

**Middle States Accreditation Review Report  
for the University of Maryland, College Park**

**Submitted by: Dr. Mark McNamee, Provost  
Virginia Tech**

**Dr. Sally Mason, Provost  
Purdue University**

**Campus visit by generalist reviewers conducted  
November 16 and 17, 2006**

## **Summary: Explanation of Report and Comments**

As generalists participating in the Middle States Commission on Higher Education accreditation review of the University of Maryland College Park, we were asked to review a series of standards and comment on whether each has been met. The standards under review were those not included as part of the Special Topics selected by the University of Maryland for its institutional self study. The specific standards under review were: 1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and selected elements of 10. The generalist review is a prelude to the larger, more comprehensive site review that will be conducted in the spring by the accreditation team chaired by Dr. Larry Faulkner.

We provide below our notes and commentary for each of the standards and subheadings. Text in italics represents areas where we suggest questions that might be pursued during the subsequent visit. These are merely suggestions and do not imply that a standard has not been met. Indeed, it was our assessment that **each of the standards has been met**, as can be seen from the narratives provided below.

We spent nearly an entire day reviewing documents and documentation and asking questions. By day 2, we began the process of drafting this report. The University of Maryland officials were all extremely helpful and accommodating. We were impressed by the well-developed self-study and the numbered roadmap that allowed us to access electronic sites readily from the text of road mapped standards. All of this fine preparation bodes well for the spring visit. The level of organization and the completeness of the work prepared for the accreditation visit speaks well of this very fine university. We had the opportunity to meet with Dr. Faulkner and with key university officials, including Provost William Destler, during our two day visit.

### **Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives**

The self study prepared for the University of Maryland begins with Standard 1, which includes links to the most current version of UM's mission statement. This statement is comprehensive, reaffirms what would be expected of an institution of the breadth and quality of UM, and focuses on five areas that intermesh well with the goals and priorities of the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) [see Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education]. The links lead to thorough documentation of the recent past and current state of mission vision and development.

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. clearly defined mission, goals, and objectives that:**

In addition to the most recent mission statement, links are provided to the Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes webpage, the timeline for establishment of the School of Public Health (new program), and relevant Senate actions and articles to further inform the review team of activities fundamental to mission.

Standard has been met.

**1a. guide faculty, administration, staff and governing bodies in making decisions related to planning, resource allocation, program and curriculum development, and definition of program outcomes:**

This section is organized to allow reviewers to assess statements by the President (**1a1**), reports to the MHEC (**1a2**), documents relevant to undergraduate education initiatives (**1a3.1**), graduate education and research initiatives (**1a3.2**), diversity initiatives (**1a3.3**), outreach and community partnership initiatives (**1a3.4**), and administrative, operational and physical infrastructure initiatives of the UM (**1a3.5**).

The documentation provided is thorough, informative, easy to track, and provides an excellent overview of the breadth and quality of ongoing initiatives that are hallmarks of this fine university.

Standard has been met.

**1b. include support of scholarly and creative activity, at levels and of the kinds appropriate to the institution's purposes and character:**

Although only a single link is provided as evidence of this standard, note that there is considerably more documentation provided via the link to initiative two and through the additional links that are part of **1a3.2** above.

Standard has been met.

**1c. are developed through collaborative participation by those who facilitate or are otherwise responsible for institutional improvement and developments:**

The links in this section lead the reviewers to a section of the university strategic plan and to the list of those who have participated in the planning process. The UM clearly intends to follow a similar participative process in the upcoming strategic planning initiative.

Standard has been met.

**1d. are formally approved, publicized and widely known by the institution's members:**

The procedure and evidence for this are well documented by text and links to relevant information at several sites, including links referred to above in **1a1**. The internal and

external vetting of plans and the planning process appear to be thorough and well conducted.

Standard has been met.

**2. mission, goals and objectives that relate to external as well as internal contexts and constituencies:**

This is covered within the current strategic plan, as indicated by appropriate links.

