

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

I. Introduction

The Institutional Effectiveness working group (WG4) was formed in June 2014. It was charged with evaluating compliance with standards 2, 4, and 7 which all relate to the success of the University in its self-evaluation and overall assessment of whether it is achieving its mission and vision. In addition, the group was charged with answering three related research questions examining institutional effectiveness on three scales. They examined 1) the University's adherence to its core values, 2) the metrics the university uses to measure effectiveness, and 3) how the university capitalizes on the accreditation already done in each school to evaluate student outcomes. Institutional Effectiveness is crucial for UMB to effectively educate its students, provide appropriate and superlative care to its clients, and to perform efficiently.

WG 4 was composed of eight people and divided into three sub-groups; each subgroup was allocated one standard and one question. The sub-groups met independently during the year and interviewed several University administrators, including Dr. Bruce Jarrell and Peter Gilbert. Each sub-group reviewed documents from the schools, including strategic plans and accreditation documents and extracted pertinent information for the standards and questions, and compiled their sections of the chapter. A survey compiled by UMB was also made available and pertinent questions/responses are summarized in the chapter as well. The sub-groups sent their sections to the co-chairs, who edited, assembled, and executed the final chapter. Section II of this chapter presents WG4's findings regarding UMB compliance with standards 2, 4, and 7. Section III answers the three research questions; and Section IV includes recommendations and suggestions designed to make the university an even better institution. Section V contains appendices.

II. Standards

Standard 2: PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and utilizes the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

Shortly after the start of his tenure in July 2010, President Perman launched the first comprehensive, widely participatory strategic planning process in UMB's history. Led by Dr. Stephan Bartlett, MD, Chair of the Department of Surgery in the School of Medicine and Mr. Peter Gilbert, Chief Operating Officer and Executive Vice President, a broadly representative committee of twenty-four faculty, administrators, and students engaged in a year-long process identifying goals and priorities to advance the university's mission. The result *Redefining Collaboration: University of Maryland Strategic Plan 2011 – 2016*, reflects input from hundreds of faculty, students, staff, and community partners who participated in focus group meetings, town halls, feedback sessions, and surveys.

2.1 University Planning

Strategic planning at the university level takes into account two different contexts. First, UMB engages in strategic planning within the framework of the strategic plan for the entire university system, *Powering Maryland Forward: USM Strategic Plan 2010 – 2020* and *Maryland Read, the 2013 – 2017 Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education*. Both of these comprehensive plans outline broad goals that inform UMB priorities. Second, because of UMB's highly decentralized structure, the University's strategic planning process builds upon the mission, goals, and planning efforts of the professional schools, which, in turn, are based on many factors including trends in the professions and professional accreditation criteria. Thus, planning at UMB is both a top-down and a bottom-up process.

The UMB Strategic Plan is anchored in broad themes, identified at the outset of the process by Deans and University Executive Leadership. These themes were then further tested and refined by the Strategic Planning Committee. The themes are:

1. Achieve pre-eminence as an innovator.
2. Promote diversity and a culture of inclusion.
3. Foster a culture of accountability and transparency.
4. Excel at interdisciplinary research.
5. Excel at interprofessional education, clinical care and practice.
6. Develop local and global initiatives that address critical issues.
7. Drive economic development.
8. Create an enduring and responsible financial model for the university.
9. Create a vibrant, dynamic university community.

Working Groups were developed around each theme. These groups conducted research, engaged in focus groups, held town hall meetings, visited other institutions, and conducted surveys, all to inform the development of the plan. Each Working Group developed goals and tactics related to the Plan themes. Deans and Executive Leadership were kept abreast of the work through regular updates. Goals, tactics, and metrics were developed by the Working Groups, and then brought to the entire Strategic Planning Committee for ratification. A draft of the plan was shared with the broader UMB community for input and, after adoption by the Strategic Planning Committee, presented to the Deans, Executive Leadership, and ultimately the President for review and approval.

