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 MSCHÉ 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 http://www.provost.umd.edu/SP07/Implement/Reallocation_FY2010_Academic_Affairs.cfm).

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>T/TK</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</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</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T/TK</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non T/TK</td>
<td>Lect. &amp; Instr.</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>subtotal</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>1501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| T/TK         | total               | 2309    | 2392    | 2404    | 2435    | 2482    |

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.
### Research Faculty by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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](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

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](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](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 to 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 insure 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. 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.