Standard has been met.

*How the next strategic plan will build on external partnerships and collaborations might be an interesting discussion for the review team.*

**3. institutional goals and objectives that are consistent with mission; and**

Again, it is clear that the current roadmap for UM has been its strategic plan. They are consistent and well-grounded in their references to the guiding force that this has played over the past five years.

Standard has been met.

**4. goals and objectives that focus on student learning, other outcomes, and institutional improvement.**

Understandably, this section refers to links that provide some depth to the learning and other outcomes goals and objectives. UM has attempted to weave these common themes throughout the self study. The issue of learning outcomes assessment, in particular, is discussed more completely in sections **8.4** and **8.7**.

Standard has been met.

**Standard 4: Leadership and Governance**

The documentation explaining the governance and hierarchy of governance at UM is extensive and complete. The links to each of the major pieces of governance, both internal and external, are easy to navigate and clearly explain how the university is structured internally and how it reports out externally. Especially impressive is the documentation provided from the MHEC, which oversees all of higher education in the state of Maryland. From their documents they appear to be a well-informed and knowledgeable governing body that has the background and insight to be effective advocates for higher ed.

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. a well-defined system of collegial governance including written policies outlining governance responsibilities of administration and faculty and readily available to the campus community;**

Shared governance appears to be strongly embedded within the UM culture. This is well documented by policy and procedure documents that can be easily accessed through the links provided in this section. The review team should be able to verify what appears to be a very healthy and collegial partnership between administration, faculty, student and staff leaders on campus by conversations with selected individuals during the campus visit. Relationships between administration and all aspects of the university would appear to be exemplars in higher education.

Standard has been met.

**2. written governing documents, such as a constitution, by-laws, enabling legislation, charter or other similar documents, that: a. delineates the governance structure and provide for collegial governance, the structure's composition, duties and responsibilities...; b. assign authority and accountability for policy development and decision making, including a process for the involvement of appropriate institutional constituencies in policy development and decision making; c. provide for the selection process for governing body members;**

The bylaws for the board of regents, the university, and the graduate council are laid out for examination in fine detail. Other relevant documents, including links to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Manual, the oversight functions of the Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses, and various advisory committees all provide good information on the various layers of governance and oversight that help guide the university in its planning and decision making.

Standard has been met.

**3. appropriate opportunity for student input regarding decisions that affect them:**

Students are well represented on all relevant governing boards and have ample voices in planning, policy, and fee-setting decisions. The links provided substantiate the membership of graduate and undergraduate students in these activities.

Standard has been met.

**4. a governing body capable of reflecting constituent and public interest and of an appropriate size to fulfill all its responsibilities, and which includes members with sufficient expertise to assure that the body's fiduciary responsibilities can be fulfilled;**

**5. a governing body not chaired by the CEO;**

A link to the membership list of the regents and to individual bios for each of the regents demonstrates the impressive group of people who have been selected to serve on UM's governing body. The board is not chaired by the chancellor, but by a member of the regents.

Standards have been met.

**6. a governing body that certifies to the Commission that the institution is in compliance with the eligibility requirements, accreditation standards and policies of the Commission; describes itself in identical terms to all its accrediting agencies; communicates any changes in its accredited status; and agrees to disclose information required by the Commission to carry out its accrediting responsibilities, including levels of governing body compensation, if any;**

The appropriate compliance statement is provided for review.

Standard has been met.

**7. a conflict of interest policy for the governing body (and fiduciary body members, if such a body exists), which addresses matters such as remuneration, contractual relationships, employment, family, financial or other interests that could pose conflicts of interest, and that assures that those interests are disclosed and that they do not interfere with the impartiality of governing body members or outweigh the greater duty to secure and ensure the academic and fiscal integrity of the institution;**

The documents linked to this item provide an overview of a broadly configured Ethics Policy and the relevant Maryland state code.

Standard has been met.

