dual Masters program in Transcultural Counseling. Instruction in the program began in January 2012.

A large number of changes to the University’s program inventory have taken place over the last five years, including development of new programs, discontinuation of others, and numerous curriculum changes. A year-by-year inventory of academic program changes is maintained at http://www.provost.umd.edu/ProgDocs.

I.E: Highlights of the Report

In preparation for writing this Periodic Review Report, a Steering Committee was formed that included administrators from the major divisions, the vice chair of the University Senate, and two students. Four subcommittees gathered materials, with each led by an associate provost who was also a member the Steering Committee. Membership of the Steering Committee and the subcommittees is in Appendix D. Section II of the report constitutes the majority of the document, and is largely a response to the 26 recommendations developed by the Self Study team. The recommendations themselves are included in Appendix E, with a cross-reference to both the Self Study and the PRR. We also make reference to the
recommendations directly in the text of report where relevant. There were no formal recommendations from the external review team and the suggestions of the review team essentially reflected the recommendations within the Self Study. As a result, Section II is organized around the Self Study, focusing on the two broad topics used in that report: Topic A: Institutional Assessment, Planning, and Resource Allocation, and Topic B: Educational Offerings and Effectiveness. Section II.A follows Topic A and includes a discussion of how resource allocation and planning is carried out in the context of the Strategic Plan and under the budgetary conditions of the last five years. We highlight some of the decisions directly affecting academic programs as well as long term planning for the campus infrastructure: buildings, the network infrastructure and the libraries.

Section II.B, closely following Topic B of the Self Study, begins with an overview of the faculty, how they are assessed, and some of the institutional efforts to address issues of diversity, and of support and mentoring for the growing cadre of part-time instructional faculty and for research associates. Recent developments related to enhancing the undergraduate experience, such as the establishment of an Honors College and the start of new living-learning communities, participation in Education Abroad programs, and involvement in undergraduate research and internships are also noted. The University has created a new plan for General Education with delivery beginning in Fall 2012. This new program is built upon a foundation of learning outcomes. The details of the program itself are in the University’s official document, “Transforming General Education”, which is included as Appendix F. Section II.B.3 describes the process used to develop the General Education plan and how the assessment of learning outcomes in the University’s existing program, CORE, influenced its elements. Section II.B.4 covers issues associated with admissions and enrollment planning and management. Section II.B.5 describes the many initiatives undertaken to support graduate education, highlighted as a major institutional priority in the University’s Strategic Plan. This section concludes with an analysis of ongoing efforts to develop a solid institutional structure for learning outcomes assessment as the basis for improvements to our academic programs.

Section III contains a qualitative discussion of some of the key challenges and opportunities facing the University over the next five years. This section is focused on four major themes: enrollment planning and delivery of instruction within the context set by the University System of Maryland’s 2020 Strategic Plan, international engagement, planning around the physical environment of the campus, and the very recent development of a structured partnership with the University of Maryland, Baltimore to stimulate opportunities of interest to both campuses.

Section IV contains a very brief overview of enrollment and financial trends. Detailed enrollment projections are included as Appendix J. Audited financial statements are provided as companion documents.

Section V focuses on linkages throughout the university between institutional effectiveness and student learning, but most notably on our processes to assess student learning outcomes and use them to facilitate continuing improvements to our offerings in both undergraduate and graduate education. Four broad areas are discussed in which outcomes assessment is now embedded in processes associated with curriculum revision: program management and review, graduate outcomes assessment, curriculum management and general education.

Finally, Section VI highlights a few specific examples in which linked institutional planning and budgeting processes, most specifically the annual 2% budget reallocation process adopted after the development of the Strategic Plan, has enabled funds for directed initiatives. Much of the discussion of the reallocation process is in Section II, so Section VI highlights just a few specific initiatives, including funds provided to develop courses for the new General Education program, resources to support major
research initiatives, and special education offerings such as new living learning programs and the Blended Learning Initiative. It concludes with examples of how our comprehensive review of doctoral programs is feeding back to curriculum revision.
II: Responses to Recommendations from the 2007 Self Study

No formal recommendations resulted from the 2007 team visit to the University. In its evaluative report, the review team identified twenty-one suggestions, most of which were closely aligned with twenty-six internal recommendations that emerged from the 2007 Self Study. In this section we will focus on the internal recommendations.

While the evaluative report is organized around the MSCHE Standards, this section of the PRR follows the organization of the Self Study, in which a Special Topics model was used. Topic A, “Institutional Assessment, Planning, and Resource Allocation,” addressed Standards 2, 3, and 7. Topic B, “Educational Offerings and Effectiveness,” addressed Standards 11, 12, 13 and 14 as well as major portions of Standard 10. The remaining standards were evaluated by generalist reviewers prior to the site team’s visit to campus. Since the objective of the PRR is to assess institutional effectiveness, linked planning and budgeting processes, and to provide an overall analysis of assessment processes (including learning outcomes assessments), this section will focus on these areas, which are largely related to Standards 2, 3, 7, and 14. For efficiency, related recommendations will be grouped within the narrative below. A chart indicating each recommendation, its reference within the 2007 Self Study, along with brief summary responses, is included as Appendix E.


The University’s Strategic Plan, approved through shared governance processes in May 2008, now guides the planning and allocation of resources at all levels of the University. All major decisions are a reflection of the University’s mission and the goals identified within the Plan.

Initial planning for implementation took place throughout FY 2009, focusing on establishing realistic goals and strategies consistent with resources. In a two-day retreat in the summer of 2008, the President, vice presidents, and deans agreed on a timetable for implementation, first-year priorities and initiatives, and assignments to each division responsible for specific activities. This process is now repeated each year, with retreats led by the President assessing progress and making decisions on the continuation of ongoing initiatives and priorities for new activities. The college and schools developed five-year strategic plans with specific goals and objectives which were presented to the Provost and the Council of Deans and approved in Spring 2009.

A Strategic Plan Implementation Report is made at the end of each fiscal year providing a detailed summary of activities and accomplishments in all major components of the plan, and is made available to the campus on the Provost’s Web site (see http://www.provost.umd.edu/implement.cfm). Progress is reported on a wide range of topics, including student recruitment and retention, new educational programs, external research grants, outside partnerships, improvements in infrastructure, faculty hiring, and resource allocation. This strategy has allowed the campus as a whole to understand and participation in driving the future direction of the University.

Recommendations 1-6, which are all related to resource allocation, are addressed collectively in the narrative below.

II.A.1: Resource Allocation

Resource allocation across the major divisions of the University has a central role in supporting the agreed-upon priorities and activities needed for progress toward the goals of the Strategic Plan. The University has identified an extensive set of high priority activities in every division to undertake if resources were available. New resources become available from increases in General Funds and tuition
increases beyond those required to cover mandatory costs, enrollment increases, cost efficiency in existing programs, and revenues from selected teaching and research programs. In some instances existing resources are reallocated across divisions. If these sources are insufficient to meet essential activities, across-the-board reductions and subsequent reallocations are sometimes necessary.

Responsibility for resource allocation rests with the President. The Senior Vice President and Provost, in collaboration with the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and Chief Financial Officer, and in consultation with the other vice presidents, has a central role in proposing priorities and making recommendations on internal reallocation to the President. Proposals for additional resources are made by the vice presidents on an ongoing basis to the Finance Committee or the President’s Administrative Council for review. The Finance Committee makes resource allocation recommendations to the President in many areas, some of which may have implications across the University’s major divisions.

Examples of activities that have received new resources in the last five years include:

- Funds set aside for instruction in the new General Education program
- Creation and renovation of classrooms to support the new General Education program
- Creation of an Office of Sustainability
- Funds to University Relations to support the Great Expectations external fundraising campaign
- University of Maryland Ronald E. McNair Graduate Fellowships

II.A.2: Budget Overview, 2007-2011

Trends in the University’s budget over the period of 2007-2012 reflect the fluctuations in the national economy, which have in turn affected the state of Maryland’s overall budget and its support to the University, tuition policies, and overall enrollment levels. General Fund revenue (i.e., state support that is not from tuition) to the University was reduced by 11% in the two-year period FY 2009 and FY 2010. Additional budget reductions were mandated through faculty and staff furloughs. The number of furlough days increased with salary, with the maximum number of furlough days for the highest paid employees over the three year period of furloughs as follows: FY 2009 (5 days), and FY 2010 and FY 2011 (10 days in each year). General Fund revenues increased in FY 2011 and FY 2012, although they did not offset increases in mandatory costs. No furloughs were imposed in FY 2012, although since FY 2009 the state mandated that there be no salary merit or cost-of-living increases.

The Maryland state legislature introduced a tuition freeze for resident undergraduate students in FY 2007, lasting four years. Tuition revenue has nonetheless grown due to an increase in overall university enrollment in this four-year period.

However, when increases in the University’s costs are considered, state-supported revenues per student (in constant dollars) declined in the period FY 2007 - FY 2011. Expenses of higher education institutions (Higher Education Price Index of costs) have increased an average 2.7% annually since FY 2007. For the period FY 2007–FY 2011, General Funds per full time equivalent student (FTES) declined 8.6%, while tuition revenue per FTES increased 3.4%. Total state-supported funds (General Fund and tuition revenue), in constant dollars per FTES, declined 2.8%.

UMCP has strived to limit the growth in mandatory student fees. Proposals for fee increases originate with the vice presidents and, in some instances, with major student organizations. Proposed changes in fees are reviewed by the Student Fee Review Committee, chaired by the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and including significant representation of students. The Committee’s recommendations are submitted to the President, and proposed changes, along with the overall fee
structure, are reviewed by the President’s cabinet. Final decisions to recommend fee increases to the
USM Board of Regents rest with the President. In 2007, undergraduate students enthusiastically
proposed a sustainability fee, now $8/year, to support sustainability projects developed by students.

II.A.2.a: Resource Allocation within the context of Budget Reductions

The President, vice presidents, and the deans consistently reaffirm the University’s commitment to the
goals of the Strategic Plan and the strategic plans and current priorities of all divisions, which provides
the basis for making specific decisions in times of overall budget reduction. Reductions are distributed
across all divisions, with each vice president responsible for those within his or her own division, given
planned goals and priorities.

The same standard applies to colleges and schools within the Division of Academic Affairs. For example,
to identify reductions in FY 2010, each dean submitted a budget proposal for his or her unit, protecting
activities that were central to the University’s mission, minimizing the number of layoffs, and minimizing
reductions to graduate assistant support. All proposed reductions from the units were rank-ordered by
the severity of their adverse impacts, a process that helped both the deans and the Provost to carefully
assess consequences. The Provost sought the advice of his advisory group, the Academic Planning and
Advisory Committee (APAC) and discussed budget principles with the University Senate. The resulting
decisions were made publicly available on a Web site in December, 2009
(http://www.provost.umd.edu/fy10reductions.cfm).

II.A.2.b: Resource Allocation in the Division of Academic Affairs

The Strategic Plan established a formal process for reallocating 2% of the state-supported unrestricted
budget of each college or school each year, and this strategy has been followed since FY 2009. This
process has permitted the University to support new or enhanced academic initiatives despite the
funding reductions. Of the 2% retained to be allocated, half is held by the Provost, and half held by the
deans. Colleges and schools are asked to submit proposals to the Provost requesting funds from the
reallocation pool to support initiatives directly tied to an advertised set of priorities linked to the
Strategic Plan. To ensure comprehensive and fair review, the Provost seeks counsel from the Academic
Planning Advisory Committee (APAC). The Provost’s decisions are reflected in the following year’s
budget, and described in the year-end Strategic Plan Implementation Report (see

This process has focused the allocation of resources on the basis of specific teaching or research goals.
The annual 2% reallocation affects all academic programs. The requirement for colleges and schools to
make the difficult decisions to provide the necessary funds has resulted in an increased focus on how
reallocated funds will be spent. Reallocation has also enabled new educational initiatives -- examples
will be given below in the discussion of educational offerings.

For FY 2012, 1/4th of the pool (0.5% of budgets) was returned to the Provost to provide funding for
faculty retention and support for targeted, opportunistic, hires of diverse faculty and qualified spouses
of faculty candidates and recruitment. An additional 1/4th of the pool was used centrally to meet
mandatory cost increases University-wide. The remaining half of the pool was retained within the
college and school budgets for reallocation among departments.
II.A.3: Efficiencies and Revenue Generation [recommendations 3 and 4]

As highlighted in the text surrounding recommendations 3 and 4 of the Self Study, the University must continually assess the efficiency with which it uses its resources, as well as explore opportunities for additional sources of revenue. Examples of progress in this area are:

- Enrollment planning and a shift of admissions to the spring semester
- A campus-wide revenue sharing model for entrepreneurial academic programs
- Substantially increased research activities through partnerships with federal agencies.

The first two of these will be discussed further in Section II.B on Educational Offerings and Effectiveness.

In an effort to increase research productivity and revenues from external grants, the University has developed an extensive network of partnerships with federal agencies and the private sector that provide opportunities for research collaboration, support of graduate students, and internship opportunities. In the public sector, these include National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), NASA, the National Cancer Institute (NCI), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the Smithsonian Institution (SI). In 2010, the University signed an extensive cooperative agreement with the NASA’s Goddard Space Flight Center to promote joint space-based science, increased connections and visits between scientists in both organizations, seed grant programs, and student internships. In May 2010, a partnership with the National Cancer Institute (NCI) was established for academic and research exchanges related to technologies for cancer research. Our partnership with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) will further its mission of safeguarding the nation’s food and drug supply, testing and approving new biomedical devices and providing health-related information to consumers nationwide through the establishment of the Maryland Center of Excellence in Regulatory Science and Innovation (UM-CERSI). Ties have been expanded with the Smithsonian Institution, through joint support of new research projects and a joint competitive seed grant program. New private-sector partnerships include Lockheed Martin, SAIC, Google, Tenable, and MIT Lincoln Laboratory in Cybersecurity and with Canon Life Sciences in Bioengineering.

II.A.3.a: Support for Undergraduate Teaching: ACCESS Funding

The majority of the University’s instructional resources are within the base budgets of the academic units. The Provost retains some resources (a few percent of the college budgets), however, to meet critical short-term instructional needs. At the undergraduate level, ACCESS funding ensures that sufficient instruction is available to students so that they are not hindered in their progress towards degree completion. Each year, enrollment levels, the fraction of seats offered that are filled, and waitlists throughout the period when students are registering for classes, are carefully reviewed at all levels - colleges, departments, and individual courses, including General Education courses. The Provost then allocates the ACCESS funds to assure that academic programs offer sufficient numbers of seats to meet student demand. ACCESS funding has gradually increased in recent years, to approximately $3.7 million in FY 2012.

II.A.3.b: Designated Research Initiative Funding (DRIF)

Half of the revenues generated from annual indirect cost recoveries are used to support the base operations of the campus. The remaining half is budgeted as the Designated Research Initiative Fund (DRIF) and is allocated to the academic enterprise. A substantial portion of DRIF dollars is reallocated annually by formula to the colleges and departments that earned it, thereby creating at the unit level a strong incentive to grow campus sponsored research activity. This money is typically used as seed funding to improve the likelihood of success in future sponsored research endeavors and to fund new
faculty start-up requirements. The DRIF amount available for distribution continues to grow each year. In FY 2007, $27.2 million was distributed to the Provost, the Vice President for Research, deans and departments. In FY 2012 the distribution has reached $35.6 million, an almost 31% increase.