2.2. Planning in the Schools

All of the professional schools at UMB have engaged in planning on an ongoing basis, as required by the professional accrediting agency for each of the schools. The plans for each school were developed by broad-based committees composed of faculty, staff, and administrators. Drafts were distributed widely for comment and approved by the faculty governance organization in each school before being submitted to the UMB president for approval. Each school's planning process and examples of the results of plan implementation are described below.

i. School of Dentistry

The Committee on Dental Accreditation reviewed and approved the UMSOD accreditation in March 2011. In preparation for the accreditation review, the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee updated and improved its Policy and Procedures document. A Plan of Organization has recently been completed as well. Faculty committees are categorized as either Dean's or Faculty Assembly committees, specifying to whom the committee reports its results. These documents increase transparency of Dental School governance by clarifying the organizational structure of the school and the path to promotion for faculty. Both documents were created by faculty committees, and discussed and approved by the entire faculty. Faculty and the CODA team gave positive feedback on the new APT guidelines. The Organizational Changes were just passed and feedback is not yet available.

ii. School of Law

While the Carey School of Law does not currently have a formal written strategic plan, considerable comprehensive planning activity took place in preparation for its recent accreditation by the American Bar Association. A description of this planning activity and its results can be found in the most recent School of Law Self Study. Each element includes commitments, goals, and strategies. Standing committees focus on curricular development, admissions, faculty development, and administration. As a response to market force, a meaningful decline in employment opportunities was seen for JD graduates in recent years, and a comparable decline in applicants, and related impacts on tuition revenue. This combination of trends led the Dean to appoint "Futures Committee" charged with developing recommendations around a host of issues impacting the future of the law school and legal education.

iii. School of Medicine

The School of Medicine published *Shared Vision 2020 for UM Medicine: Thriving in Challenging Times* in July 2013. That document summarizes the joint strategy for the missions of the School of Medicine and the University of Maryland Medical System. The stated goal is to accelerate the pace of discovery, collaboration, and innovation and redouble efforts to continue excellence in the quality of patient-centered care across the School of Medicine and the Medical System. The School of Medicine attained and sustained top-tier status through a fierce, goal-oriented, aggressive, strategic, and opportunistic approach to maximizing academic yield. *Vision 2020* calls for a new, nimble approach to thrive in challenging times, implementing a plan to apply strategic innovations across all of its mission areas.

Steps taken to implement the strategies include the launching of the "Foundations of Research and Critical Thinking" course in August 2013 and two iterations of the Festival of Science (2013 and 2014), which provides an opportunity for UMSOM academic units to highlight their ongoing work and receive external feedback on their research portfolios. In addition, an external Scientific Advisory Council was established to evaluate the nature and quality of research at the School. Other efforts under the "Accel-Med" initiative ("Accelerating Innovation and Discovery in Medicine") include Interdisciplinary Research, including funding through the Dean's Challenge Awards, and the establishment of the Center for Innovative Biomedical Resources (CIBR)

iv. School of Nursing

The SON developed a Strategic Plan for 2012-2017 that was based on a comprehensive review of the previous goals and accomplishments. The resulting Plan included a confirmation of the SON mission, five goals, and 16 objectives. “Champions” were appointed for each goal to work with a faculty group to determine the tactics and deliverables for the plan. Progress towards achievement of the goals is evaluated annually, and new objectives and deliverables are developed as needed.

Interprofessional initiatives and collaborations aim to build programs of research through new collaboration in discovery, translation, and implementation projects. The Office of Strategic Partnerships and Initiatives (SPI) advances UMSON’s mission by building external partnerships for education, research, and practice that achieve the School’s strategic goals. SPI is comprised of the offices of professional education, clinical enterprise, and legal and contractual services.

A rigorous self-study of the Nursing programs was undertaken as part of its reaccreditation by the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, whose site visit took place in September 2014. During this process the SON developed objectives and tactics from each goal of its strategic plan. The following was identified - In alignment with the UMB Strategic Plan, UMSON will:

- Increase inter-professional initiatives and expand opportunities for faculty, staff and students to engage in research, practice, health policy, advocacy, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and professional development activities
- Increase the academic progression of students by marketing and recruiting doctoral students and creating seamless transition plans for educational advancement. The final decision will be made at the CCNE meeting in April-May, 2015.

v. School of Pharmacy

In 2013 the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education accredited the UMSOP. Between January 2009 and April 2010, UMSOP developed a new strategic plan with mission, vision, pledge, and educational philosophy for 2010-2015. Internal stakeholders (faculty, students, and preceptors) and external stakeholders (alumni and employers) were surveyed three times throughout the 16-month process. In addition, the Dean led numerous focus groups to gather information and solicit feedback. The strategic planning steering committee used the information to revamp the mission and vision. The Pledge is comprised of five themes with 22 sub-goals. For each theme the Dean appointed a “champion” and “go-to-people” to implement and evaluate the different benchmarks.