**8. a governing body that assists in generating resources needed to sustain and improve the institution.**

The regents (chair in particular) have clearly been vocal advocates for the university with the legislature and in other public venues. Examples are provided that support this observation.

Standard has been met.

**9. a process for orienting new members and providing continuing updates for current members of the governing body on the institution's mission, organization, and academic programs and objectives;**

Regular reports to the regents are mandated in the bylaws and have clearly been happening. Agendas, minutes, and central data bases all support that the governing body is well informed of the various activities at the UM.

Standard has been met.

**10. a procedure in place for the periodic objective assessment of the governing body in meeting stated governing body objectives;**

We found it curious that the evidence presented to demonstrate this item refers primarily to the public oversight provided by the press and other civic and business groups.

*A question for the review team might be to elaborate on this issue to understand whether there is indeed a periodic objective assessment of the effectiveness of their board. This may be a question more appropriate at the system level than at the UM individually.*

**11. a CEO, appointed by the governing board, with primary responsibility to the institution; and**

This is mandated by the regent's bylaws.

Standard has been met.

**12. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of institutional leadership and governance.**

Five year review of the president is mandated by the regents. Continuous reporting and assessment by the institution to the regents would appear to address the effectiveness of governance.

Standard has been met.

*If one assumes that institutional leadership is largely/solely the responsibility of the president, then this has been addressed as requested. If, however, institutions are led by leadership teams, with vice presidents, deans and even department heads playing important roles, then it is curious that all administrators are periodically reviewed (five-year intervals) except vice presidents. This might be a question for the review team to address. We did not view this as a serious deficiency; merely a curiosity.*

***See Institutional Response***

**Standard 5: Administration**

The links to the various administrative officers and offices are extensive and complete.

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. a CEO whose primary responsibility is to lead the institution toward the achievement of its goals and with responsibility for administration of the institution;**

The CEO's job description is well delineated by the regents (see links provided).

Standard has been met

**2. a CEO with the combination of academic background, professional training, and/or other qualities appropriate to the institution's mission;**

The president's bio impressively meets this standard.

**3. administrative leaders with appropriate skills, degrees and training to carry out their responsibilities and functions;**

The bios for each of the deans and vice presidents are provided and document an impressive array of administrative talent.

Standard has been met.

**4. qualified staffing appropriate to the goals, type, size, and complexity of the institution;**

The document "Who's Where" provides a comprehensive look at the overall administrative structure of each of the major units within the university. The organizational charts alone attest to the fine attention to staffing that has been paid at the UM.

Standard has been met.

**5. adequate information and decision-making systems to support the work of administrative leaders;**

Numerous sites where data and information about the university can be found are provided. These are good examples of the many and varied ways that administrators can inform themselves during decision making.

These sites and sources are typical for large universities and are more than adequate to demonstrate meeting this standard.

**6. clear documentation of the lines of organization and authority; and**

The extensive organizational charts referred to in 4 above and linked again here readily document the lines of authority.

Standard has been met.

#### **7. periodic assessment of the effectiveness of administrative structures and services.**

It was in this section that we learned that dean and unit chairs are reviewed at regular (five-year) intervals, but not vice presidents (see **12** under Standard **4**). Because this standard explicitly addresses structures and services, we see the information about deans and unit chairs as less critical to addressing this standard. Indeed, the documentation provided demonstrates good and effective program review processes in addition to the good and effective practices of regularly reviewing auxiliary services and units that support the university and its overall academic mission.

Standard has been met.

#### **Standard 6: Integrity**

**In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and ethical freedom.**

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. fair and impartial processes, published and widely available to address student grievances, such as alleged violations of institutional policies; The institution assures that student grievances are addressed promptly, appropriately, and equitably.**

The policies and documentation are comprehensive and detailed for both undergraduates and graduate students. Most of the policies are easily accessible in the catalogs as Appendices. The sexual harassment policy is Appendix B in the undergraduate catalog (it would be convenient to cite this in the report). The only weakness is a lack of documentation of the number of cases handled. Informal mediation is the preferred first step and no documentation occurs.