II.A.4: The Physical Infrastructure [recommendation 5]

No doubt one of the most important long term planning efforts is to have a physical infrastructure that can support the strategic goals of the University. As indicated in the Self Study, while there is an ongoing campaign of both new construction and renovation of older facilities, the University continues to have a backlog of deferred maintenance needs. The backlog is now estimated to be $750 million. Deferred maintenance contributes to energy consumption. It also limits our ability to meet the goals of the University’s Climate Action Plan, developed in 2009, which outlines a strategy to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions over the next decade, with goal of carbon neutrality by 2050.

The University has attempted to address its infrastructure backlog by including renovation and renewal projects in the capital budget, and by redirecting more internal operating funds to facilities renewal whenever possible to meet the Board of Regents policy to increase operating expenditures until 2% of replacement value ($38.9 million for state-supported buildings based on Fall 2009 data) is expended annually.

Working with the University System of Maryland, the University was successful in making a case to the state legislature to receive additional capital project funding to direct towards facilities renewal. The University received $10M in FY 2012 for this purpose, with a comparable amount in the FY 2013 budget. The governor’s five-year planning budget also has this funding to continue moving forward, an important success for the University.

Priority setting for physical infrastructure improvements takes place through two processes: capital budget requests, for projects of $5M or more, and allocation of Facilities Improvement funds for smaller projects (between $125,000 and $5M). Each process involves a call for proposals from individual units, divisions, or colleges and an oral presentation to the Facilities Advisory Committee, who then make recommendations to the University’s Facilities Council. The Facilities Council forwards a multi-year plan for major projects to the University System of Maryland for inclusion in the System Funded Construction and for the state’s Capital Improvement Program. For the small projects, the Facilities Council allocates approximately 75% of available funds for a prioritized list, holding the remainder in reserve for emergencies and unanticipated needs until the end of the fiscal year.

In 2009, the USM Board of Regents approved a $61M financing plan to upgrade and refresh the telecommunication infrastructure of the campus over five years. The campus network could no longer meet the modern demands of the community, with 70% of the network’s equipment categorized as obsolete, and 80% of campus buildings cabled with wiring that could not support modern network speeds. The outdated equipment did not support new services mandated by state auditors that required new equipment to enhance the security of the university’s network and critical applications. Included in the security aspects of the project are wired network authentication, firewall service for university departments, intrusion prevention, and, potentially, installation of equipment mandated by the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act. Implementation of the new infrastructure in 200 campus buildings is being carried out over a five-year plan, with 63 buildings completed and 18 more underway as of January 2012.

A key strategy to address energy conservation has been implementation of energy performance contracts and retrofits to existing buildings. Since the University’s Climate Action Plan was launched in 2009, the most impactful project has been a 15-year, $20 million Energy Performance Contract with
Johnson Controls, Inc. to provide energy conservation measures in nine buildings which represent typical academic, research, administrative, dining and mixed use facilities on campus. The conservation measures are designed to provide $1.7 million in guaranteed avoided energy costs and a 22% reduction in energy consumption for these buildings annually. Thirty-six academic buildings have also been retrofitted with energy-efficient lighting fixtures, resulting in an approximately 73% reduction in energy use and an estimated annual savings of $373,000. Additional savings is expected through the installation of occupancy sensors in general purpose classrooms.

Since 2007, the University has added 700 new beds in the traditional university student housing inventory and 368 apartment style beds in Capstone public/private partnership buildings. In Fall 2011, the University was able to offer beds to all first year and returning students who desired to live on campus for the first time. A strategic plan for university housing is now in the process of being developed, which includes participation by key stakeholders both on campus and in the neighboring community. The Off Campus Housing Office works with landlords and tenants to help provide resources for students, referrals and support. The Department of Transportation Services supports the private apartment developments through a variety of parking and shuttle service agreements which provide access to students living in the surrounding area.

II.A.4.a: Long Term Planning for the Physical Infrastructure

In February 2012, the USM Board of Regents approved an update of the University’s 2011-2030 Facilities Master Plan. It is included as Appendix G of this report and available at http://facstage.umd.edu/masterplan. The plan establishes a framework for the orderly growth and physical development of the campus over the next decade. At its core is the development and continued build out of eight districts that include academic and residential buildings surrounding open spaces and linked to the campus core by pedestrian corridors. The new plan includes increased attention to the university’s relationships with the College Park community. It also focuses on environmental stewardship and sustainability, landscape designs and land use, and vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Among the plan’s key features are a commitment to reducing greenhouse gas emissions as articulated in the Climate Action Plan, a transportation system that connects to the larger regional network of public transit, and a placement of buildings that promotes smart growth and collaboration among disciplines on campus.


The University Libraries completed its strategic plan in 2010, realigning its activities to meet new demands and the changes in how students and faculty locate and use information. The plan includes a new financial model that reflects resources from a $50 per semester per student fee and addresses a nine-year period of reductions in the Libraries’ collection budgets. More than 40 electronic databases were added to support a wide range of research and learning purchases, at an annual investment of more than $2 million. A new student-oriented facility, the Terrapin Learning Commons, fills the second floor of McKeldin Library with new technology, redesigned space, collaborative work areas, and new service models for providing assistance to students. The University Libraries has formed partnerships with like-minded academic libraries to expand access to information and to undertake initiatives to preserve the digital assets of the academy. In response to the dramatic changes affecting scholarly publishing, including the international Open Access movement, the University Senate and Provost created a joint Open Access Task Force in 2012. This group will consider the potential effects of open-access venues for faculty scholarly work, for textbooks, and other for educational materials on the Libraries and on University policies.
Recommendations 7 and 9 will be addressed in the following pages related to Topic B, “Educational Offerings and Effectiveness.” Recommendation 8 will be addressed in section 5 of this report as part of the discussion of learning outcomes assessment.

II.B: Topic B: Educational Offerings and Effectiveness

The University’s 2011 Mission Statement, the 2007 Self Study, and the 2008 Strategic Plan all emphasize the University’s role as a public, research-extensive institution and the flagship of the University System of Maryland. Topic B of the Self Study focuses on the five standards related to the University’s academic enterprise – the quality, breadth, accessibility, oversight and assessment of educational offerings, and the role of the faculty in meeting the University’s academic mission.

Topic B of the Self Study was organized around two institutional foci: Faculty and Educational Effectiveness and Educational Offerings and Effectiveness. Responses to the internal recommendations are organized accordingly.

II.B.1: Faculty [recommendations 9 – 12]

As noted in the Strategic Plan, “faculty are the single most important factor determining the reputation, impact and visibility of the University” (see Appendix B, the Strategic Plan, p. 14). The goals outlined in the Strategic Plan and the strategies to accomplish them reflect this sentiment. These include efforts to recruit and retain outstanding scholars and educators, continued efforts to promote a campus climate based on fairness, equity and diversity, and use of resource allocation processes to provide incentives for achievement in all aspects of the University’s mission.

II.B.1.a: The Teaching Faculty

The majority (72%) of the instructional faculty at the University are full-time employees, either in tenured or tenure-track (T/TT) positions or in long-term instructional appointments. Of the full-time T/TT faculty, 93% hold terminal degrees in their discipline. The vast majority of these individuals have a tenure home in one of the academic departments on campus, although shared appointments, either across departments, across colleges, or between an academic unit and a research institute, are not uncommon. Each academic unit is obliged to maintain an established set of criteria that conform to University policy for the evaluation of cases for appointments, promotion, and tenure. The APT process includes three levels of review: department, college and campus. No significant changes to this policy have been made since 2007, except in the adjustment of the composition of the campus-level review committee to reflect demographic changes in some of the colleges. The Office of Faculty Affairs publishes a manual with guidance on APT policy implementation. Recent efforts to revise and streamline this document have led to suggestions for improving the quality and transparency of the APT process. The Office of Faculty Affairs also runs annual workshops for new department chairs, new faculty, candidates for promotion, and Associate Deans on issues related to promotion and other relevant campus policies.

Table II.B.1 shows the distribution of instructional faculty by title over the last several years. While the number of T/TT faculty has not changed significantly since 2007, the number of lecturers has grown by approximately 18%. Of the current cohort of lecturers, roughly two-thirds are either full-time or are employed at greater than 50% FTE, and thus are eligible for health benefits from the University). The remaining instructional faculty members (approximately 350) are employed at less than 50% FTE and are typically hired to teach one or more courses per semester. These individuals bring a wide range of expertise, experience, and interests to the campus. They range from highly experienced professionals in
government and industry who teach an occasional course, to those with graduate degrees who are either seeking full-time employment in academia or who desire to teach on a part-time basis for personal reasons. In 2009, the University System of Maryland, at the direction of the Maryland General Assembly, convened a workgroup to develop a better understanding of this cohort of faculty across the University System of Maryland, and to improve their status as employees in the higher education sector of the state of Maryland. Recommendations from this workgroup ultimately led to a revised USM policy on the employment of adjunct faculty in October, 2010. The new revisions clarify baseline standards for appointments and contracts and employment conditions for this group of instructors, as well as providing for two levels of appointment, enabling enhanced status and compensation for experienced adjunct faculty with proven records of outstanding instruction. The University of Maryland, College Park, developed a local version of this policy through its Senate Faculty Affairs Committee; this was approved by the University Senate in March 2012. (see http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii107a.html). In December 2011, the division of Academic Affairs created a new position, Director of Faculty Initiatives, whose responsibilities will include tracking and providing a central point of contact for adjunct faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Faculty by Category</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Fall 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T/TK Assistant Professor</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/TK Associate Professor</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/TK Professor</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non T/TK Lect. &amp; Instr.</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>2392</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>2482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table II.B.1: Instructional Faculty by rank and category, FY 2006 through FY 2010*

Graduate teaching assistants play an integral role delivering undergraduate education. Approximately half of the 4,000 graduate assistants at UMCP are graduate teaching assistants. Following the Self Study, a robust Policies for Graduate Assistantships document was developed, including the first formal grievance procedures for graduate assistants; Guidelines for Parental Accommodation for Graduate Assistants have been instituted; and the Graduate School has partnered with the Center for Teaching Excellence to provide innovative new programs to help graduate assistants improve their effectiveness as classroom instructors and develop their own teaching portfolios (http://cte.umd.edu/programs/graduate1/index.html).

**II.B.1.b: Research Faculty and Scholarship [recommendation 10]**

Despite furloughs and the difficult budget climate, faculty research productivity has continued to grow over the past five years. Research expenditures across campus increased from $325M in FY 2004 to $453M in FY 2011. Faculty received a record $545M in research awards in FY 2010. While some of this growth is a result of awards through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), most of it is a direct result of a deliberate and targeted effort to develop a network of research partnerships with federal agencies and private organizations, as indicated in Section II. Examples of some of the most recent activities include the following:
1. The establishment of a brain imaging laboratory for cutting-edge, cross-disciplinary research in children's cognitive, social and psychological development and in children's and adults learning and processing of language, through a grant from the National Science Foundation;

2. A grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to develop automated irrigation systems that will help farmers reduce overwatering and retain their crops' valuable nutrients;

3. A contract extension of $22.7 million to the National Foreign Language Center for STARTALK. Part of the National Security Language Initiative, STARTALK is a multi-agency effort to expand foreign language education in seven languages deemed critical by the federal government: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Persian, Urdu and newly added Swahili and Turkish.

4. An award of $10.3 million in stimulus funds by the U.S. Commerce Department's National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) to build an advanced quantum science lab. The lab will be built as part of stage one of a new Physical Sciences Complex, currently under construction. An additional award of $15.5M from NIST to the University, also from stimulus funds, implemented a national NIST measurement science and engineering fellowship program. These two awards reflect the extremely close collaboration between the University and NIST that has developed in recent years;

5. A National Science Foundation award of $27.5M over five years to establish the Socio-Environmental Synthesis Center, which will provide national leadership in addressing large-scale environmental challenges;

Additional examples can be found on the University’s Strategic Plan implementation Web site (http://www.provost.umd.edu/implement.cfm) as well as in various publications and announcements. The high research productivity of the faculty also has resulted in numerous major awards and recognitions, examples of which are also on the Strategic Plan implementation web site.

The number of members of the campus community engaged full-time in research and other scholarly activities has grown significantly, primarily in the category of postdoctoral researchers, reflecting the substantial increase in research funding at the University. Table II.B.2 identifies research appointments over the last five years. The three levels of Research Scientist parallel the T/TT ranks of assistant professor through full professor, but the responsibilities of Research Scientists do not include core instruction. Among Research Associates are postdoctoral scholars who continue their training through the research and scholarship projects of specific faculty. Faculty Research Assistants are primarily technical or other support staff on research projects, for which the minimum educational requirement is a bachelor’s degree.

In response to recommendation 10, the Graduate School and the Division of Research have collaborated on sustained efforts to create enhanced understanding and support of postdoctoral fellows and to develop campus wide community within this group. The collaboration has produced a Web site (http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/postdoctoral_fellows/about_manual.html), including a manual with information about housing, benefits, specific information for international fellows, and community services. The office of the Vice President for Research provides training and workshops in Responsible Conduct of Research, now required for National Science Foundation funded researchers. Pending initiatives include developing and adopting a set of “guiding principles” for a quality postdoctoral experience, balancing benefits between employee and non-employee postdoctoral researchers, formalizing the appointment process, and developing strategies to assist with career opportunities and placements. In 2009, the University joined the National Postdoctoral Association.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Faculty by Category</th>
<th>Fall 07</th>
<th>Fall 08</th>
<th>Fall 09</th>
<th>Fall 10</th>
<th>Fall 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Research Scientist</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Research Scientist</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associates</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty research Assistants</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>1309</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II.B.2: Research Faculty by rank and category, FY 2006 through FY 2010

II.B.1.c: Faculty Diversity: Recruitment, Retention and Support [recommendations 11 and 12]

In the evaluation of the University’s Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses and Threats in the Strategic Plan, the diversity of campus faculty, staff, and student populations is considered one of the University’s major strengths. The Strategic Plan identifies as major goals the aggressive recruitment of outstanding and diverse individuals throughout the campus community and the promotion of a “climate based on fairness, equity and diversity in all policies, procedures, and activities.” While the Self Study identified some successes over the last decade, developing and sustaining a diverse faculty is an area where active and deliberate measures are required and are being taken on an ongoing basis. The University has undertaken a number of initiatives in support of this effort, closely following the goals and strategies of the Strategic Plan.