An example of this is a strategic sub-goal for Education. This goal aims to “complement strong learner-centered environments using best practices in educational methodologies and instructional technology with evidence-driven approaches to teaching and assessment”. The new curriculum was designed to be a student-centered learning process, and where basic and clinical sciences in therapeutic decision making are integrated. In addition the curriculum focuses on building a strong foundation of professionalism and life-long learning, thus the School’s investment in state-of-the-art instructional technology.

Another sub-goal is to “promote effective pharmacy practice models that have a positive impact on improved patient outcomes, decreased health care costs, adherence, minimization of

adverse events, and reduction in medication errors.” Researchers and faculty members of UMSOP and UMSON have been collaborating to study the effectiveness of patient-centered involvement in the choice of treatment options.

vi. School of Social Work

The School of Social Work is currently undergoing accreditation. They undertook the process of creating a new strategic plan in the Fall of 2012, with the assistance of a strategic planning consultant. The process began at the annual all-school meeting, where approximately 250 faculty and staff broke into small discussion groups to conduct a collective SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis and generate key themes for planning. Over the next several months, a Strategic Planning Committee appointed by the Dean and comprised of faculty, staff, and members of the board of advisors, facilitated the creation of a new strategic plan. Subgroups worked to refine and establish goals, objectives, and metrics related to five themes generated from the initial SWOT analysis: Education, Community Impact, Research, Diversity, and Advancing the Profession. Members of the Strategic Planning Committee have met periodically since the new plan was created to discuss modifications to objectives and metrics and will compile and disseminate an annual report to the larger School of Social Work community highlighting progress toward achieving each of the five strategic plan goals.

The mission of the School is to “develop practitioners, leaders, and scholars to advance the well-being of people and communities and to promote social justice. As national leaders, we create and use knowledge for education, service innovation, and policy development.” The Plan is meant to be a guiding light for the School, and the result of the Plan should be a more effective, efficient, and engaged School capable of producing exceptional graduates and more powerful interventions, superior methods for testing them, and improved means for communicating them.

2.3. Resource Allocation

As a major research university, the budgeting and financial planning for UMB is complex, involving multiple revenue sources and a wide range of entities with diverse operations and needs. The ability to respond quickly to both needs and opportunities is critical. Despite this diversity – or perhaps because of it – decisions on resource allocation fundamentally flow from mission and strategic goals at both the University and school levels.

The President has responsibility for determining the allocation of resources to both the UMB central units and the schools. The President makes these determinations, however, through a participatory process involving the Deans and Executive Leadership, who in turn seek advice and counsel from the faculty, staff and administrators in their respective units. Annually the Dean of each school makes a presentation to the President and senior leadership outlining the school’s strategic priorities, progress on key metrics, new initiatives and needs and their alignment with the University’s strategic priorities. Similarly, the Vice Presidents responsible for each major administrative unit present their plans to the President.

Along with this more formal annual program and budget process, each Dean meets individually with the President on a monthly basis. The Deans and the President meet together monthly; and Deans, Executive Leadership and the President meet monthly. All of these meetings, combined with the more formal budget process, create an environment in which information is freely shared and decisions made with broad input and the development of shared consensus whenever possible. That said, the allocation of most of UMB's revenue is not discretionary. For example, external support for research must be spent as contracted. State appropriations and tuition support existing academic programs. Mandatory increases in expenditures such as health care costs take up most of any annual budgetary increases.

In addition to what might be considered broad, operational base budget allocations, implementation of the Strategic Plan has resulted in targeted resource allocation closely tied to strategic goals and progress along key metrics. In 2013, after completion of the Strategic Plan, the President appointed a Strategic Plan Executive Implementation Committee consisting of the Deans and a broad representation of other leaders across campus. Members of the Executive Implementation Committee were assigned responsibility for tracking implementation of goals through the cited metrics. A 'dashboard' contains data on the progress toward goals, shared with members of the Committee and shared publicly on the University website.