Standard has been met.

**2. fair and impartial practices in the hiring, evaluation and dismissal of employees;**

UM has an excellent set of detailed policies for faculty and staff, including non-tenure track faculty. The online faculty handbook provides an excellent resource for the most important policies and practices and could be featured more strongly in this section.

Standard has been met.

**3. sound ethical practices and respect for individuals through its teaching, scholarship/research, service, and administrative practice, including the avoidance of conflict of interest or the appearance of such conflict in all its activities and among all its constituents;**

Complete and comprehensive sets of policies exist covering conflict of interest, conflict of commitment, research policies, misconduct, integrity, information technology, classroom materials, etc.

*In several cases, the University System has policies that are similar in style and content to the University of Maryland College Park policies. Are the two policies fully consistent? If there is a difference, which policy takes precedence?*

*See Institutional Response*

A minor observation involves the use of an obscure term "Project Nethics" in describing IT policies. In looking at the documentation it is clear that the term is a contraction of "Net Ethics".

Standard has been met.

**4. equitable and appropriately consistent treatment of constituencies, as evident in such areas as student discipline, student evaluation, grievance procedures, faculty promotion, tenure, retention and compensation, administrative review, curricular improvement, and institutional governance and management;**

Comprehensive policies exist for student conduct, student honor system, merit pay and review systems. The "comprehensive report" is included as documentation of actions taken, but this report exists without any context (date, source of information, ownership). (A question about the policy: What happens to a student who commits an offense shortly before graduation? Is the degree withheld pending resolution?)

*See Institutional Response*

Standard has been met.

**5. a climate of academic inquiry and engagement supported by widely disseminated policies regarding academic and intellectual freedom;**

Statements about academic freedom and rights and responsibilities are strong. The reference to the existence of multidisciplinary centers does not seem highly relevant to the intent of this standard. (Several documents associated with these rights and responsibilities documents include re-statements of the non-discrimination policy. The specific list of items is not fully consistent among the different documents, although the intent is clear.)

Standard has been met.

**6. an institutional commitment to principles of protecting intellectual property rights;**

Clear and comprehensive policies exist for IP and copyright issues. As noted in item 6.3, the system and the campus have policies that look similar. Are they fully consistent? Whose policy prevails if there are differences?

*See Institutional Response*

Standard has been met.

**7. a climate that fosters respect among students, faculty, staff, and administration for a range of backgrounds, ideas, and perspectives;**

There exists a strong array of academic and support programs that promote diversity and equity for faculty, students, and staff. The Curriculum Transformation Project and the Consortium on Race, Gender, and Ethnicity provide good examples of projects that can support long-term and pervasive changes.

Standard has been met.

**8. honesty and truthfulness in public relations announcements, advertisements, and recruiting and admissions materials;**

The university has a large, active public relations operation and produces many materials. As a public university, they operate under intense public interest and scrutiny.

Standard has been met.

**9. reasonable continuing student access to paper or electronic catalogs;**

Undergraduate catalog is available in print and online form. Graduate catalog is online only. Both are comprehensive and available.

Standard has been met.

**10. when catalogs are available only electronically, the institution's web page provides a guide or index to catalog information for each catalog available electronically;**

**11. when catalogs are available only electronically, the institution archives copies of the catalogs as sections or policies are updated;**

Archiving is good. It was easier to find the graduate catalog starting from the university homepage than it was to find the undergraduate catalog.

Standards have been met.

**12. availability of factual information about the institution, such as the Middle States Commission on Higher Education annual data reporting, the self-study or periodic review report, the team report, and the Commission's action, accurately reported and made publicly available to the institution's community;**

Complete information is available online. The Common Data Set available through the institutional research web page is very good.

Standard has been met.

**13. institutional information provided in a manner that ensures student and public access, such as print, electronic, or video presentation;**

The web site is comprehensive and access to all information is good.

Standard has been met.