The percentage of women among the T/TT faculty has not changed between 2007 and 2011, remaining at about 30%, and the percentage of women faculty in STEM disciplines continues to be low, closer to 10%. There has been modest growth at the rank of full professor, as women have moved up the promotion ladder. The 2007 Self Study identified trends indicating that the University has been reasonably successful in the recruitment of women into the professoriate, but less successful in retaining them. To help address retention, the University succeeded in securing, in 2010, a five-year NSF ADVANCE award entitled “Inclusive Excellence,” whose primary objective is to address issues of retention among T/TT women faculty. The award is focused on women in STEM fields, and the university matched it with institutional funds to support initiatives across all disciplines. In order to affirm the commitment of the University as a whole, the Provost serves as Principle Investigator and the Dean of the A. James Clark School of Engineering as co-PI. The nine activities of the UM-ADVANCE program (http://www.advance.umd.edu) include mentoring initiatives at all three professorial levels, leadership training, review of campus policies related to creating a more family-friendly environment, a seed grant program for interdisciplinary research, and a dashboard to increase transparency regarding salaries and productivity expectations. A major activity during the first year of the award was the completion of a work-environment survey to assess faculty perceptions of their professional growth, assessment of the campus climate with respect to work-life balance, and satisfaction with opportunities for advancement. Results from the survey are currently being disseminated through meetings of faculty within the colleges and schools. Survey results differed by rank, gender and ethnicity, providing an important source of information for future initiatives. The survey also revealed that Maryland faculty indicate satisfaction with the institution, but also indicate
a higher desire to leave the University than is found at comparable institutions nationally. Since the primary reason given is to secure a better salary, one can infer that this reflects the difficult budgetary climate in the State, the resulting salary freezes, and by several years of furloughs.

Between 2000 and 2009, the percentage of T/TT faculty of color increased from 16% to 20%. In 2009, 43% of new T/TT hires were members of ethnic minority groups, demonstrating some success in recruitment. Despite the larger minority population, however, numbers for some underrepresented groups are small and not showing a significant increase. The number of T/TT African American faculty, indeed, dropped from 41 in 2007 to 35 in 2010. Similar trends are seen among U.S. Hispanic T/TT faculty.

In 2010, the University Senate adopted a “Strategic Plan for Diversity” (see Appendix H, or http://www.provost.umd.edu/Documents/Stategic_Plan_for_Diversity.pdf), which identifies a set of action items to advance the University’s diversity goals, including diversifying the faculty and then retaining them. They include the development of specific mentoring plans for junior faculty, the development of best practice models from units that have been successful in retaining faculty of color, and careful evaluation of campus service requirements of faculty from under-represented groups. In 2011, under the direction of President Loh, the University established the position of Chief Diversity Officer. Initial implementation these elements of the Diversity Plan began in 2011. The CDO reports jointly to the President and the Provost. The inaugural CDO, Dr. Kumea Shorter-Gooden, joined the campus in January 2012.

II.B.1.d: Policies to Improve Faculty Work-Life Balance

The University continues to improve policies related to balancing work and personal life. The Self Study noted the 2005 adoption of an automatic tenure delay for new parents. In 2009, the University adopted a policy that enables T/TT faculty to temporarily reduce their duties to part-time to care for young children (http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/docs/II-110A.pdf). In 2011, a family-care resource and referral service was established, for help with both childcare and eldercare. A policy for parental accommodation for graduate assistants has been established. A policy for parental leave for faculty was recommended to the President by the University Senate in April 2012, and a policy for staff is currently under consideration.

II.B.2: Assessment of Faculty Performance [recommendation 9]

As indicated in the Self Study, assessment of faculty performance is carried out through multiple avenues and at many levels, using the promotion and tenure process, faculty activity and workload reporting, annual merit reviews, and periodic academic unit reviews. The processes described in Section C of the Self Study have not changed significantly since then.

Following upon the 2007 Self Study, the Strategic Plan’s overall strategy for improving institutional planning and resource allocation included developing a more robust and systematic post-tenure review process. A joint Senate-Provost Task Force, charged in Fall 2008 with drafting a new policy proposed a plan that included options for reduction of salary in the case of poor performance. The plan was rejected by the University Senate. The existing policy was then reviewed carefully for possible revision in alignment with the Strategic Plan, but was found to have internal inconsistencies that make such revision difficult at best. Consequently, the Offices of Faculty Affairs and Institutional, Research, Planning, and Assessment have worked with relevant Senate committees to revise the two primary mechanisms for data gathering, the Faculty Activity Reports and the Course Evaluation System, to make them more relevant for faculty assessment. In the interim, the annual merit-pay review process continues to serve as the main mechanism for faculty review.
Some issues regarding implementation of the University’s merit-pay policy across campus led the President and the University Senate to form a joint task force in 2009 to review the University’s policy and make recommendations for improvements. The task force’s overall assessment was that the University’s policy provides the foundational elements of a sound plan, but compliance and implementation could be standardized. The Task Force recommended that each academic unit have a written plan that is clearly communicated to its faculty, that performance over multiple years should be considered in merit reviews, particularly following a period of no merit pay funding, and that a plan be developed to address issues of salary compression that can result from several years of tight budgets. Implementation of these steps is nearing completion.

University System of Maryland (USM) employees had no cost-of-living or merit based salary increases during FY 2009 through FY 2012. In addition, all state employees were subject to furloughs of up to 10 days for three years in a row from FY 2009 through FY 2011. Given the flexibility to structure its own furlough plan, UMCP instituted a graduated system, with number of furlough days related to annual salary, in order to impose the least burden on the lower paid employees. Following USM policy, faculty were expected to choose furlough days that would avoid cancellation of any classes.

II.B.3: Enriching Undergraduate Education [recommendations 13-16]

Both the University’s mission statement and Strategic Plan call for continued efforts to elevate the quality of undergraduate education, both through continuous improvement in our major programs, informed by assessment of learning outcomes, and through providing enriching and challenging educational opportunities that enhance the majors. This section of the report will highlight recent efforts to enhance our signature living learning programs, international experiences, and opportunities for undergraduate research and internships, in response to the internal recommendations identified in the 2007 Self Study.

II.B.3.a: Living Learning Communities [recommendation 13]

In 2008 the Provost appointed a Committee on Living-Learning Programs to undertake a comprehensive review of campus living-learning and other special programs. The review examined strengths and weaknesses of the existing programs and recommended changes designed to increase the quality of undergraduate education and enroll a larger number of academically talented students. Acting upon the committee’s recommendations, a new Honors College was created (http://www.honors.umd.edu/overview.php), bringing together existing programs (University Honors, Gemstone, and Honors Humanities) and providing a home for new programs created through a competitive call for proposals. As of 2011, three new programs have been added to the Honors College: Digital Cultures and Creativity, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, and Integrated Life Sciences. The Honors college now annually enrolls approximately 1000 students.

Another 900 students are enrolled in the suite of programs designated “College Park Scholars”. Since 2007, major changes in the College Park Scholars program as a result of the review process include the addition of two new programs—Science and Global Change (2009) and Global Public Health (2010), and the discontinuation of three programs—Advocates for Children, American Cultures, and Earth, Life, and Time (all in 2010).

In addition to the Honors College and College Park Scholars, a group of special living-learning programs have existed since at least 2002 and also undergo review; these include Beyond the Classroom, Civicus, Global Communities, Hinman CEOs, Language House, and the Jiménez-Porter Writer’s House. Two new programs have been added to this group, Flexus: The Marilyn Berman Pollans Women in Engineering Living and Learning Community (2010) and Virtus: A Living-Learning Community for Success in
Engineering (2011). The Global Communities program was suspended, redesigned, and restarted in 2011 following its review.

The Provost's Advisory Committee on Living-Learning and Special Programs, chaired by the Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, established eight program expectations and criteria for assessment: (1) recruitment effectiveness, (2) retention/completion/graduation rate effectiveness, (3) quality of program concept and goals (including assessable learning outcomes), (4) quality of curricular content, design, and integration, (5) program staffing in leadership and instruction, (6) quality of activities outside the formal curriculum that enhance the program, (7) quality of continuous improvement, and (8) student satisfaction. Annual reviews are now conducted using these criteria along with institutional data on enrollments and students' academic performance. Annual review reports are communicated to program directors, upper-level supervisors of programs, Deans of Colleges that sponsor programs, and the Senior Vice President and Provost.

II.B.3.b: International Experiences and Study Abroad [recommendation 14]

Preparation of informed citizens and skilled professionals who are ready for global engagement was identified as a primary objective of the Strategic Plan. Several new initiatives have been undertaken to further this goal. International exchange programs have been expanded. New study abroad opportunities have been created for spring break, summer-before-college, summer and winter terms, regular semesters, and full academic years. In collaboration with a broad range of organizations, the University has offered new international internship, volunteer, teaching, and work experiences. To better support students with limited finances, additional funding has been allocated, with support from the office of the Provost. In 2009-2010, 99 Pell Grant students utilized $112,500 in scholarships, and in 2010-2011, 122 Pell Grant students utilized $140,000. Overall, the number of scholarship applications increased by 68%. As a result of these initiatives, participation in Education Abroad programs by University of Maryland students has increased from 1,669 in AY2007-2008 to 2,023 in AY2010-2011.

In support of developing a more global curriculum, the University has fostered new programs and courses with an international and/or global focus. The new General Education program will recognize and encourage international study, research, internship, and service learning experiences as means of satisfying Distributive Studies requirements. Stimulated by the General Education program’s new Diversity requirement in Cultural Competence, a new 1-credit course has been developed in which students engage in their planned experience prior to leaving the U.S., so that they are better prepared to have a deep experience during their time abroad. This course is required of all students who participate in a semester-long Education Abroad program.

At the curriculum level, six colleges have established a total of ten new degree, certificate, and minor programs with a global focus. These include three bachelor’s degrees (Arabic Studies, Environmental Science and Technology, and Persian Studies), two post-baccalaureate certificates (Global Health, Terrorism Analysis), and five minors (Arabic Studies, Engineering Leadership Development, Persian Studies, Sustainability Studies, and Technology Entrepreneurship). At the course level, twenty academic programs have created or revised 39 undergraduate courses with international or global content.

The Office of Undergraduate Studies, in collaboration with three colleges, has sponsored a new Global Studies Minor, which includes four interdisciplinary tracks: International Development and Conflict Management, International Engineering, Global Poverty, and Global Terrorism. Two new citations with a global focus have been created within the College Park Scholars Living-Learning Programs in Science and Global Change (2009) and Global Public Health (2010).
As part of the reconfiguration of the Office of International Programs into an Institute (described in Section III), the office of Education Abroad became an independent unit within the institute. Its mission statement can be found at http://www.international.umd.edu/studyabroad/9850.

II.B.3.c: Undergraduate Research, Experiential Learning and Internships [recommendations 15-16]

The University offers diverse opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in research, experiential learning, and internships. The Maryland Center for Undergraduate Research, a unit of the Office of Undergraduate Studies, administers the Maryland Student Researchers (MSR) program, which brings faculty researchers together with undergraduate volunteers. Likewise, a broad range of research opportunities exist through college-administered programs, through funding agency sponsored programs such as NSF’s Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute’s Undergraduate Research Fellowships, and through informal opportunities with individual faculty members.

Opportunities for experiential learning and internships are also broadly distributed across the University. Many living-learning programs, specialized programs, and dedicated internship/service learning programs incorporate experiential learning as an important programmatic component. Moreover, in the general University curriculum, almost all academic units offer undergraduate credit-bearing experiential learning courses, and many academic programs require experiential learning. Experiential learning courses are carefully regulated by sponsoring units and requirements for hours of performance per credit hour and for academic components associated with experiences are standard.

An ongoing concern is how well the University can track these types of experiences and measure to the extent to which they benefit our students. To address this, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA), in collaboration with the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of the Registrar, has undertaken several steps to improve the collection and reporting of research, experiential learning, and internships pursued by undergraduates. Such pursuits are now tracked among a larger group of “special undergraduate experiences” that are categorized as follows: capstone; experiential learning; field work; individual instruction-intensive personal instruction; independent study; internship; leadership development; research experience; service learning; teaching assistantship; and thesis. Representatives from each academic college reviewed all existing approved courses in the summer of 2011 to validate these categories of “special undergraduate experience.” This process resulted in the recognition of 2,024 special-experience courses in Fall 2011—an increase of about 160% over the 780 special-experience courses recognized in Fall 2010. Additionally, a comprehensive list of special undergraduate experiences that occur outside of credit-bearing coursework has been compiled. Data collection methods appropriate for tracking these experiences have been selected, and the entire list has been prioritized for implementation in ongoing data-gathering and reporting.

II.B.3.d: Foundational Education: General Education [recommendations 17, 26]

Central to the University’s Strategic Plan is a commitment to “implement a new General Education program that complements the disciplinary programs and enriched special programs and is designed to help students develop the knowledge, habits of thought, and outlook that will prepare them to succeed and thrive in the 21st Century.” In 2009, a task force was jointly appointed by the Provost and Senate, and charged with developing a new vision for general education at Maryland. The plan was approved by the University Senate April 2010. In summer 2010, an Implementation Task Force began its work to develop the details of delivery, oversight, review and implementation, which was also reviewed and endorsed by the University Senate, in 2011. The new plan will go into effect for students entering in Fall 2012. The new program is described in detail in “Transforming General Education at the University of
Maryland,” which is included as Appendix F and available online at http://www.provost.umd.edu/GenEdReport/GenEdPublic-Dec2010.pdf.

During the summer of 2010, twelve faculty committees comprising 67 members of the campus community were convened and charged with defining the specific learning outcomes that will characterize courses in each of the new General Education categories. The learning outcomes are published online and at (http://www.gened.umd.edu/documents/GeneralEducationLearningOutcomes.pdf).

A critical element of the implementation is the set of nine Faculty Boards of 6-8 members each, composed primarily of tenured/tenure-track faculty from across the campus. Each Faculty Board is responsible for supervising the initiation and semester-by-semester operations of one of the categories of the general education program. The Faculty Boards also review and approve new and existing courses for inclusion in the new program. During this phase, attention is strongly focused on ensuring that courses submitted to the Faculty Boards clearly state how they address the learning outcomes of the relevant category. The online course submission and review process provides detailed guidance to instructors concerning, for each category, a) learning outcomes, b) the minimum number of specific learning outcomes required to be met, and c) learning outcomes that are required for all courses in that category. The Faculty Boards are also charged with developing rubrics for the assessment of the effectiveness of the new General Education program and recommendations for periodic revision of the outcomes based on assessment. New freshmen will enter the program in Fall 2012, but because elements of the program involve instruction at the junior and senior levels, it will not be fully operational until Fall 2014.

At the time of the 2007 Self Study, an assessment plan for the existing CORE General Education program had been developed but not yet implemented. Assessments of each category were carried out in the intervening years and their results strongly informed the development of the new General Education plan. For example, results from the assessment of courses in the CORE category of Diversity indicated that students increase their understanding of Diversity as they progress in their education at the University; however, the data failed to show a relationship between taking Diversity courses and actual learning about diversity. Students had come to use this requirement to explore their own identity, which, although valuable, was not the requirement’s original purpose. In the new General Education plan, the requirement is increased to two courses and given a different focus. The “Understanding Plural Societies” category emphasizes learning about pluralism and the interfaces between cultures. The “Cultural Competence” category introduces a mechanism for students to gain an increased understanding of cultures and cultural practices through experience, while learning to communicate effectively across cultural differences in a diverse society and world. The learning outcomes in this latter category include an analysis of their own cultural beliefs, as the development of skills to negotiate cross-cultural situations and conflicts.