The Executive Implementation Committee holds an annual review of each area and theme. Through this review, it determines the allocation of funds in a special projects Strategic Plan account to help advance key goals in the plan. As part of the implementation phase of the University's 2011-2016 Strategic Plan, the Executive Implementation Committee approved more than \$2 million to support the themes, goals, tactics, and fundamental elements of the plan. Following the recommendations of the Committee, the University, from its overall budget, approved \$1.25 million in one-time University expenditures related to the strategic plan and \$1 million in recurring expenditures. The funded areas cover a broad cross-section of the strategic plan. Examples include:

- The theme to achieve pre-eminence as an innovator received a one-time allotment of \$400,000 and a recurring \$250,000 to “develop a highly facile, universally accessible, secure information technology electronic health information infrastructure with knowledge management and decision support functions to support novel, data-driven health care delivery research and clinical care.”
- The theme to excel at interdisciplinary research was awarded a one-time \$300,000 allotment to “identify, assess, enhance, and support existing interdisciplinary research programs.”
- The theme to develop local and global initiatives that address critical issues received a recurring \$71,000 to “create an on-campus center for local engagement that supports and facilitates student-focused community-engaged education, research, and service” and a one-time \$50,000 investment to “increase the proportion of graduates working in underserved and/or resource-limited settings locally and globally.”
- The theme to drive economic development was awarded a recurring \$111,000 to “create an Industry Liaison Office to train faculty to work with industry, market UMB to industry, and assist faculty in successfully completing projects.”

- The theme to create an enduring and responsible financial model for the University received a one-time \$250,000 allotment to “apply technology to streamline business processes and improve efficiency and cost structure across the University while providing dependable support services.”
- Safety is a priority and is part of the theme to create a dynamic University community. A recurring \$270,000 was approved to “leverage security and public safety resources to increase safety awareness and sense of well-being for the University community.”
- Three of the four fundamental elements of the strategic plan—enhanced organizational structure for information technology (IT), improved two-way communication, and government and external relations—also received funding. IT received a recurring \$120,000 to create a single sign-on to simplify access to email and the current UM Portal as well as other systems or online services. Communications was provided a one-time \$149,300 allotment to develop and implement external and internal communication plans, which include developing a common University events calendar and a mobile application as well as evaluating our current website and content management system. Government and external relations received a recurring \$125,250 to “create and enhance relationships between University leadership and key federal officials and agencies relevant to the University’s mission.” The fourth fundamental element of faculty and staff training will focus on a comprehensive development program that both enhances knowledge and skills of all employees and creates a training website.

The President communicates updates on the Strategic Plan implementation and data on progress toward goals in the dashboard (add link). In addition he provides success stories about specific initiatives through the University website and his monthly *President’s Message* to the University community (<http://www.umaryland.edu/president/communications/>). Strategic plan success stories provide a forum for the University community and the public to better understand the progress the University is making toward achieving performance measures and goals. Accountability and transparency are priorities of the University leadership and through open communication students, faculty and staff can be involved and informed in the University challenges and success. (<http://www.umaryland.edu/about-umb/strategic-plan/strategic-plan-successes>)

2.4. Institutional Renewal

Institutional renewal at UMB occurs at two levels. At the School level, institutional renewal occurs through School based planning and assessment, in keeping with the requirements of school-based accrediting bodies. At the University level, institutional renewal occurs in the most broad-based way through the Strategic Plan Implementation process. Complementary strategic efforts – initiatives outlined in *The President’s Priorities* and pursued through UMB’s structured collaboration with University of Maryland, College Park, *MPowering the State* – align with the Strategic Plan goals and provide additional energy, leadership and resources to the process of institutional growth and change.

In the summer of 2014, midway through the timeframe of the Strategic Plan and in response to increasing constraints on state-level funding for the University, the Strategic Plan

Implementation Committee began a process of reviewing progress on the Plan's goals and tactics. A review of the Plan's environmental scan was conducted. The Plan's goals and tactics were reviewed and it was determined that many of the initiatives and strategies in the plan had begun to be operationalized and should be assigned to specific administrative units to become embedded as ongoing facets of University operations. Though the Strategic Plan Executive Implementation Committee would continue to monitor and track process on these operational objectives, it would focus its attention on prioritizing and advancing the remaining strategic goals and tactics. Through meetings in the late fall of 2014 and early winter of 2015, the Executive Implementation Committee prioritized Strategic Plan goals and tactics and heard reports on process from assigned goal and tactic leaders. This process resulted in recommendations on which among these goals and tactics should be highest priority – both protected from likely University budget reductions in FY15 and FY16, and supported through reallocation of existing resources where possible.