**14. fulfillment of all applicable standards and reporting and other requirements of the Commission;**

This process of review demonstrates fulfillment of this standard. Previous reports and updates were available for review.

**15. periodic assessment of the integrity evidenced in institutional policies, processes, practices, and the manner in which these are implemented.**

Documents provide evidence of faculty senate review and proposed revisions of policies. (Links to the underlying senate documents were not active, but the summary statements provide evidence of active review and implementation.)

Standard has been met.

## **Standard 8: Student Admissions**

**The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.**

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. admissions policies, developed and implemented, that support and reflect the mission of the institution;**

The admissions policies and practices are fully described for undergraduates and the overall intent of the admissions policies are clearly articulated in the Mission and Goals

statements. The university has developed many programs designed to help with the recruitment of underrepresented minorities and they are working hard on transfer policies. There are good links to school counselors and community colleges.

Very little information is provided about graduate admissions.

*The graduate admissions process is highly decentralized, but more information should be available. For example, are GRE exams required? Is there a minimum GPA? What is the role of the graduate school?*

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

## **2. admissions policies and criteria available to assist the prospective student in making informed decisions;**

Excellent factual information is provided to help students and others determine if they meet university expectations.

Standard has been met.

## **3. accurate and comprehensive information regarding academic programs, including required placement or diagnostic testing;**

Detailed information is available through links from the admissions websites to specific programs. The university has a number of Limited Enrollment Programs, which are fully described.

Standard has been met.

## **4. information on student learning outcomes available to prospective students;**

This item is interpreted narrowly to focus on retention and graduation rates.

*In today's environment, this item is likely to become a bigger, broader, and more important issue. The Special Topics deals more directly with learning outcomes and assessment. Links back to this standard will be useful.*

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

## **5. accurate and comprehensive information, and advice where appropriate, regarding financial aid, scholarships, grants, loans, and refunds;**

An excellent website with complete information for students and families is readily accessible.

Standard has been met.

**6. published and implemented policies and procedures regarding transfer credit and credit for extra-institutional college level learning; and**

Good documentation exists regarding transfer credits.

Standard has been met.

**7. ongoing assessment of student success, including but not necessarily limited to retention, that evaluates the match between the attributes of admitted students and the institution's mission and programs.**

Institutional research provides comprehensive data on student retention and the university has used the data to improve performance. (Within the documentation there is reference to "MFR". What is MFR? This entire section focuses narrowly on graduation rates and persistence and then lists all programs that help student succeed. )

*See Institutional Response*

Standard has been met.

*There is little evidence of real assessment in this section.*

*A good report from a President's Task Force (#372) is insightful, although the report is undated and no context is provided.*

*See Institutional Response*

*The Policy on Diversity in Educational Programs references a provost-led review process, but no evidence of the reviews is provided. This area is probably the least well developed of all the standards under review.*

*See Institutional Response*

**Standard 9: Student Support Services**

**The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.**

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

**1. a program of student support services appropriate to student strengths and needs, reflective of institutional mission, consistent with student learning expectations, and available regardless of place or method of delivery;**

The university has a strong, comprehensive array of student support services offered primarily through student affairs and academic affairs.

Standard has been met.

**2. qualified professionals to supervise and provide the student support services and programs;**

Sample data provided support the statement that the personnel are professionally trained and are recruited through a rigorous search process based on job specifications.

Standard has been met.

**3. procedures to address the varied spectrum of student academic and other needs, in a manner that is equitable, supportive, and sensitive, through direct service or referral;**

Most of these issues are embedded in item 9.1. The counseling and health services follow standard confidentiality and patient rights practices.

Standard has been met.

**4. appropriate student advisement procedures and processes;**

Most advising is college based, which is appropriate. Students who do not declare a major initially receive centralized advising through Letters and Sciences. Web sites provide advising advice and appropriate links. An advising conference helps with the professional development of advisors.

Standard has been met.