A unique feature of the new General Education program is a Distributive Studies category called “Scholarship in Practice” (SP). Courses in this category are meant to help students better understand the process of developing new scholarship. During AY2011-2012, the ten faculty CTE-Lilly Fellows developed a workshop and primer on how to create such courses for non-majors, and created course models for a wide variety of disciplines. Their materials highlight the expectation for formative assessment and feedback, following the SP faculty board expectation that SP courses must offer students opportunities to revise and refine their work as they participate in the process of authentic work of a discipline.
Two specific recommendations from the Standard 12 working group of the 2007 Self Study also informed the new General Education plan. The first was in response to the call to develop a set of innovative courses that engage students in applying scientific principles to contemporary issues. A suite of signature courses, the Marquee Courses in Science and Technology, was developed, introducing students not majoring in the sciences and engineering to the process of science and how scientific thinking addresses major societal concerns. The courses (http://www.marqueecourses.umd.edu/courselist.html) are taught by a small group of STEM faculty who meet regularly to discuss pedagogy and course content. The Marquee project uses an outcomes-based design model with teaching styles targeted to address the desired outcomes, and an assessment-oriented approach to course improvement.

The success of the Marquee courses spawned the development of a campus-wide set of signature courses in the new General Education program, dubbed the “I-Series” (http://www.gened.umd.edu/i-series/iseries.php). I-Series courses are not surveys of particular fields of knowledge, but instead provide students with the basic concepts, approaches, and vocabulary of particular disciplines and fields of study as well as an understanding of how experts in those disciplines and fields employ them to wrestle with big questions. In preparing for full implementation of the new General Education program, over 100 I-Series courses have already been approved or offered. The process of their creation -- development of learning outcomes, a call for proposals of courses designed to meet outcomes, course selection by a faculty committee, I-Series faculty learning community meetings, and outcomes-targeted course design and teaching -- served as a pilot for the remainder of the General Education implementation process.

Furthermore, in responding to a recommendation to incorporate more opportunities for the development of research skills into curricula, the new General Education program allows those students who become engaged in undergraduate research to receive General Education academic credit for their experience, something which was unavailable in the existing CORE program.

II.B.4: Effectiveness in Undergraduate Education [recommendations 18-19, 22]
II.B.4.a: Admissions, Student Performance, Retention, and Graduation [recommendation 18]

The University has an established set of peer institutions against which annual benchmarks in student profiles, performance, satisfaction, retention and graduation rates are measured. These include the University of California, Berkeley, the University of California, Los Angeles, the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Peer performance data are reported to the University System of Maryland each year, an example of which is found in Appendix N. Recent increases in the academic profile of students entering the University now place the student profile at the average of our peers. A continuing challenge, however, has been to increase retention and graduation rates.

The Student Academic Success-Degree Completion Policy, implemented in Fall 2005, establishes a structured framework and set of criteria to guide all students to completion of an undergraduate degree within a reasonable period of time. This plan requires all academic units to create graduation templates that specify the degree requirements for each major and to provide semester-by-semester course schedule models that achieve graduation within four years. Benchmarks are also established for each major that specify the credit and course criteria that will indicate satisfactory progress to degree. Students are evaluated according a regular periodic review schedule set by the academic unit, and those who are in danger of falling behind the program benchmarks are required to consult with an advisor prior to registration. This program has been very successful in raising retention and graduation rates.
First year freshmen retention rates reached 94% for those entering in Fall 2007 enrollees and 95% for those arriving in Fall 2010. Graduation rates have also increased, with the six year graduation rate at 82% for the Fall 2003 class, more than 15% higher than the similar cohort of Fall 1995. Five year graduation rates are now very close to six year rates, and the four year graduation rate is rising rapidly, now 65%, up from 58% in Fall 2001.

The University continues to work to improve retention and graduation rates. To prepare for the new General Education program, new four-year plans are being written by all programs, and benchmarks are also being revised or reassessed; the Provost has established a new Benchmark Committee to approve these plans.

Nonetheless, the University’s retention and graduation rates still lag those of our peers. In January 2010, a Task Force on Retention and Graduation was established to try to better understand why, and to provide advice on specific actions that would significantly improve them. The Task Force examined the role of academic success and other factors in students’ decisions to leave the University, including academic preparation and progress of all fall freshmen enrolled at the University in three cohorts (Fall 2006, 2007, and 2008). A particular focus was on those students who are less successful in their first year, including those on probation, since they tend to have much lower retention rates. Academic preparedness, measured by test scores and grades, has a significant effect on student retention, though outcomes for individual students at any level of preparedness are also affected by many other factors. The Task Force made a number of recommendations to identify students who are academically at risk early in their careers and provide intervention and support for them. Initiatives that were implemented in 2011 include moving the function of supporting the re-enrollment of students who withdraw from the University and wish to return from Admissions to the Student Success Office within the Office of Undergraduate Studies, adding new a Transitional Advising effort in the division of Letters and Sciences (the academic home for students who have not yet declared a major), and requiring all colleges to provide targeted additional advising for first-year new freshmen with a GPA of 2.3 and below.

II.B.4.b: Enrollment Management

Over the last several years, undergraduate enrollments have been influenced by factors related to student talent level, graduation rates, and traditional enrollment practices. As the number of talented Maryland high school graduates has increased, more students matriculate with advanced placement credit, along with a desire for larger course loads. The result has been a shorter time to degree and a significant increase in our undergraduate graduation rates.

In order to maintain the undergraduate class size without negatively affecting graduation rates or over-stressing resources, a plan was developed to increase the number of students who enter the University in the spring. The Freshmen Connection Program (FCP) is one element, and has contributed to more balanced enrollments, increased efficiency, and improved access for the growing number of talented Maryland high school graduates. FCP is a fall semester academic program designed for students who accept admission to Maryland for the following spring semester. FCP course offerings meet general undergraduate degree requirements, but are offered at non-peak time, thus encouraging students to graduate on time while maximizing the efficient use of facilities and other resources.

In its first year, 2006, Freshmen Connection enrolled 371 students. In 2011, program enrollment had increased to nearly 800. When we have a continuous stream of close to 800 FCP students entering the University each spring, it is projected that these students could generate additional tuition revenue of nearly $32 million based on current tuition rates. Through Freshmen Connection, the University is
better able to serve more students, maintain instructional quality, and bring balance to our use of facilities over the academic year.

II.B.4.c: Transfer Students [recommendation 22]

Among institutional priorities in the University’s Strategic Plan is a goal to attract a larger pool of applications from academically talented students, enroll more students from underrepresented groups, enroll an increasingly stronger group of freshman and transfer students, and become the school of choice for more of the highest achieving students graduating from Maryland high schools.

Consistent with this goal a new transfer process was implemented involving four specific changes. First, a specific communication area for prospective transfer students on the admissions web site was improved, which also now includes access through social media. Second, a fixed schedule for admission decisions was established (fall decisions in mid-April for March 1 applications, mid-June for June 1 applications; spring decisions in early October for Augusts 1 applications). Third, a pre-transfer advising system was established in 2008 for prospective students, with both scheduled appointments and walk-in advising hours. Pre-Transfer Advisors provide information about students’ individual transfer credits for courses successfully undertaken, major options, and projected graduation timelines. During its second year, Pre-Transfer advisors worked with 1,936 individuals through advising hours, on-line chats, or telephone meetings. Fourth, transfer students are now systematically advised to take advantage of the first transfer student orientation available in order to register as early as possible for courses.

Transfer student recruitment and admissions to the University’s five undergraduate programs encompassing eight majors at the Universities of Shady Grove have been fully integrated into campus procedures through coordinated recruitment and advising efforts between College Park and Shady Grove. Parallel information regarding transfer admissions for Shady Grove is available from Web sites of both locations. Transfer admission workshops and information sessions are available at Shady Grove and at local community colleges campuses often with representatives from individual College Park majors that are available at the Shady Grove campus. In addition, the Shady Grove programs have established articulation agreements with the feeder community colleges, most notably with Montgomery College, which has by far the most significant pipeline. The advising of prospective transfer students at Shady Grove occurs primarily with on-site advisors for each of the undergraduate programs. A variety of advising materials about academic preparation for transfer into undergraduate programs is available, including specific curricula that students need to undertake at regional community colleges in order to graduate from the University of Maryland in four years.

II.B.5: Effectiveness in Graduate Education

The University’s Strategic Plan identified graduate education as a major institutional priority and identified four goals and corresponding strategies closely aligned with MSCHE’s Standard 11. The Graduate School then developed its more detailed Strategic Plan, including strategies for assessing and improving the quality of programs; enhancing the graduate student academic and campus experience; funding the graduate enterprise, with an emphasis on increasing funding for graduate students; increasing support for graduate diversity and international initiatives; and building a campus intellectual community through special fellowships, awards, and programming. The Graduate School’s plan can be found at [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu); progress on each of the campus goals for Graduate Education can be found at [http://www.provost.umd.edu/implement.cfm](http://www.provost.umd.edu/implement.cfm).

Previously part of the Division of Research and Graduate Studies, the Graduate School became an autonomous unit in 2004. Many initiatives described below date from the writing of the Self Study in 2006.
II.B.5.a: Graduate School Initiatives and Graduate Education [recommendation 7]

Program Review and Student Quality

In the most recent report of the National Research Council rankings, 31 of the 56 ranked UMCP programs are in the top 20 percent of programs in their fields based on one of the study's two general assessment methodologies. There are 21 UMCP programs in the top 20 percent of their fields in research; 19 are in the top 20 percent in student support and outcomes; and 33 are in the top 20 percent in diversity. In current rankings by U.S. News and World Report, 60 UMCP graduate programs rank in the top 25 in their fields.

In Fall 2008, an extensive two-year review of all doctoral programs on campus was initiated. Each program provided a description of its academic goals, its structure and data, using five-and three-year windows, on such metrics as student quality, student progress to date, time to degree, student financial support, and student placements in academia and other sectors of the economy. The data were used in a collaborative process to determine appropriate program sizes and recruitment targets. One of the primary goals was to reduce the overall doctoral population over a five-year period, to increase the financial resources and faculty mentoring that could be provided to each student, and thus to improve degree completion and time to degree rates. New doctoral student enrollment in Fall 2010 numbered 732 students and in Fall 2011 753 students, a 7% decrease from the five year average of 800 students for the period from Fall 2005 through Fall 2009. The creation of an extensive baseline on student progress and support now provides the foundation for ongoing annual collection of data for doctoral programs.

Concurrent with the doctoral program review, the Graduate School and the Campus Assessment Working Group (CAWG) conducted two online surveys: a survey of campus graduate programs to map policies, practices, and initiatives related to mentoring, advising, research and pedagogical training, professional development, and placement (96% response rate); and a parallel survey of campus doctoral students, examining the student experience of those initiatives (33% response rate). Analysis of the surveys was completed in Spring 2010, the results were widely disseminated. A Task Force on Mentoring was charged with reviewing the analysis, conducting research on national best practices, and reporting its findings to the Graduate Council. An outcome is a brochure on tips for mentors and mentoring for graduate students.

In 2009, the Graduate School initiated a thorough review of UMCP’s graduate admissions process, created a working group representing all relevant campus administrative units, and developed a new online admissions system. In 2010, the Graduate School assumed responsibility for international graduate admissions, which had previously been managed by two separate campus units. In 2011-12, following an extensive review, UMCP selected Hobson’s Apply Yourself to replace the now outdated application system. A contract has been executed, and the new system will be installed campus wide for Fall 2013 admissions.

Graduate Student Initiatives

Initiatives have also been launched to help improve the experiences of graduate students while they work towards their degree. These include twelve Ph.D. completion workshops, delivered annually, on dissertation writing and professional development, as well as mentoring and teaching programs in collaboration with the Center for Teaching Excellence.

In 2010, two task forces, one on Graduate Student Writing and another on Responsible Conduct of Research and Scholarly Integrity, were charged with surveying existing initiatives across campus,
researching best practices nationally, consulting with faculty and students, and preparing recommendations for multiple, coordinated initiatives at campus, college, and department levels. The International Graduate Student Association concurrently collaborated with the Graduate School on developing and implementing an international graduate student peer program in writing and editing support.

**Graduate Student Financial Support**

The campus has approximately 4,000 students supported on graduate assistantships (research, teaching, and administrative). Graduate assistant stipends increased by a total of 9% between Fall 2007 and Fall 2009, and they were exempt from the furlough requirement that applied to university employees. Assistantship stipends campus-wide average $17,369 for 9.5 month appointments and $24,199 for 12 month appointments; assistantships also carry faculty health benefits and tuition.

Fellowships are awarded and financed through individual departments and colleges, through the Graduate School, and through external grants. External fellowships have increased over the last five years. For example, in AY2009-2010, the number of students supported on NIH/NSF training grants increased from 27 to 42, and the number of Fulbright fellows grew from 20 to 45.

The Graduate School allocates $4.8M in fellowship dollars, and another $4M in tuition remission, annually to colleges and academic programs for awarding to students. Called Block Grant Fellowships from 2005 through 2009, the program was reconfigured in 2009-10 to maximize effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability and renamed University and Dean’s Fellowships. At that time, an instrument was created for programs to report annual total funding commitments for fellowship recipients, producing a system for accounting of all fellowship dollars, for tracking specifics of support for individual students, and eventually for conducting a data-based assessment of fellowship funding in relation to student success.

Flagship Fellowships were created in 2007 to recruit and retain truly superlative students through competitive multi-year enhancement awards. The goal is to award ten Flagship Fellowships per year, reaching a steady state of approximately forty Flagship Fellows. In the first five years of the competition for this program, 47 students have been recruited to the University with 13 of those in FY 2011. A Society of Flagship Fellows was created in 2008, with various activities and events supported with funding from the Graduate School.

The new McNair Graduate Fellowship program will enhance opportunities to recruit and retain outstanding alumni or alumnae of McNair undergraduate programs from institutions across the country, providing a first-year support that includes a fellowship stipend. The Graduate School expects award up to five McNair Graduate Fellowships in the Spring 2012 recruitment cycle. Numerous other discipline-specific fellowships and awards are offered across campus and administered by the Graduate School.

Ann G. Wylie Dissertation Fellowships were established in 2006, one-semester awards intended to support outstanding doctoral students in the final stages of writing their dissertation. The Graduate School awarded 46 Wylie Fellowships in the 2011-12, surpassing the stated goal of 40-45 per year.

The University also provides some central resources for students to travel to conferences through Goldhaber Travel Awards, and, more recently, through International Conference Student Support Awards. Funding for these awards has doubled since FY 2009.

The University of Maryland Distinguished Dissertation Award, created in Spring 2011 for dissertations submitted in 2010, recognizes four dissertations annually, in four broad disciplinary categories, and
carries a $1,000 prize (the process also serves as an internal vetting for nominations for the national ETS/CGS Dissertation Awards).

The long standing General Research Board and Creative and Performing Arts Awards for Graduate Faculty ($600k total annual budget) were revised and renamed in 2009. In order to support the University’s mission of mentoring graduate students, they now explicitly require graduate student mentoring to be included in the funded project.

The Graduate Faculty Mentor of the Year Award, created in 2010, recognizes four student-nominated faculty mentors each year and carries a $1,000 prize to be used for mentoring initiatives. The Outstanding Director of Graduate Studies and Coordinator of Graduate Studies Awards, created in 2012, recognize two outstanding faculty directors and two outstanding staff coordinators annually, and carry a $500 prize.