Some of the key goals emerging from this process as focused institutional priorities included:

- Educate the health, human, and legal services workforce of the state of Maryland and continue to service the workforce's evolving educational needs in order to promote well-being and justice throughout the state.
- Work closely with the University of Maryland Medical System (UMMS) to achieve pre-eminence through continued development of an innovative, high-efficiency integrated health care delivery model and research enterprise that leverages the extraordinary talents of the professional schools.
- Excel at interdisciplinary research and interprofessional education, clinical care and practice and public service that informs the development of knowledge, public policy, and human service.
- Foster a culture of entrepreneurship leading to rapid identification and support of innovative discovers with translational potential
- Enhance University-wide IT committee structure, infrastructure and services in an appropriate and coordinated matter.

Two other efforts, *The President's Priorities* and *MPowering the State* bring added energy and focus to these strategic goals. For example, since the beginning of his appointment to leadership at UMB, President Perman has stressed the importance of interprofessional education and included it in his statement of *The President's Priorities*. His first operationalization of this priority was the development of The President's Clinic, a weekly clinic led by Dr. Perman – a pediatric gastroenterologist – and involving rotating groups of students from all six of UMB's professional schools to demonstrate team-based care while treating young patients. The commitment to interprofessional education as a University-wide institutional priority was confirmed through its inclusion as a key goal during the Strategic Planning process. This led to the development of a Center for Interprofessional Education, led by Dean Jane Kirchling, School of Nursing. The Center hosts an annual interprofessional education day, provides small grants for interprofessional education projects and hosts resources on its website. As a result of these strategic efforts, UMB is transforming its culture to provide innovative educational programs addressing today's needs for professionals trained in cross-disciplinary, team-based work.

Similarly, *MPowering the State* is allowing UMB to advance strategic goals and foster institutional growth and change. An initiative of the University System of Maryland Regents, *MPowering the State* is a structured collaboration between UMB and University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP) to advance research, education and economic development. Funded through a \$9.2M allocation from the Maryland General Assembly, *MPowering the State* is led by the UMB and UMCP Presidents and a Steering Committee of two very senior leaders from each university. *MPowering the State* has funded cross-university initiatives in biotechnology research, bioinformatics and bioimaging, public health, law, agriculture, and technology commercialization. Additionally, infrastructure projects involving library resources, information technology and recreational facilities have been undertaken. Each initiative identifies key metrics to measure progress and reports annually to the Steering Committee for evaluation and consideration of future funding requests. Additionally, the Deans across both universities engaged in a planning retreat to identify new initiatives that would advance each campus's strategic priorities. Two new cross-university research centers – one in bioengineering and one in bioinformatics and bioimaging – have been formed. Planning discussions are underway for a cross-university Clinical and Translational Science Institute, including a comprehensive initiative on brain health. *MPowering the State* has allowed for significant strategic investment and development of new initiatives, all of which have the potential for expanding new revenue streams in a time of dwindling resources. Three such examples are 1) Gliknik, Inc., a UMB startup, that raised \$4.9 million and phase 2 clinical trials under way. 2) Immotions Medical, Inc., a UMB startup, which left Massachusetts to relocate to the BioPark at UMB and 3) OmniSpeech, LLC, a UMCP startup, and gains more than \$2.8 million in funding. In this way, it fosters institutional renewal in ways that are aligned with UMB's strategic plan.

Summary of Standard 2.

Within the framework of the strategic plan for the entire university system, UMB engages in strategic planning that is anchored in broad themes and builds upon the mission, goals, and planning efforts of the professional schools, which, in turn, are based on many factors including trends in the professions and professional accreditation criteria. Despite the fact that, as a major research university, UMB relies on multiple revenue sources and a wide range of entities with diverse operations and needs, the decisions on resource allocation fundamentally flow from mission and strategic goals at both the University and school levels. The President makes these determinations, through a participatory process involving the Deans and Executive Leadership, who in turn seek advice and counsel from the faculty, staff and administrators in their respective units. The allocation of most of UMB's revenue is not discretionary. Institutional renewal at UMB occurs in the most broad-based way through the Strategic Plan Implementation process.