**5. if offered, athletic programs that are regulated by the same academic, fiscal, and administrative principles, norms, and procedures that govern other institutional programs;**

The athletics program reports to the president and the management and operations appear to be solid.

*The academic support programs for athletes are described in some detail, but the formal reporting structure for academic support for athletes is not explicitly described. By inference, it appears that the program reports through the Athletic Director.*

***See Institutional Response***

There is academic involvement through a faculty committee and coordination of efforts with the university advising programs. The university has good documentation of the academic progress of athletes.

Standard has been met.

**6. reasonable procedures, widely disseminated, for equitably addressing student complaints or grievances;**

This standard is similar to standard 6.1. The university has clear and comprehensive policies and practices.

Standard has been met.

#### **7. records of student complaints or grievances;**

*No records are available centrally. It would appear to be useful to gather some information about this topic even if it involves self-reported information collected from departments and other units where complaints are filed. This is one of the few places where the university is somewhat non-responsive to the standard, but it is not clear if changes are needed.*

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

#### **8. policies and procedures, developed and implemented, for safe and secure maintenance of student records;**

University follows standard practices under FERPA and HIPAA. A new student and employee ID card system is being implemented. (Not sure from the documentation what the problems were with the old system.) IT security is emerging as an even bigger issue and there is no indication here of what steps the university is taking to protect data from theft or misuse.

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

#### **9. published and implemented policies for the release of student information; and**

University has good policies consistent with federal policies.

Standard has been met.

#### **10. ongoing assessment of student support services and the utilization of assessment results for improvement.**

Reviews of specific units are carried out in a responsible manner with committees appointed from outside the unit under review. The reports generally contain an analysis of current strengths and weaknesses plus specific recommendations about ways to improve or enhance the services. The report includes an opportunity for comments from the unit under review. It is not clear how the recommendations are evaluated and implemented by those with the authority to make changes. This last step would represent full responsiveness to the element. (If documentation exists it could be added to the report.)

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

## **Standard 10: Faculty**

**The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals. [Only elements 10.2, 10.6, 10.7, 10.8 and 10.9 are considered in this report.]**

**Relative to this standard, an accredited institution is characterized by:**

### **2. educational curricula designed, maintained, and updated by faculty and other professionals who are academically prepared and qualified;**

The university has a well documented and clear set of policies and practices to initiate and approve courses and programs under the explicit direction of the faculty. The online PPC manual is an excellent resource.

Standard has been met.

### **6. published and implemented standards and procedures for all faculty and other professionals, for actions such as appointment, promotion, tenure, grievance, discipline and dismissal, based on principles of fairness with due regard for the rights of all persons;**

The university has detailed and comprehensive policies to guide all aspects of faculty related employment and advancement. The Online Faculty Handbook is an especially useful and accessible source of information about the many detailed policies and practices. The existence of an ombudsperson seems like a good practice given the complexity and importance of faculty personnel practices.

*This section does not address the issue of post tenure review (which is only briefly mentioned in 10.7).*

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

### **7. carefully articulated, equitable, and implemented procedures and criteria for review of all individuals who have responsibility for the educational program of the institution;**

A good system of reviews for faculty, deans, chairs, other academic leaders and academic units is in place. (A summary list of the reviews carried out over the past few years was provided upon request as a supplement to the report under review.) The policy on post tenure review is very brief and general and it is not clear what the impact or outcomes are for the post tenure review process.

*There is not a formal review process for the vice presidents other than an annual update as part of the salary program.*

***See Institutional Response***

Standard has been met.

**8. criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty; and**

The university has clear and explicit policies related to part-time or adjunct faculty, including Professor of the Practice. All courses are evaluated by students regardless of the instructional title.

Standard has been met.

**9. adherence to principles of academic freedom, within the context of institutional mission.**

The university has taken strong stands on the issue of academic freedom and has committees and policies designed to ensure the protection of academic freedom.

Standard has been met.