Diversity and International Initiatives

Using 2008-2009 data, Diversity Issues in Higher Education ranked UMCP 4th for African American doctoral graduates and 23rd for total under-represented minority doctoral graduates among AAU institutions. In collaboration with UM Baltimore County and UM Baltimore, UMCP administered and provided programming for PROMISE: Maryland’s Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP), funded by a multi-year NSF grant for recruitment/retention of under-represented students in STEM disciplines. The Graduate School has continued to fund PROMISE initiatives after the NSF grant was completed in 2011, particularly those initiatives determined to be most effective in recruiting and retaining a diverse student population. The Graduate School/Driskell Center Graduate Assistantship, a jointly funded annual assistantship for a doctoral candidate working on a topic related to the holdings or mission of the David C. Driskell Center for the Study of the African Diaspora, was launched in 2010.

The University continues to expand its graduate international offerings. A team of three distinguished international education experts has been created to develop capacity for facilitating international initiatives for colleges and programs; they include the former Associate Provost for International Programs; the former Director of the UMCP Confucius Institute; and the former Director of the Office of International Services. They bring, respectively, expertise in Latin America and the Middle East, Asia, and Europe. With this team, the Graduate School has helped facilitate master’s degree initiatives in Hanoi, Nanjing, and Suzhou and other relationships and initiatives with China, Israel, Germany, Denmark, and England.

II.B.5.b: Graduate Professional Programs [recommendation 21]

Entrepreneurial Graduate Programs

The University offers a diverse menu of professional master’s degrees and graduate certificates. It also offers an increasingly wide range of executive programs, distance learning programs, and hybrid programs, also targeted toward professional audiences, under entrepreneurial funding models in which the largest portion of tuition revenue goes directly to the college/department offering the program.

In October 2007, the Provost formed a Task Force on Professional/Executive Graduate Programs, chaired by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Task Force was charged with reviewing overall academic policies and practices for professional/executive masters and certificate degree programs, both domestic and international, and with making appropriate recommendations regarding these programs. The goal was to ensure that professional/executive programs maintain the highest levels of academic standards, integrity, and oversight, while remaining responsive, agile, flexible, and competitive in the marketplace. The report of the task force is included as Appendix P.
In March 2010, the Provost implemented a policy on tuition sharing for professional/executive programs, based on recommendations from a campus-wide committee. The goal was to create a simple, uniform, and equitable model to be applied to all programs. Under this policy, entrepreneurial academic programs are assessed a sharing rate of 15% of the gross tuition and fee revenue, while programs operating off-campus or on-line are assessed at 10%. This centrally collected percentage of revenue is then allocated with a defined amount committed to recovering administrative costs, and the remaining amount dedicated to initiatives that support the University’s academic mission and Strategic Plan. The model is based on the principles that departments must have financial incentive to create entrepreneurial programs; that the programs benefit from the learning environment and academic reputation of the campus, and thus should contribute to maintaining and enhancing these assets; and that successful growth in entrepreneurial programs will provide a revenue stream for carrying out the University’s primary mission.

The level of activity in entrepreneurial academic programming continues to grow; we estimate that these programs will bring in over $46 million in tuition revenue in FY 2012.

**Masters and Graduate Certificate of Professional Studies**

In 2005, as indicated in the Self Study, the University established a template for a new category of professional graduate programs, designated the Master (and Graduate Certificate) of Professional Studies (MPS and GCPS); This template provides a structure for developing customized, usually multidisciplinary degree programs, offered either for candidates in general or for cohorts of qualified employees in government agencies, private sector organizations, or other entities. These programs Fall under the category of entrepreneurial programs discussed above.

The Graduate School is the home of the Professional Studies degrees and, together with the offering academic unit or units, provides academic oversight of them. New tracks are proposed and evaluated through the same academic committees and procedures as core academic programs. Proposals must include program goals, student learning outcomes expectations, assessment of the faculty who will provide design and instruction, and an assessment of available resources and expenditures. Admissions criteria are consistent with the policies of the Graduate School.

The Masters and Graduate Certificates of Professional Studies tracks have become effective vehicles for international engagement and education; for example, a very successful track in Criminal Justice Leadership was launched in 2011 at the People’s Police Academy in Hanoi, with the cooperation of the Department of State.

**II.B.6: Assessment of Student Learning [recommendations 8, 23-26]**

Assessment of student learning outcomes in academic programs has now become embedded in the University’s institutional culture. A well-established structure for periodic review and revision of curriculum assessment plans now exists, along with a cycle of reviews and a set of structures in place to inform the campus of assessment results for short-term and long-term campus planning.

The assessment of student learning in academic programs is coordinated through the Provost’s Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment, established in 2003. Charged by the Provost to work with all campus units as they develop learning outcomes and to establish a new standard for assessment, the Commission consists of three interacting groups of UMCP faculty and administrators, and is chaired by the Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies. The Planning Team, consisting of leadership from the Offices of Undergraduate Studies and Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment, establishes the agenda for and oversees the work of the entire Commission. The
Deans’ Steering Committee, comprised of six college deans, serves as an advisory board for the Planning Team and meets as needed to discuss and decide policy issues. The College Coordinators serve as liaisons between the planning team and their respective deans and colleges. Each college designates one or two faculty members or academic administrators to serve as coordinators.

In Fall 2005, faculty in each degree program established program learning outcomes and the assessment methods that would be used to measure them. An initial four-year cycle of assessment was completed in March 2010. During this first cycle, program and college assessment committees reviewed the results and made recommendations for further action as appropriate. The College Coordinators acted as peer reviewers at the institutional level and used rubrics to review results and provide peer feedback to each program as well as to provide analysis of how it could be improved.

Due to the size and complexity of the University, and the responsibility of each program to state its own goals and objectives based on its disciplinary needs, the assessment of student learning resides mostly at the program level. The two notable exceptions to this decentralization are the new General Education program, which is organized through the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and the University Libraries, through which information literacy is assessed campus-wide.

In FY 2011, concluding the first cycle, each college prepared a summary and review of the college's assessment of student learning work across the previous four years, along with assessment schedules for the next cycle. Colleges addressed accomplishments in the assessment process and provided information on how the assessment results were being used to inform program improvements – essentially closing the feedback loop. Detailed assessment reports from each college, and the College Coordinator reviews of each college report, were provided in the Commission’s FY 2011 report to the Provost, as part of the annual evaluation of the campus assessment effort.

In FY 2011, the Commission also reviewed and revised some of the basic operations followed during the first complete four-year cycle. The Commission was divided into undergraduate and graduate committees, chaired by the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and the Dean of the Graduate School, respectively. This division recognized the very different expectations of graduate and undergraduate instruction, and laid the foundation for a more robust and relevant assessment process at the graduate level.

In Fall 2010, a campus committee for Graduate Outcomes Assessment was created and charged by the Dean of the Graduate School with developing a new overall plan for doctoral outcome assessment (DGOA). Over the winter and spring of 2011, the committee presented the evolving DGOA plan to focus groups of department chairs, graduate directors, and graduate faculty. Following these meetings, the Dean of the Graduate School distributed a set of documents to the colleges that outlined a final DGOA plan, emphasizing flexibility with respect to disciplines, and provided a schedule for implementation.

A new graduate outcomes assessment process is now in place for doctoral programs. It is described in more detail in Section V, and at the Graduate School’s Doctoral Graduate Outcomes Assessment Web site, [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/DGOA.html](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/DGOA.html). The Web site provides examples of model programs that all units may use to craft a doctoral assessment process tailored to their own program.

**Other Assessment Processes**

Assessment of academic programs also takes place, more broadly, through the process of academic unit reviews. Most units undergo a comprehensive review on a seven-year cycle. This periodic review covers not only academic programs, but also the quality and diversity of faculty research, administrative support and use of facilities within the department, and unit governance. In their self-assessment of
undergraduate programs, units are expected to articulate how student learning outcomes are evaluated and their impact on curriculum revision. While explicit reference to learning outcomes assessment is not yet part of the graduate review guidance, the first round of assessments is beginning to influence revisions to graduate programs. Further discussion and examples are in Section V.A of this report.

Syllabi have an important relationship to the many campus policies related to student participation in their curricula, including grievance policies and excused absences for religious observances or for medical reasons. Syllabus guidelines for faculty have been posted on the Office of Faculty Affairs Web site for a number of years, but they now include an expectation for inclusion of course goals and/or a list of student learning outcomes (see http://faculty.umd.edu/teach/syllabus.html).

While the Provost’s Commission on Learning Outcomes maintains a comprehensive Web site on outcomes assessment and produces annual reports to the Provost and to colleges, individual departments have not yet incorporated their own goals into their published materials for students. A step that will make this an easier process for departments is the recent launch of a new curriculum management system to handle course catalog information, called Testudo Curriculum Management. This new system, described in more detail in Section V.C, merges the course proposal process, which had been paper-based, with course catalog information, which is and has been stored in an electronic database. Although learning outcomes have been required for new course proposals for several years, this information was not easily accessible. With Testudo Curriculum Management, learning outcomes are as visible to all faculty and staff as course descriptions. Faculty can categorize them as “skill,” “accreditation,” or “subject” oriented, as well as search for and reuse learning outcome phrases, allowing for more consistency in program descriptions and greater efficiency in individual course development. The system also provides a channel for communicating the foundational elements of a course to faculty or graduate assistants who may be teaching the course for the first time.

The ability to organize and document learning outcomes will allow program directors to see how a system that connects higher level concepts (learning objective categories) to course learning objectives can be used in curricular decision-making. Ultimately, the system will be available to students, will include program curricular information, and will be the basis for program audits. As this functionality is developed, students should be able to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the relationships between program requirements, program learning outcomes, and individual course learning outcomes.
III: Major Challenges and Opportunities

The Strategic Plan and the vision laid out within continue to provide a roadmap for the University and a detailed set of benchmarks against which we can measure our progress towards firmly establishing the University of Maryland as a world-class institution. No doubt, as with many public universities today, establishing the necessary funding to carry out these ambitious goals will remain one of our greatest challenges. This section of the report is focused on some key developments that we foresee will continue to move us toward our goals, along with some of the issues we will face in addressing them.

III.A: Enrollment Management and Future Planning [Standard 2]

III.A.1: The University System of Maryland’s 2020 Strategic Plan

In 2010, the University System of Maryland (USM) Board of Regents embraced the national goal of a 55% degree completion rate for U.S. citizens and developed a strategic plan to increase USM enrollment by about 40,000 students across the system institutions. Enrollment, rather than the number of degrees awarded, was to be provided to the state legislature as a basis for funding the plan.

The University of Maryland, College Park’s (UMCP’s) Strategic Plan and previously approved enrollment projections called for a decrease in enrollment of about 1500 undergraduate and 1000 graduate students over Fall 2010 enrollment, in conflict with the USM plan. In order to support the state and USM goal of increased degree production, we developed a new 10-year projection aligned with their goals. Initially, the plan was to increase growth by about 4000 students from Fall 2010 enrollment over a 10-year period. No funding for USM’s enrollment initiative was provided in FY 2012, thus the proposed enrollment increases have not begun. The projections in Appendix J thus initiate growth in enrollment starting in FY 2015, still contingent upon additional funding. The result would be an additional 2900 students by 2021, an increase of about 7.7% over Fall 2011 actual numbers. Approximately 2200 of those are projected to be undergraduates. Growth at the Universities at Shady Grove is also anticipated, but will depend on the availability of funding and appropriate laboratory space to expand in the STEM disciplines.

The USM plan also calls for an increase of 40% in enrollment in STEM disciplines at UMCP. Enrollment growth of this magnitude, and especially the significant growth in the STEM disciplines, presents a number of challenges to the institution. Detailed and coordinated planning is required to achieve these goals and at the same time continue with the significant gains in quality of programs and the ability to attract talented students that have been achieved over the last decade. To achieve the STEM enrollment targets, the applicant pool will need to grow by more than 10% at a time when a 14% decline in the number of Maryland high school graduates is predicted. There is a current space deficit of 1.6M sq. ft. on campus, and enrollment growth will require space not only for classrooms, laboratories, mid-sized lecture halls, and computer rooms, but also for office and research space for new faculty and graduate students.

A financial challenge in meeting the STEM enrollment goals is the fact that the cost of instruction in STEM disciplines is substantially higher than in non-STEM areas. While this is in part due to market forces that drive faculty salaries, it is also because of the need for high quality laboratory instruction, in smaller section sizes and with laboratory equipment. UMCP is currently exploring, in collaboration with USM, a strategy for increasing tuition rates for students who enroll in STEM disciplines.

In Fall 2011, the deans of each of the academic colleges were interviewed to assess the impact of the proposed growth and to identify the specific demands that such growth would place upon their units. As expected, budget limitations are the most pervasive concern, along with shortages of faculty and in
the physical infrastructure. Every college has many courses with enrollment at or near capacity. Deans stress that the cumulative effect of furloughs and three years without merit pay has put the University at risk of continuing to lose excellent faculty and staff who are the backbone of the university’s high quality programs. Expanding capacity in virtually every dimension will require both additional funding and long-term planning.

An analysis of trends in student movement to and from STEM disciplines is in progress in order to better understand how and whether attracting and admitting more students to STEM disciplines will translate into additional STEM degree production.

III.A.2: Development at the Universities at Shady Grove

A location with potential for enrollment growth is the Universities at Shady Grove (USG), USM’s regional center in Montgomery County, Maryland. Educational programs at USG are developed and managed by nine of USM’s institutions, at both undergraduate and graduate levels. Degrees are awarded by the sponsoring campus. By design, undergraduate instruction is only in the third and fourth years. The majority of students (70%) transfer from nearby Montgomery College, thus requiring close collaboration with them in the development of new programs. There are no residence facilities at USG so, unlike the College Park campus, the student population consists entirely of commuters.

The administration of programs is typically through a program director from the sponsoring USM campus, and who is local to USG. The program director is responsible for securing instruction, classroom and office space, for student recruitment and advising, and for curriculum development. In the case of UMCP, additional program administration is provided through a Director of College Park Programs and a Coordinator for Shady Grove Admission. UMCP students are approximately half of the total undergraduate enrollment at USG. UMCP’s response to USM’s enrollment growth plan will require as many as 2000 additional students over a short period of time. To meet this demand, new program offerings and more electives will be required. A more centralized administration and financial model for academic programs would be desirable to manage this ambitious growth. The support of new programs will require additional faculty, facilities, and, for the highly desired STEM disciplines, teaching laboratories.

In collaboration with the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB), UMCP has proposed a major academic initiative at USG as part of its newly formed partnership “MPower Maryland” (described below). The plan calls for new educational programs in health, law, and human services (UMB) and science, technology, engineering, math, business, and the social sciences (UMCP) at USG. The research efforts of the two campuses will also be enhanced through the existing Institute for Biosciences and Biotechnology Research (IBBR), adjacent to the USG campus, in cooperation with the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) in Gaithersburg, Maryland.