STANDARD 4: Leadership and Governance

The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

UMB is a constituent institution of the University System of Maryland (USM), which is governed by a Board of Regents. The Board of Regents, in consultation with the USM chancellor, appoints the president of UMB, who serves as the chief executive officer. The president of UMB appoints the deans of the professional schools and the Graduate School, who report directly to the president. The president of UMB also appoints administrative officers of the university including a chief academic and research officer and a chief operating officer.

4.1. University System of Maryland

The USM, an independent unit of state government, is Maryland's public higher education system. Its members include all public colleges and universities in the state, with the exception of Morgan State University and St. Mary's College. USM is the twelfth-largest university system in the nation. It comprises 12 institutions and two regional higher education centers, offering over 1,000 undergraduate and graduate/professional degree programs to more than 152,000 students at 200 sites worldwide.¹

Pursuant to Maryland law, USM is governed by a [17-member Board of Regents](#) (BOR) appointed by the governor of Maryland with the advice and consent of the Senate.² Fifteen of the members serve staggered five-year terms; the sixteenth member, by statute, is the Secretary of Agriculture, who serves *ex officio* as long as he or she continues in that position; and the seventeenth member is a USM student who serves a one-year term. The BOR is responsible for the governance and management of USM and its constituent institutions, centers, and institutes. It appoints the USM chancellor, who serves as its chief executive officer. The BOR has expressly delegated certain authority to the chancellor and the presidents of the constituent institutions (see [Bylaws of the University System of Maryland Board of Regents](#) (“Regents Bylaws”)).

Maryland law requires that BOR approve and adopt a System-wide plan of higher education, developed by the chancellor on the basis of plans developed by the constituent institutions.³ The law sets forth certain priorities that the chancellor is required to include in the plan. It includes a priority directed at UMB:

*Maintain and enhance an academic health center and a coordinated Higher Education Center for Research and Graduate and Professional Study in the Baltimore area, comprised of the University of Maryland, Baltimore and the University of Maryland Baltimore County, with a focus on science and technology.*⁴

Actions taken by USM to enhance UMB’s professional schools and its joint Graduate School programs with UMBC are designed to fulfill this requirement.

Pursuant to Maryland law, every four years the BOR reviews and approves the mission statement of each constituent institution, including a review of whether academic

¹ <http://www.usmd.eedu/usm/faqs/>

² Md. EDUCATION Code Ann., § 12-104

³ Md. EDUCATION Code Ann., § 12-106

⁴ Md. EDUCATION Code Ann., § 12-106(a)(1)(iii)(2).

programs are consistent with that mission.⁵ The purpose of this review is to assure that the mission of USM's constituent institutions are consistent with the USM Charter and systemwide plan, and that they promote the efficient and effective use of the institutions' and System's resources. The results of this review are then reported to the Maryland Higher Education Commission for review. The BOR recognizes the distinct mission of UMB and historically has been very supportive of UMB's special needs. For example, the BOR authorized establishment of independent faculty practice plans for the School of Medicine and the Dental School that modified the System-wide faculty appointment procedure to allow School of Medicine faculty to attain tenure, acknowledging their academic accomplishments, yet receive salary support from the practice plans and clinical units of the academic health center in addition to state budget support.

Similarly, Maryland law requires the development of [an annual Performance Accountability Plan](#).⁶ The BOR reviews and approves the Performance Accountability Plan for each constituent institution and annually reviews a written report from each president on the attainment by the institution of the objectives in the Performance Accountability Plan of the institution. This report is also submitted to the Maryland Higher Education Commission. Each president is held accountable for meeting the objectives of the Performance Accountability Plan and other key goals, through their individual performance review plans. In consultation with the institutions and the chancellor, the BOR establishes standards for funding based on differences in the size and mission of the constituent institutions and approves consolidated budget requests for appropriations for USM with respect to the operating and capital budgets.

4.2. UMB Administration

The BOR, in consultation with the USM chancellor, appoints the president of UMB as its chief executive officer.⁷ Presidents, all of whom serve at the pleasure of the BOR, are evaluated annually by the chancellor, who discusses the results of that evaluation and consequent recommendations for compensation actions with the designated select committee of the Board of Regents.