**University of Maryland**  
**Institutional Responses to Questions Posed in the Report of the Generalist Reviewers**  
**January, 2007**

**Standard 4, Element 12:** The Vice Presidents report to the President and are reviewed by him at least annually. Back to report

**Standard 6: Element 3:** UM policies are required to conform to USM policies, which govern in case of disagreement. UM policies are vetted by the Chancellor's Office and, where applicable, by the State Attorney General's Office. Back to report

**Standard 6, Element 4:** The "comprehensive report" was prepared in fall 2005 by the Office of Student Conduct, a unit of the Division of Student Affairs, specifically for the purposes of the document review. The Office of Student Conduct is responsible for overseeing the adjudication of cases of alleged violations of the conduct codes. Students who commit an offense shortly before graduation have a block placed on the release of their diploma, degree, and academic transcripts while the offense is being considered in the Office of Student Conduct. Once the issue is resolved, the diploma and transcript may be released and the degree awarded, depending upon the outcome. Back to report

**Standard 6, Element 6:** See earlier response concerning Element 3. Back to report

**Standard 8, Element 1:** The Graduate School administers institutional minimum standards for graduate admissions. These include a 3.0 overall GPA and a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution. Colleges or departments generally have additional requirements. See also [http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/admission\\_new.htm](http://www.gradschool.umd.edu/catalog/admission_new.htm) Back to report

**Standard 8, Element 4:** See Section XV of the self-study. Back to report

**Standard 8, Element 7:** (part 1) MFR is the annual "Managing for Results" report discussed in Section II.A of the Self-Study. Back to report

**Standard 8, Element 7:** (part 2) This is the report of the President's Task Group on Undergraduate Graduation Rate - Student Success Rate. The time frame and context for establishing this task group is discussed in Sections II.A and II.B. More details are in Appendices 8, 9, and 10. Back to report

**Standard 8, Element 7:** (part 3) See the discussion under Initiative three in Section II.B of the self-study and Appendices 17, 85, and 86. This process is still in its early stages. Back to report

**Standard 9, Element 5:** Regular academic support services are coordinated through the Academic Support and Career Development unit of the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. The Department is headed by an Athletic Director who reports to the President. Academic Support and Career Development has oversight by a committee established by the Provost that reports directly to him. This oversight committee is chaired by a dean and includes the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, the chair of the Athletic Council, the Athletic Director, and other

individuals. Finally, the Athletic Council, composed primarily of faculty, advises the President on all matters relating to intercollegiate athletics. This Council is chaired by a faculty member appointed by the President. The Council, which has input from its own Academic sub-committee, reports directly to the President via its chair. [Back to report](#)

**Standard 9, Element 7:** Local response to, and informal mediation of, most complaints is believed to be an appropriate policy for the institution. [Back to report](#)

**Standard 9, Element 8:** The previous ID system used the Social Security number as an identifier. The new system does not. The new system also has additional capabilities for storing information electronically. For IT security; see Section IV.G and Appendices 107 and 108. [Back to report](#)

**Standard 9, Element 10:** Student Affairs has three types of assessment, each of which leads to a different course of action regarding the evaluation and implementation of recommendations. These are annual reports, specifically targeted assessment efforts, and on-going assessment efforts. Assessments of on-going service and program offerings are included in departmental annual reports. Action items for completion in the following year are identified in meetings with the Vice President for Student Affairs. Accountability for these action items is managed through the Performance Review and Development (PRD) process. Specifically targeted assessment efforts provide information about a program or service to inform the administrator responsible for its implementation. Implementation is the responsibility of the unit conducting the assessment. On-going assessment work, as in the Counseling Center, informs a broad base of units on campus regarding trends and patterns of behavior reported by our students. These findings assist a variety of campus decision-makers on issues related to their programs and services. [Back to report](#)

**Standard 10, Element 6:** Discussed in Section IV.C of the Self-Study. [Back to report](#)

**Standard 10, Element 7:** Vice Presidents report to and are reviewed by the President. [Back to report](#)