A key requirement of the plan is the joint appointment of a senior academic leader (dean). This individual will lead IBBR, organize the USG geographically-based faculty, expand technology transfer and commercialization activities in the region, act as the MPower point of contact at USG, expand collaboration among academic programs, and support the home campus deans in fulfilling their institutional requirements for their programs, including accreditation. This leader will be charged with creating a strong collaborative relationship with the USG’s executive director. The net result would be a substantially increased academic pipeline of students in Montgomery county, from the undergraduate level through professional programs, into key areas of workforce needs identified in the county and the region. Planning is currently underway and will require close cooperation with the University System of Maryland.
III.A.3: Supporting the New Plan for General Education

Section VI contains a discussion of institutional planning and budgeting efforts to prepare for the General Education program, which begins in Fall 2012. There will be several years of transition, as current students, who are under the existing CORE program, move through their curricula and as new students enter, requiring that both plans be supported in this transition period. Some aspects of the new program will be delivered as third and fourth year instruction, not phasing in until Fall 2014.

As indicated in section VI, the total number of credits required in the new General Education plan is comparable to the number of credits required under CORE, but there will be shifts in instructional demands. Some aspects of the new program, such as the I-Series courses and Scholarship in Practice, require that new courses be developed, and in some instances by academic units that have not typically delivered general education instruction. Aspects of the new program provide more flexibility in the counting of credits and students may end up completing their requirements with fewer courses overall. We are hopeful that transfer students may come to the University more likely to have completed their General Education requirements because of degree-completion initiatives underway at community colleges across the state.

Exactly how shifts in instructional demands will play out will depend on all of these factors as well as on student interests and on faculty engagement in developing new courses. Financing the new General Education program will require careful attention. Adjustments will be required on a year-by-year basis, likely for at least six years, until the new program is fully in place and CORE has been phased out.

III.B: International Engagement [Standards 11 and 13]

Substantial growth in the University’s engagement in its international agenda is a major initiative of the Strategic Plan, and global engagement has become a focal point of the University under President Loh. Goals include enhancing and enriching undergraduate opportunities, including but not limited to Education Abroad, increased research and graduate-level educational partnerships with international peer institutions, and enhanced collaboration with official and informal international communities in the Washington, D.C. area. While some steps have begun in this direction, much of the work will proceed over the next several years.

Education Abroad opportunities continue to expand, with an increasing focus on providing more opportunities for students in STEM disciplines. New directions include the establishment of “Freshmen Abroad” to provide incoming students with an immediate overseas immersion program and Graduate Student Research Fellowships that provide graduate students the opportunity to participate in research projects abroad. Increasing financial support for students will be a necessary step for Education Abroad programs to continue to grow.

III.B.1: International Undergraduate Enrollment

In addition to continuing to send our own students abroad, the University seeks to increase enrollment by international students in our own undergraduate programs. In Fall 2011, 111 international students matriculated at the University as new freshmen, contributing to a total of somewhat over 700 international undergraduates. While the University provides the necessary services to these students such as advising, orientation, visa processing, and some transitional housing, it is recognized that these services could and should be improved if the campus is to welcome a larger population. In September 2011, the Vice President for Student Affairs convened a task force to evaluate the experiences of international students and make recommendations for improvement. The report provides a set of 21 recommendations that range from increasing campus awareness of the special needs of international
students, the development of summer orientation and bridge programs, enhanced housing support, to increased mentoring and establishment of an umbrella organization to support international student groups.

International students who come, by cohort, into the undergraduate curriculum starting in their junior year (in so-called “2+2” programs) tend to be more likely to be retained and to graduate than those entering in their freshman year. This is thus a potential area of successful growth. The College of Agriculture and Natural Resources has several such programs with China that have operated successfully for a number of years and serve as a model to those units wishing to move in this direction.

III.B.2: International Graduate Student Enrollment

International graduate student enrollment presents a different set of challenges and opportunities. The University has a long tradition of strong and successful international recruitment into our doctoral programs. Approximately 50% of the 22,000 graduate applications received annually are international; about 63% of those are from China and India. International doctoral students have a comparatively high ten-year graduation rate of 65.5% and a comparatively low time-to-degree rate of 5.78 years. They represent approximately 36% of doctoral degrees awarded and they enjoy considerable success in our internal fellowship competitions. Since the decennial review, the University has either expanded or created several programs for international graduate students, including the English Editing for International Graduate Students Program, airport pick-up service for new international students, and an annual Thanksgiving Dinner for international graduate students and their families, hosting about 600 guests.

We seek to continue to improve the quality of the overall graduate applicant pool and both the quality and quantity of professional masters degree applications and enrollments. English language proficiency is an ongoing challenge. This is addressed through testing and instructional options that maximize flexibility while maintaining rigorous standards. We have also begun working at an institutional level to create opportunities for U.S. graduate students to study, conduct research, and present research abroad. New initiatives include International Conference Student Support Awards and Graduate Student International Research Fellowships.

III.B.3: Joint Graduate Programs

A new direction to enhance our global reach has been to establish more formal partnerships with overseas institutions in areas of mutual benefit, through either joint or dual doctoral programs. Recent examples include a joint Ph.D. program in Astronomy with the Pontificia Universidad Catolica de Chile, a dual Ph.D. program in Mechanical Engineering with Pusan National University in South Korea, a dual Ph.D. program in Chemistry with East China Normal University in Shanghai, China, and a dual master’s degree program in Transcultural Counseling in collaboration with the University of Malta. Some units are developing specialized masters programs for specific cohorts, such as the Master of Professional Studies in Justice Leadership, offered to the People’s Police Academy in Vietnam. This program was developed at the request of the U.S. Department of State, recognizing the national prominence of our program in Criminal Justice. These latter two programs, in Malta and in Vietnam, were accompanied by successful Substantive Change requests to the Middle States Higher Education Commission. It is our expectation that the development of new formal, strategic international partnerships will continue to grow in the coming years.
III.B.4: Creation of the Institute for International Programs

To provide a stronger framework for moving the global agenda forward, the University’s Office of International Programs was reorganized in 2009 to become the Institute for International Programs (IIP). International student admissions functions were moved to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and to the Graduate School. The Maryland English Institute, responsible for testing and training in English for foreign students, was moved to the College of Education. In Spring 2011, a new interim director of IIP was appointed, with a new title of both Associate Provost and Associate Vice President, and who reports jointly to the Provost and the President. A new director will be arriving on campus in August 2012. The new director’s agenda will be to continue to expand and provide coherence to the University’s many international activities and to increase their visibility.

III.C: The Physical Environment of the Campus [Standard 3]

As indicated in Section II, there is an ongoing effort to both reduce the backlog of deferred maintenance on the physical infrastructure of the campus, and to develop new construction and substantial renovations to support the educational enterprise. The University has had recent success in securing Capital Improvement Funds from the state to address infrastructure needs. Planning for new buildings as well as renovations to existing facilities is strongly influenced by the priorities established in the Strategic Plan, with the goal of supporting the academic and research mission of the University.

III.C.1: Major Campus Construction and Renovation

Highlights of major projects that are either underway or are planned to begin within the next five years are identified below.

- An $80M Physical Sciences Complex, for which construction is scheduled to be complete in FY 2014, will provide new office and high quality laboratory space for the departments of Physics and Astronomy, the Institute for Physical Sciences, and the Joint Quantum Institute.

- The Edward Saint John Learning and Teaching Center, with projected cost of $45M, will provide new state-of-the-art classroom facilities in the center of campus. The building is expected to accommodate approximately 2000 students in a mix of large lecture halls and interactive classrooms. Construction is scheduled to begin in FY 2015, to be available for instruction in Fall 2016.

- A remote storage facility for library materials will free up space within McKeldin Library for substantially more student traffic and to create additional, well supported, learning spaces;

- A new Bioengineering building will support the University’s accelerated growth in both research and instruction in this rapidly growing interdisciplinary area.

- A new residence facility, Oakland Hall, opened in August 2011 for 709 residents. A 231,700 sq. ft. building, Oakland Hall has eight residential floors and seminar space for the Office of Resident Life’s academic enrichment center. The building recently received LEED Gold certification.

- Construction is scheduled to begin in June 2012 for another new residence facility, Prince Frederick Hall, which will accommodate 462 undergraduate students on six residential floors, and two new living-learning academic programs.
III.C.2: East Campus Development

The community directly surrounding the College Park Campus was identified in the Strategic Plan as a “threat” to advancing the University’s goals. The city of College Park itself is a wonderful community, but economic development of the region has been stagnant for decades, with limited amenities that are attractive to the academic community. New development would greatly benefit both the local community and the university. For many years there has been a plan to develop the section of University property to the east of the major closest North-South artery, referred to as East Campus. This development project would bring a more urban, pedestrian-oriented town center to College Park with a district of retail, residential, much-needed affordable graduate housing, hotel, and entertainment uses. The value to the University is to create a district that is more attractive to faculty and students at a major research university, and provide affordable housing in the region, particularly for graduate students. After a failed start due to the economic downturn, in 2010 the University successfully identified a highly respected development firm to work with. The first phase of development will include a hotel/conference facility, graduate student housing, and retail amenities to the northernmost section adjacent to the campus.

III.C.3: The University of Maryland Research Park: M Square

The University has created substantial opportunities for partnerships with federal agencies and private companies just a mile away, through the development of the University of Maryland Research Park. “M Square” (http://www.msquare.umd.edu) includes both UMCP initiatives and those in a public-private partnership between the University and the Corporate Office Properties Trust. It offers flexible space locations for startup companies and build-to-suit options for larger technology clients. When fully built out, M Square will encompass two million square feet and employ an estimated 6,500 people. It is quickly becoming a major center for climate and environmental science; current occupants include the Earth System Science Interdisciplinary Center, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA), the Joint Global Change Research Institute, and NOAA’s Center for Weather and Climate Prediction. This focus on the environment in M Square complements new educational opportunities including a new Bachelor of Science degree program in Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences (as of Fall 2011), and a new Council on the Environment that will provide a network for interdisciplinary research through collaboration among the many activities in environmental science across campus and in M Square.

Additional occupants that have developed close research relationships with the University include the Federal Department of Agriculture’s (FDA) Center for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition, which has led to the UMD/FDA Joint Institute for Food Safety and Applied Nutrition; the National Foreign Language Center and the Center for the Advanced Study of Language, which have a partnership with our programs in Second Language Acquisition and languages; and the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity (I-ARPA). Research collaborations with these groups are expected to grow in coming years as the new tenants become fully established.

III.D: “MPower Maryland”: Partnering with the University of Maryland, Baltimore [Standards 2, 3, 4, 11, and 13]

In Spring 2011, the Maryland State Legislature directed the University System of Maryland’s Board of Regents to consider the pros and cons of merging the two campuses, in College Park and Baltimore, into a single University of Maryland. In response, the Board oversaw a comprehensive study that involved UMCP and UMB community members and representatives from all USM institutions. The Board of Regents concluded that the risks and disadvantages of complete merger of the two institutions
outweighed the advantages, and instead embraced a more limited but structured collaboration that has resulted in a framework entitled “MPower” (http://mpowermaryland.com). Under this new working relationship, the two campuses will combine their highly complementary resources and expertise to provide new opportunities in education, research, and innovation and entrepreneurship to the State of Maryland. A broad implementation strategy was approved by the Regents in March 2012, which includes the following initiatives:

- A new academic vision for Montgomery County, centered at the Universities at Shady Grove (as described above).
- A Collaborative School of Public Health, in which accredited Master of Public Health degrees on both campuses would be combined into a single program. This relationship builds upon the existing, fully-accredited School of Public Health at UMCP and the department of epidemiology and public health within UMB’s School of Medicine which hosts an accredited MPH program. Accreditation of the collaborative school is expected to be granted upon receipt of a letter of intent to form the school and will be reviewed formally by the accrediting body, the Council on Education for Public Health, in two years.
- The formation of a new joint organization, UM Ventures, to promote technology transfer and commercialization through collaborative leadership and a unified set of services between the two institutions.
- Enhancements to the existing collaboration between the two campuses in Bioengineering and the health sciences, particularly pharmacy, including opportunities for joint faculty appointments, collaborative research, and joint degree programs.
- Establishment of a new Center for Biomedical Informatics and Imaging, jointly developed between UMCP’s Institute for Advanced Computer Studies and UMB’s School of Medicine.

Additional opportunities will include joint educational programs, a seed grant program in basic and translational research, and joint library access. Detailed planning in all of these activities has begun. All parties involved recognize that new financial resources will be required to execute this plan. The collaboration will be led by a steering committee, jointly appointed by and reporting to the presidents of the two institutions, who will then report to the University System Chancellor. The steering committee currently consists of the chief academic officers of each institution and the chiefs of staff of the two presidents. A timeline for implementation of the planned activities awaits the commitment of the resources required for their execution.

**Summary**

By 2013, the Strategic Plan will be in its fifth year. The period during the plan’s first five years has been one of significant budget stringency as well as one with significant changes in leadership. It is, in fact, a remarkable testament to the quality of the planning process that the University has continued to annually review its progress against the benchmarks established by the Strategic Plan, and succeeded in accomplishing the goals outlined within. As with the Middle States accreditation process, it is typical to carry out a periodic review of the 10-year Strategic Plan after approximately five years, to review accomplishments, and identify new challenges and opportunities.
Section IV: Enrollment and Financial Trends and Projections

The University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP) is a constituent of the University System of Maryland (USM). UMCP's operating expenditures of approximately $1,688M are funded from a number of sources. In FY 2012, unrestricted revenues, approximately $1,274M, included $413M of direct state appropriation, $453M from tuition and fees, $237M of “auxiliary enterprise” income from, for example, student housing, parking, and intercollegiate athletics, and $86M in government and private gifts and grants.

The state allocation portion of the budget is determined annually by the Governor and the Maryland General Assembly, upon the recommendation of the Board of Regents. Tuition and fee levels are proposed by the institution and require the Regents’ approval. Capital expenditures normally may be funded through annual direct state appropriation or through debt issued by the USM, which then requires repayment from institutional resources.

While the Regents have oversight over all the resources of the University, they delegate to the President broad authority concerning their management and use. The President testifies annually before the General Assembly, before the University community, and elsewhere concerning institutional achievements, goals, and resources use and needs.

Enrollment projection planning at the University is a collaborative process led by the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) and involves a number of steps. First, the Associate Vice President for IRPA and the IRPA Director of Enrollment Policy and Planning meet with the Provost, the Associate Vice President for Academic Services and other senior leaders to review enrollment trends and determine input targets (new freshmen, transfer, graduate students, etc.). The Strategic Plan provides the framework for this discussion so that changes in enrollment strategy support the plan’s institutional priorities and strategies. The targets are then entered into a complex model that provides both headcount and FTE projections, which are then reviewed and refined. The process occurs every fall and spring, with adjustments made as necessary during the budget development cycle.

IV.A Enrollment Trends and Projections

Tables IV.1.a shows student enrollment over the last five years. While enrollments of incoming students have decreased following the guidance of the Strategic Plan, the total number of students on campus has increased slightly over five years due to improvements in retention rates. The distribution of students by race and ethnicity is not shown in the table, primarily due to changes in the reporting categories in 2010 that makes five-year comparisons difficult. This information is available through the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (https://www.irpa.umd.edu), and indicates that the percentage of undergraduate students who self-identify as “White:U.S.” has declined, from 59% in 2001 to 56% in 2011. This trend reflects the changing demographics in the region. As shown in Table IV.1.b, about 25% of our undergraduates receive a degree in a STEM discipline. While the total number of STEM bachelor’s degrees has increased, this proportion has been relatively stable for the last decade.