The president is responsible and accountable to the chancellor and the Board of Regents, and has the responsibility of taking initiatives to implement the policies of the Board and the constituent institution and to promote the institution's development and efficiency. The president's major responsibilities, for which the BOR has delegated authority, include developing a plan of institutional mission, goals, priorities, and a set of peer institutions; responsibility for all academic matters, including developing new academic programs and curtailing or eliminating existing programs; formulating operating and capital budget requests; appointing, promoting, fixing salaries, granting tenure, assigning duties, and terminating personnel; creating any position within existing funds available to the University; establishing admission standards; setting tuition and fees; administering financial aid; entering into contracts and cooperative agreements; accepting gifts and grants and maintaining and managing endowment income; and overseeing affirmative action and equal employment opportunities in compliance with state, federal, and BOR mandates and policies.

⁵ Md. EDUCATION Code Ann., § 11-302.

⁶ Md. EDUCATION Code Ann., § 11-304.

⁷ Regents Bylaws, Art. 5, § 1.

The president of UMB appoints the deans of the professional schools and the Graduate School, as well as all vice presidents. The deans report directly to the President and have responsibility for academic affairs, administration, research, development, information technology, and communications within the schools. It is the role of the central administration to address enterprise-wide issues; ensure that auditing, planning, reporting, and other accountability processes are adhered to; coordinate liaison with external shareholders; and support the deans and faculty of the schools in their academic enterprises. The administration is led by a Chief Academic and Research Officer and Senior Vice President, together with a Chief Operating Officer and Senior Vice President, both of whom report to the President. The other members of the executive leadership reporting directly to the President include the University Counsel, the Vice President for Medical Affairs, Chief Communications Officer and Chief Development Officer. A Chief Administrative and Financial Officer, Chief Enterprise and Economic Development Officer, Chief Information Office, Chief Accountability Officer and Chief Government Affairs Officer complete the President's executive cabinet, reporting through the senior vice presidents.

4.3. University-wide Shared Governance

Elected UMB faculty, students, and staff participate in the USM shared governance structures—the Council of University System Faculty, the USM Student Council, and the Council of University System Staff. In addition, UMB adheres to the USM system of shared governance, in which faculty, staff, and students discuss and provide input on major issues affecting UMB, through UMB governance structures and school-based committees.

The [USM Policy on Shared Governance in the University System of Maryland \(I-6.00\)](#) rests final authority and responsibility for the welfare of USM institutions with the Chancellor and Presidents, but requires informed participation at every institutional level by faculty, students, staff and administrators. (I-600 II (A, B & C)). The policy specifies that faculty, students, and staff shall have opportunities to participate in decisions that relate to mission and budget priorities; curriculum, course content, and instruction; research; appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty; human resources policies; selection and appointment of administrators; issues that affect the ability of students to complete their education; and other issues that affect the overall welfare of the institution. The faculty, staff, and student governance bodies at UMB adhere to this principle. (I-600 II (D)).

UMB has a Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and University Student Government Association that serve as the elected shared governance body for its constituency as mandated by USM policy. (I-600 III (B)). These bodies adhere to the USM requirements that “[a]t least 75% of the voting members shall be elected by their constituencies” and “[s]uch bodies should elect their own presiding officers.” The UMB president and other senior administrators meet monthly with these elected representative bodies or their executive councils and regularly generate action items. In addition to these university-wide groups, each of the schools has established plans of organization for students and faculty. As a result of the decentralized nature of UMB, the key decisions in curriculum, student advancement, and faculty appointment and tenure are made at the school level.

In addition to university-wide elected bodies, the UMB President has appointed various university-wide committees and working groups made up of faculty, staff, administrators and students that advise on the development and implementation of key policy and programmatic decisions. Examples of such bodies include the [Strategic Planning Committee](#) which led the development of “*Redefining Collaboration: Strategic Plan 2011 – 2016*”, the [Executive Implementation Committee](#) which has guided the implementation of the strategic plan, the [Diversity Advisory Council](#) which makes recommendations to the president to promote UMB’s culture of diversity and inclusion, the [Enterprise Risk Management Steering Committee](#) which identifies, prioritizes and plans responses to institutional risks, and the Middle States Self Study Steering Committee which has prepared this Self-Study report.