Demographic changes are less dramatic at the graduate level, to which students are recruited nationally and internationally. In 2001, 52% of graduate students self-identified as “White:U.S.”, while that number was 49% in 2011. About 25% of our graduate students are identified as international. They represent approximately 22% of masters degrees awarded annually and approximately 36% of doctoral degrees. International graduate students are distributed unevenly across campus, with the largest proportion in Smith School of Business, in the College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences, and in the Clark School Engineering.
### Table IV.1.a: Enrollment trends over the last five years. Breakdown by race and ethnicity is not shown here because of the change in federal reporting categories between Fall 2009 and Fall 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>23780</td>
<td>24383</td>
<td>24617</td>
<td>24841</td>
<td>24697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New first-time</td>
<td>4237</td>
<td>3915</td>
<td>4202</td>
<td>3993</td>
<td>3994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transfers</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>2471</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>2103</td>
<td>2101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12,494</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>12,583</td>
<td>12,634</td>
<td>12,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13,363</td>
<td>13,775</td>
<td>13,959</td>
<td>14,288</td>
<td>14,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>6844</td>
<td>6934</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>7095</td>
<td>7536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>3624</td>
<td>3269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>5,066</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>5,058</td>
<td>5,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,215</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>5,552</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>5,793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IV.1.d: Bachelor’s degree production (count of majors), as well as degrees conferred in the three colleges that largely constitute the STEM disciplines. This table does not reflect additional individual departments with a STEM focus in colleges or schools that are largely non-STEM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Bachelor Degrees Awarded</td>
<td>6,847</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>6,805</td>
<td>7,177</td>
<td>7,038</td>
<td>7,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Natural Resources</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer, Math &amp; Natural Sciences</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. James Clark School of Engineering</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM Degrees</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>1,622</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% STEM Degrees</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables IV.1.c and IV.1.d show retention and graduation rates for undergraduates, separately for full-time, degree-seeking, new first-year students and for new transfer students who came to UMCP in (and were retained in) their junior year. Retention rates are a full 10 percentage points higher than in the mid-1990’s, and graduation rates have increased by about 15%, both for new first-time students and for
transfer students. They have continued to increase in the last five years, with now almost 95% of starting students returning after their first year. Continued efforts to improve retention and graduate are discussed further in Section II.B.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>After 1 Year</th>
<th>After 2 Years</th>
<th>After 3 Years</th>
<th>After 4 Years</th>
<th>After 5 Years</th>
<th>After 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 01</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 02</td>
<td>3,886</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 03</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>4,192</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>3,898</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>4,191</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>3,922</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV.1.c: Retention and graduation rates for full-time, degree-seeking, new first-year students. For years 1-3, percentages include those retained or graduated. For years 4-6, percentages include only those that graduated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>After 1 Year</th>
<th>After 2 Years</th>
<th>After 3 Years</th>
<th>After 4 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 01</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 02</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 03</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 04</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 05</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 06</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 07</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 08</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 09</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 10</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV.1.d: Retention and graduation rates for students who transferred to UMCP from other institutions and were retained in their junior year.

The University graduates approximately 600 doctoral students and 2400 master’s degree students annually, as well as a very small number of first professional degrees (less than 40). The median time to degree for a doctoral student, accumulated over all doctoral programs, is 6.3 years, with very little
change over the last decade. Tables IV.1.e and IV.1.f show the retention and graduation rates for students in master’s and doctoral degree programs, respectively.

### Graduation rates in program with a Masters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>After 2 Years</th>
<th>After 4 Years</th>
<th>After 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 01</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 02</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,457</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 03</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>1,926</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>1,862</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>1,857</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08</td>
<td>2,174</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,778</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09</td>
<td>2,185</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 10</td>
<td>2,371</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>2,336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IV.1.e:** Graduation rates for students who began in a master’s degree program. The report matches the student’s start in the program to subsequent degree records at the same class level. Note that the fiscal year begins on July 1, and so FY 06 includes Fall 2005 and Spring 2006.

### Graduated in a program with a Doctorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort Size</th>
<th>After 6 Years</th>
<th>After 8 Years</th>
<th>After 10 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 00</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>421</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 01</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>473</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>518</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 02</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>553</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 03</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>527</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 04</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 05</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 06</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 07</td>
<td>852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08</td>
<td>871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09</td>
<td>882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 10</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 11</td>
<td>772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 12</td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table IV.1.f:** Graduation rates for students who began in a doctoral degree program. See notes for Table IV.1.e.
Enrollment projections over 10 years are reported annually to the University System of Maryland (USM). The most recent report is included in Appendix J. These projections reflect UMCP’s response to USM’s 2020 Strategic Plan, and are further discussed in Section III.A.1.

**IV.B: Financial Trends and Projections**

Table IV.2.a shows annual institutional revenues and expenditures in broad categories as they appear in the Governor’s Budget Book. While there has been some modest growth in the budget, operating expenses have grown at twice the rate of the state appropriation. Capital budget authorizations and projections are shown in Table IV.2.b. The basis for projections is the Governor’s FY 2012-FY 2016 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and the University System of Maryland’s FY 2012-FY 2016 System Funded Construction Program (SFCP). The budgets vary considerably from year to year as they reflect specific construction and renovation projects. Projects such as student housing and development in the East Campus and M Square are not included in these budgets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNRESTRICTED REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>350,067</td>
<td>380,843</td>
<td>399,434</td>
<td>418,865</td>
<td>442,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriation</td>
<td>370,689</td>
<td>396,174</td>
<td>394,417</td>
<td>397,956</td>
<td>396,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Investment Fund</td>
<td>15,618</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>15,353</td>
<td>15,576</td>
<td>15,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>191,692</td>
<td>209,779</td>
<td>215,685</td>
<td>215,990</td>
<td>224,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Gift &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>64,516</td>
<td>72,225</td>
<td>75,626</td>
<td>80,290</td>
<td>90,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>53,828</td>
<td>58,642</td>
<td>72,549</td>
<td>49,576</td>
<td>12,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>1,317,546</td>
<td>1,432,705</td>
<td>1,505,716</td>
<td>1,554,967</td>
<td>1,594,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTRICTED REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>204,824</td>
<td>217,187</td>
<td>234,119</td>
<td>275,398</td>
<td>308,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>43,579</td>
<td>50,965</td>
<td>52,103</td>
<td>51,345</td>
<td>53,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>38,351</td>
<td>46,891</td>
<td>46,165</td>
<td>49,972</td>
<td>50,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>1,317,546</td>
<td>1,432,705</td>
<td>1,505,716</td>
<td>1,554,967</td>
<td>1,594,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURES (in $1000)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>1,317,546</td>
<td>1,432,705</td>
<td>1,505,716</td>
<td>1,554,967</td>
<td>1,594,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Wages, &amp; Fringes</td>
<td>827,166</td>
<td>875,643</td>
<td>928,386</td>
<td>944,441</td>
<td>980,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>484,247</td>
<td>548,558</td>
<td>568,415</td>
<td>601,977</td>
<td>605,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical &amp; Special Fees</td>
<td>6,133</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>8,915</td>
<td>8,549</td>
<td>8,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table IV.2.a: Fiscal Trends from FY 2007 to FY 2011. Revenues and Expenditures are in $1,000. The funds called “Higher Education Investment Fund” are state-allocated from a variable annual return on state investments, a portion of which is designated for the support of higher education. They vary year by year and are not part of the base appropriation.*
### CAPITAL BUDGET AUTHORIZATIONS (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Budget</td>
<td>88,154</td>
<td>81,104</td>
<td>151,970</td>
<td>64,123</td>
<td>81,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>20,715</td>
<td>28,800</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>17,318</td>
<td>46,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Funded Construction Program</td>
<td>61,235</td>
<td>46,100</td>
<td>122,780</td>
<td>39,745</td>
<td>27,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facilities Renewal</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>7,090</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL BUDGET PROJECTIONS (in $1,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Capital Budget</td>
<td>87,295</td>
<td>108,165</td>
<td>74,740</td>
<td>91,930</td>
<td>69,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Program</td>
<td>35,100</td>
<td>48,035</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>38,050</td>
<td>31,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Funded Construction Program</td>
<td>44,895</td>
<td>52,830</td>
<td>49,640</td>
<td>46,580</td>
<td>30,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Facilities Renewal</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table IV.2.b: Capital Budget authorizations (in $1000) from FY 2007 to FY 2011, and projections (in $1000), from FY 2012 to FY 2016. The amounts for FY 2007 through FY 2012, and the FY 2013 CIP and Capital Facilities Renewal funds, are actual authorizations. The “Capital Improvement Program” refers to funding through state funds or academic revenue bonds and includes renovation projects over $1M. The “System Funded Construction Program” refers to funding through institutional funds or auxiliary revenue bonds, to be repaid by institutional funds. The “Capital Facilities Renewal” row refers to state funded renewal projects under $1M. Five-year projections are updated on a year-by-year basis.*

### GIFTS RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GIFTS (in $1,000)</td>
<td>119,250</td>
<td>128,460</td>
<td>108,995</td>
<td>104,445</td>
<td>105,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF DONORS</td>
<td>35,978</td>
<td>34,023</td>
<td>32,320</td>
<td>30,464</td>
<td>30,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE GIFT (in $)</td>
<td>3,322</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>3,372</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>3,406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table IV.2.c: Fund Raising Trends, FY 2007 to FY 2012.*
Section V: Institutional Effectiveness and Student Learning

The relationship between assessment of student learning and its influence on continuing improvements to our academic offerings is introduced in some depth in Section II.B.6, in response to the four internal recommendations centered on this topic. There we describe the Provost’s Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment and its role in the development of an infrastructure for institutionalizing assessment practices across campus. Here we develop the discussion a bit further and describe additional assessment practices that influence student learning and success.

More detail on assessment of student learning is also provided in the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment (SLOAR) report, submitted annually to the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The first full cycle of assessment of undergraduate and graduate programs was completed in 2010. The 2011 SLOAR report, included as Appendix O, contains numerous specific examples of assessment results and changes in curriculum that resulted.

At the conclusion of the first four-year cycle, the review process for undergraduate programs was streamlined, with units providing a brief annual report of assessment results, plans for the coming year, and any changes implemented in the prior year. The first cycle of these reports was submitted in Fall 2011. Following review of these materials by the Undergraduate College Coordinators, refinement of the guidance provided to undergraduate programs continued. A set of materials that include a Best Practices document, a rubric to indicate expectations for learning outcomes assessment in the programs, and a template for providing an annual summary of activities, can be found at the Learning Outcomes Assessment Web site: http://www.umd.edu/LearningOutcomes.

The vast majority of graduate programs provided annual reports to the Commission during the first four-year cycle, and in the final year four-year plan, all programs provided overall assessments. As discussed in Section II.B.6, the graduate and undergraduate processes have been separated to allow for a more tailored process at the graduate level. Planning for a new process for graduate outcomes assessment began in Fall 2010, with an initial focus on doctoral programs. More details are in Section V.B below.

We note here that, while not discussed in detail in this report, there is a substantial and growing culture of assessment among the many student-focused initiatives that are not part of the formal educational curriculum. The Division of Student Affairs maintains a Web site for assessment and research on activities and initiatives within the Center for Campus Life and the University Counseling Center. Many reports can be found there (http://www.studentaffairs.umd.edu/research.asp). In addition, the Campus Assessment Working Group (http://www.umd.edu/CAWG) carries out numerous studies to gather and exchange information about the overall experiences of students across campus. These reports inform the educational process in important ways. Two recent reports, one on student finances and another on graduate students are included in Appendix K. Online course evaluations also contribute to analysis of faculty teaching and student learning, and aspects of the course evaluations are used in the appointment, promotion, and tenure process as well as in annual merit reviews. The details of the course evaluation process can be found at https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/crs_eval.shtml.

Four examples of how learning outcomes are becoming embedded in the academic and functional processes of the University are shared below.

V.A: Program Management and Review

Learning Outcomes, and a plan for their assessment, are required at both the course and program level for new courses and programs. Proposals for new programs, or significant changes in program curricula, follow a multi-step process of review. They are first either developed or given a thorough review by a
departmental Programs, Curricula, and Courses (PCC) committee, then equivalently by a college PCC committee before signoff by the college dean. Undergraduate programs proceed to a Senate PCC committee. Graduate programs undergo review by the Graduate PCC committee, and in some cases by the full Graduate Council, prior to this step. Review of curriculum changes is complete at this step. Review of a new program proposal proceeds to the University Senate for a vote of endorsement before approval by the provost and then president. Once campus approval is granted, new programs undergo further review by the USM Board of Regents and by the Maryland Higher Education Commission.

Individual courses are reviewed through the Vice President’s Advisory Committee (VPAC), a group largely consisting of assistant and associate deans who oversee the large operations of course delivery within their colleges and schools. Course proposals are submitted via an online form that requires course learning outcomes and a generic syllabus. Proposals are reviewed at the department, college and campus level with final course approval by the provost’s representative.

According to University policy, each academic unit is expected to undergo a thorough review of its faculty, organization, and academic programs on a seven-year cycle. The portion of the review related to academic programs feeds into the University System of Maryland process for academic program review. The policy for academic unit review is included in Appendix I, along with the policies for review of deans and of department chairs and directors (both of which are carried out on a five-year cycle). The process includes a self-study, an external review by experts in the discipline, and then an evaluation by the dean, culminating in a meeting with the provost and other senior administrators in which recommendations are provided. For the undergraduate programs, academic units are expected to reflect on their learning outcomes assessment process and how it has influenced any changes to the program since the last review. As the graduate outcomes assessment process continues to develop it will also be codified in the graduate program review criteria. The impact of a culture of learning outcomes assessment is becoming evident, as these examples illustrate.

- The Department of English completed its unit review in 2009. Analysis of assessments in the undergraduate program revealed a need for more structure in the major in the third year curriculum, with a particular focus on student writing. New 300-level courses in writing about literature, pedagogy workshops for faculty, and a section of Professional Writing aimed at students interested in graduate work in the humanities are under development.

- The Department of Materials Science and Engineering completed its unit review in 2011. Its Self Study details its extensive assessment process linked to its accreditation by ABET. It clearly articulates the program’s learning objectives, benchmarks for achieving them, and the process of review. One particular course, ENMA 471 (“Kinetics, Diffusion and Phase Transformations”), was significantly modified to incorporate more exposure to modern literature and coordinated student presentations to better develop students’ critical analysis and communication skills.

- The Department of Animal Science completed its Self Study in 2011. It identified a stronger need in its graduate program for students to learn to draw conclusions from their research, anticipate new directions in their field, and to better develop their presentation skills. The department is working on improvements to research seminar courses to give students more opportunity to practice these skills.

As the assessment process continues to mature, we anticipate that most of the unit review self studies will use the student learning outcomes materials and assessment results as means of refining their curricula.
V.B: Graduate Outcomes Assessment

The first full cycle of graduate program assessments revealed a need for a different style and focus of assessment for graduate-level instruction. At the doctoral level, programs tend to be smaller, take longer to complete, and the core of most programs is individualized research work outside of the classroom. Data in sufficient quantity to be usable for feedback for program improvement comes at a slower pace than for undergraduate programs. However, reports from the initial four-year cycle do indicate that programs have used these data to implement improvements.

In recognition of these facts, the graduate assessment process at UMCP is evolving in new and important directions, although it will continue to be closely coordinated with the undergraduate assessment process. A working group was formed in 2010, comprised of faculty and administrators from seven colleges and schools. They worked throughout the AY 2010-2011. Groups consisting of department chairs, graduate directors, and graduate faculty reviewed draft criteria and guidelines, and reviewed and reaffirmed the fundamental principles that should inform doctoral-level outcomes assessment. These include the recognition of significant disciplinary differences within doctoral education and the fact that successful doctoral education entails the student’s creating new knowledge, and not just learning existing knowledge.

A Graduate Outcomes Assessment Committee was created to manage the new process. A set of materials that includes general guidelines for assessment criteria, a timetable for reporting, guidance on the differences between benchmarking and assessment, as well as a set of broad recommendations from the Directors of Graduate Studies from each unit are available to academic units through the Graduate School’s Web site, http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/DGOA.html. Recommendations for benchmarks throughout the graduate program are provided, as well as a set of “best-practice” examples from across campus, each of which uses a different process or set of rubrics and will serve as a diverse set of templates for the first new cycle of review. As of early 2012, academic units have submitted assessment plans to the Graduate Outcomes Assessment Committee and first reports are expected in Fall 2012. Because of the slower time scale for data collection, reports will be submitted bi-annually. The initial reports are likely to be based on data accumulated from both the old and the new process, until the first full cycle is complete.

A separate plan for assessment of masters programs, which is likely to be a hybrid between the doctoral and undergraduate assessment processes, will also be developed and this work is expected to begin in AY 2012-2013.

V.C: The Kuali Student Project

The campus is in the process of implementing a new curriculum management system as part of the larger Kuali Student project, replacing our current mainframe and standalone student information systems. This system will be modular, open source, and standards-based. (Additional information can be found at http://www.kuali.org/ks). It is being developed, with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, by seven founding institutions, of which UMCP is one, and an additional five partner institutions. It will integrate into a single system the functionality of processes that are currently spread across several platforms and that are often challenged to communicate with each other. These include program proposal development and approval, course proposal submission and approval, scheduling, and student registration. Kuali Student is still in its development phase, and over the next several years modules will be made publicly available for any institution to adopt. The first module, Curriculum Management, was released publicly in March 2011 and implemented at UMCP as “Testudo CM” in April 2012.
As a founding institution, UMCP has been involved in design and development since the inception of this project. UMCP has been instrumental in designing and promoting functionality to support learning outcomes assessment. By dedicating our own development resources to creating this component, we have succeeded in having learning outcomes assessment functionality incorporated as an integral part of the curriculum management module. Identification of learning outcomes at the course and the program level are supported, either through category labels or as free text. The category labels are organized by type and include skills, accreditation elements, and subject-specific elements. Users can search for learning outcomes by keyword or category and copy them into a new course or program; this allows programs to re-use standard learning objectives when appropriate.

The combination of fully developed learning outcomes and category tags will facilitate searches of the curriculum inventory. Students will be able to search for courses based on learning outcomes and therefore could, in principle, select courses based on skills that they wish to acquire. Department heads and program managers can use the system to create a curriculum map, easily identifying the skills, subjects, and accreditation areas most frequently addressed in the courses as students make their way through to program completion. Representatives from partnering institutions have also embraced this functionality, and acknowledged that having the ability to develop and codify a collected set of learning outcomes will be a significant benefit.

V.D: General Education

As outlined in Section II.B.3.d, the University is currently in the process of implementing a new General Education program. Details of the plan are in Appendix F and at http://www.gened.umd.edu. The development of General Education is an example of how the University is practicing an outcomes approach to program design. All components of the new General Education program are defined by sets of learning objectives. As indicated in Section II.B.3.d, faculty committees defined the learning outcomes for each of the course categories, considering both field specific outcomes and expectations regarding the skills and knowledge that every student who earns a University of Maryland degree should acquire, regardless of their chosen major. Assessments from our existing CORE general education program and review of the pilot programs informed the work of the committees.

Every course that will be used to satisfy General Education requirements must be submitted for review regarding its alignment with the outcomes of the relevant area. This applies to both new courses and existing CORE general education courses. The first phase of this review process is nearly complete and it will continue as new courses are proposed. A custom Web-based course submission and review package was developed to support the review process. Those who submit courses are expected to “demonstrate how the course will (1) give students the ability to meet the learning objective and (2) determine that students were successful in meeting the learning objective.” This course application approach guides faculty to consider the design of their course according to the learning outcomes approach, and, because of the large number of faculty involved in the process, has served to support the campus commitment to learning outcomes directed student learning. The review process has already resulted in modifications to courses, even prior to delivery, to align them more closely with the new learning outcomes.

The ultimate success of the new General Education program will depend strongly on our assessment of its ability to meet the intended goals. While formal assessment of the learning outcomes for General Education will require the program to be well underway and is thus a few years off, the various faculty learning communities and review boards support the faculty who are at the forefront of its delivery and provide opportunities for informal assessment to proceed. In FY 2012, the Commission on Learning Outcomes Assessment will focus on assessment methods for the new categories of General Education:
Analytic Reasoning, Oral Communication, Scholarship in Practice, and the I-Series Courses, and for the two new diversity categories, Understanding Plural Societies and Cultural Competence. The General Education faculty boards will define the rubrics that will accompany the learning outcomes to be assessed in each category, and the Provost's Commission on Learning Outcomes will provide support by advising on the details, including the selection of the specific courses to be used in the assessment process.

The significant number of faculty communities now engaged in peer groups, review boards, and committees directed towards outcomes-directed student learning provides a platform for sustaining and improving the effectiveness of assessment in our instructional process, as well as opportunities for faculty professional development.
Section VI: Linked Institutional Planning and Budgeting Processes

Because several of the internal recommendations of the 2007 Self Study had to do with issues related to the linkage between institutional planning and budgeting processes, Section II of this report contains much of the background that would otherwise be in this part of the report. Here we provide a few key examples of how this linkage is evident in specific campus initiatives.

IV.A: The Strategic Plan and Resource Allocation

As discussed in Section II, the Strategic Plan has a central role in linking planning and budgeting processes that promote continuing improvements in the quality of our institution. The Strategic Plan establishes both broad goals and specific strategies. Its implementation has focused on the role of planning in resource allocation, assessment, and continuing innovation. Success rests on following planning with an analysis of resource use and in-depth assessment at every level of the University. At the division level, planning is ongoing, with major priorities identified and resources committed by the President to meet the highest of those. Additional discussion of this process can be found in Section II.A.1.

The annual reallocation of 2% of the University’s resources each year also plays a vital role. Reallocation occurs across all divisions and colleges, creating a continuing opportunity to reallocate resources to highest priority activities. Within the Division of Academic Affairs, annual reallocation provides funds that are redirected to a wide variety of educational, research, or other goals within each college. Oversight by the Provost helps to assure that budgeting decisions are consistent with agreed-upon priorities. The University has taken advantage of this opportunity for reallocation in both good and bad budget times. Reallocation strategies within the division of Academic Affairs are described in Section II.A.2. Several examples below illustrate links between planning, assessment, and resource allocation that have made major contributions to teaching and research.

VI.B: Planning and Financial Support for General Education

Development of the General Education program (see section II.B.3.d: Foundational Education: General Education) has required close integration of educational planning and financial models to support development of new instruction. While the net number of credits required in the new General Education plan is unchanged from the existing CORE program, some redistribution of instructional responsibilities across colleges and departments is expected. For example, the new plan reduces the number of courses required in the Distributive Studies category by one course and broadens these categories such that all academic colleges should be able to contribute, including the professional schools. Within CORE, most courses were delivered by just a few colleges: Arts & Humanities, Behavioral and Social Sciences, and the two natural science colleges (which in 2011 were combined into a single College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences). However, the new plan also requires a course in Oral Communication of all students, adding demands to the specific departments with the requisite expertise to deliver this type of instruction, as well as additional requirements in Mathematics and Writing.

During FY 2010-2012 in the initial planning and implementation phase of the new General Education, financial incentives were provided to academic units across all disciplines to develop courses for the signature component of the new program, the I-Series courses. Instructors received a one-time payment to develop a new course and a teaching assistant for each course with more than 60 students enrolled. I-series courses were first offered in Spring 2010 under this plan, and new courses have been created each semester thereafter.
As the campus transitions to full implementation of the new plan, a more complex financial model has been created to support course offerings when new freshmen enter the program in Fall 2012. Permanent financial support for instruction in writing, mathematics, oral communication will be provided based on enrollment. In response to a call for proposals, a number of colleges have developed courses in oral communication that will be taught at both lower- and upper-division levels, receiving additional resources. The new I-series funding model is designed to meet the “transition” costs of offering new courses, with funding for each new course phased out over a three year period from its first offering. Following the three-year transition funding period, programs are expected to incorporate the costs into their overall teaching budgets. Incremental funding is based on enrollment, providing incentives for programs to modify or create new courses as student interests evolve. New assessment tools will be developed to evaluate instructional demands after the program begins. The University will have allocated approximately $3M by FY 2017 in I-series transition funding, targeted to serve approximately 16,000 students annually when fully implemented in FY 2017. Approximately two thirds of this funding will have been committed in FY 2013 and 2014, when the number of seats offered in I-Series courses should reach 12,000.

**IV.C: Expanding Large-scale Multidisciplinary Sponsored Research**

An extensive planning and resource allocation process underlies the University’s success in expanding interdisciplinary sponsored research. Planning in the Division of Research includes identifying prospective grant opportunities and providing mentoring, networking with federal and corporate partners, and other assistance to faculty researchers in the development of proposals. Assembling large teams of researchers is promoted by the division’s Research Development Committee, comprised of associate deans or other research representatives of every college and school, which helps identify faculty researchers from different disciplines with relevant expertise.

Financial support includes funds to conduct exploratory research, make site visits, complete proposals, and provide required matching funds. University support continues through the life of many funded projects, providing facilities and covering costs essential to the activity that cannot be charged to grants. The Divisions of Research and Academic Affairs are partners in many of these resource commitments, with decisions reflecting continuing assessment of the opportunities to expand activities over the life of the grant. Planning, assessment, and funding decisions often take place over a relatively short time period. One source of financial support is through Designated Research Initiative Funding (DRIF), which provides resources for equipment, graduate assistants, and other costs, as well as infrastructure and other costs in startup packages for new faculty. Additional details on how DRIF funds are allocated are found in Section II.A.3. This resource allocation process has helped to create many of the University’s largest research initiatives, in areas that include health information technology, the environment, energy, and the future of information.

In 2011, the University created the Maryland Council on the Environment to promote further expansion of the University’s programs related to the environment and to increase their visibility. The Council is to serve as an advisory group to the University on research, education, outreach, and economic development, and to place the University at the forefront of environmental and earth system science. The Council will coordinate strategic efforts extending core research competencies, develop new partnerships with the public and private sector, and create new interdisciplinary funding opportunities. The Council will work closely with unit heads throughout the University, state and federal agencies, and companies and foundations. The Council director reports to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President and Chief Research Officer, and is supported by funds from the Divisions of Academic Affairs and Research and from three major colleges.
VI.D: Living-Learning Programs and other Special Offerings

The development of new undergraduate curricular opportunities is a continuing process of creative design of new programs, assessment of existing programs, and reallocation to support new initiatives. Assessment of living learning and other special offerings by the Provost’s Committee on Living-Learning Programs, using a common evaluation framework considering student interest and success, has helped to identify areas for improvement or opportunities for new programs. The details of how these programs are assessed and kept fresh are in section II.B.3.a. Here we focus on how they are financially supported.

New programs in Honors, College Park Scholars, or in interdisciplinary areas have been developed through a competitive call for proposals from the Provost, with programs initially financed by cost-sharing between academic units and the Provost. Permanent funding is typically provided to the sponsoring college after the program has proven to be successful. In the last three years this process has supported the following developments:

- Three new living-learning programs within the Honors College: **Digital Cultures and Creativity**, a highly interdisciplinary program that builds on expertise in digital humanities and computing, **Integrated Life Sciences**, which has a strong focus on biomedical research and education, and **Entrepreneurship and Innovation**, which has a collaborative business and engineering focus on developing innovative solutions to contemporary problems;

- Two new programs within College Park Scholars with a global focus: **Science and Global Change**, and **Global Public Health**, as well as a **Global Communities** Living-Learning program;

- Two new minor programs with a highly interdisciplinary component: the minor in Global Studies, and in Sustainability Studies, offered jointly by the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the School of Public Policy;

- The **Blended Learning Initiative**, which is providing funding on a competitive basis to develop a suite of high quality courses that use a mix of face-to-face and online interactions to enhance student learning opportunities in areas that are particularly challenging for either students, because of conceptual difficulty of the material, or faculty, because of large enrollments. Ten courses were funded and are being initially delivered in Spring 2012.

In each case, the strategy has been to put the financial resources directly into the colleges, academic units, or in the Blended Learning Initiative, to the faculty, who provide the provide oversight, management and instruction. This entrepreneurial model has worked well to stimulate new initiatives while at the same time giving faculty a sense of ownership of the curriculum.

IV.E: Doctoral Program Review and Revision

As discussed in Section II.B.5, in 2008 and 2009 a comprehensive review of all doctoral programs on campus was carried out, with the goal of optimizing their size to produce an excellent student body that is both mentored well and financially supported. Academic units provided data on student quality, time-to-degree, financial support, and career placements, within a context of the national norms for their specific disciplines. The Graduate School analyzed the data, provided summary reports to each college or school, met with each dean, and then, after discussion, made recommendations on admissions targets, taking both student quality and yield into account. An important consideration in the right-sizing exercise was managing the available resources so that doctoral students could be fully supported through the majority of their academic career. The doctoral program review process provided a thorough baseline for ongoing assessment, analysis, and improvement.
This exercise also resulted in extensive discussion across campus and in self-assessments leading to comprehensive review in some programs. Two examples are the doctoral programs in the departments of English and Communication. Until recently, the Department of English had required a master’s degree for admission to the doctoral program. After a comprehensive review, both graduate programs were redesigned based on the anticipated career paths of applicants and enrolled students. A significantly smaller class of students is now recruited, they are admitted to the Ph.D. program directly from the baccalaureate, the number of courses was reduced, and strong advising practices were put in place to strengthen student scholarly and professional development. Strong benchmarks for assessing progress through the program are now in place. The program now focuses on a smaller group of students who are preparing for academic careers. The Master of Arts program remains in place for students who wish to pursue graduate study but who intend a career path in which a Ph.D. is not required; a Master of Arts in Rhetoric and Composition is an example. The Department of Communication has made similar changes to its graduate programs, modifying its first year curriculum, focusing recruitment and selection on those students planning to complete the doctorate, admitting students directly from the baccalaureate, and providing them with financial support for five years. Both departments expect that the programs will now be able to compete more successfully for the highest quality students, that retention and graduate rates will improve, and that time to degree will be shortened. Changes in these programs were implemented in Fall 2011.