(i) UMB Faculty Senate

The [UMB Faculty Senate](#) is an elected body whose members are chosen by faculty from the University’s six professional schools and the Graduate School. The Faculty Senate makes recommendations to the president on issues of policy that affect faculty across the various UMB schools. The president reports regularly in person to the Faculty Senate and seeks its advice and feedback. The vice president for academic affairs regularly attends Faculty Senate meetings. Other UMB and school administrators may appear, as requested, to report and provide input.

Representation on the Faculty Senate is proportional to the number of full-time faculty in each School. All full-time faculty are eligible to serve on the Senate. Senators serve staggered three-year terms. Annual elections are held to fill vacancies that occur upon expiration of members’ terms. The UMB Faculty Senate meets monthly, and meetings are open to all faculty.

Recent examples of the work of the Faculty Senate has been the development and ratification of a [Senate Resolution on Academic Freedom](#) and conducting a survey of faculty perceptions of shared governance at UMB. The Faculty Senate has also advised the President and senior administrators on a wide range of issues from safety to the UMB’s sexual misconduct policy.

(ii) UMB Staff Senate

The [UMB Staff Senate](#) is an elected body of 20 Senators who represent non-faculty employees. The Staff Senate advises the President on policies, procedures, and rules affecting employees, the work environment, issues impacting wages and benefits, and staff morale.⁸ Representation is by class of employee (exempt or nonexempt), rather than by school. Staff Senate representatives serve also on the USM Council of University System Staff (CUSS), thereby providing input to USM on staff issues. The Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate work cooperatively. For example, the Faculty Senate includes a Staff Senate representative and the two Senates have jointly addressed issues of mutual concern, such as affordable child care, safety and parking.

⁸ In FY 2000 the Maryland General Assembly approved collective bargaining for the USM institutions. Nonexempt employees at UMB subsequently elected to be represented by AFSCME, thereby constricting the role of the Staff Senate in discussions of nonexempt employees’ compensation and working conditions.

(iii) University Student Government Association

The [University Student Government Association](#) (USGA) is a student senate elected by students in the major programs and schools on campus. It is led by an executive board of six. USGA is dedicated to improving life at the University through cultural and social programming and to improving student communication at institutional levels. Through the USGA, students have a voice in University governance. The USGA appoints student representatives to the USM Student Council and to the state's Student Advisory Council of the Maryland Higher Education Commission. The USGA periodically distributes *USGA News* to all UMB students via e-mail. *USGA News* contains University-related announcements and information about events of interest to students. The USGA is responsible for deciding how the \$20 annual UMB student activity fee, paid by all students, is allocated.

4.4. Shared Governance in the Schools

Besides representation through campus-wide bodies and on a range of Presidential committees and working groups, faculty in each of the professional schools have written documents outlining the structure and scope of their participation in shared governance in the schools. They exercise responsibilities for academic programs and standards; resolve faculty and student grievances; make recommendations about faculty appointments, promotion, and tenure; and provide advice to the dean on a range of issues. Each school also has student organizations, which have representatives on various governance bodies and standing school committees.

(i) School of Dentistry

Faculty governance, described in the Dental School Plan of Organization, provides a means for the faculty to discharge its responsibilities with respect to educational policy, programs, procedures, and other matters. Membership is composed of all full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and selected student representatives. In general, this body may initiate action on any matter that may be of concern to the Dental School. It also elects faculty representatives to the USM Faculty Senate. The Faculty Assembly meets once a year but may have special meetings.

The Faculty Council, which meets monthly, acts for the faculty in legislative and advisory capacities. Membership consists of elected and ex-officio faculty and student members of the Faculty Assembly. This body formulates and approves the educational policies of the School (including recommendations for student advancement, dismissal, and graduation, and policies related to student conduct and decorum) and makes recommendations to the dean on general policy matters pertaining to the appointment, promotion, and tenure of the faculty. The Council has standing committees to support its function.

Faculty provide input to department chairs for decision making related to academic issues through departmental meetings and one-on-one discussions. This process occurs routinely and allows faculty input relative to academic issues, patient treatment, dental instruments and material selection, and research initiatives.

The Student Dental Association (SDA) is the organizational structure of the student body. The association is presided over and governed by elected representatives from all classes and is represented on selected committees within the School. The organization participates in certain student/faculty activities and sponsors and directs all student social activities.

(ii) School of Law

The Faculty Council of the School of Law consists of all full-time faculty and meets monthly. Each year, the Dean of the School of Law, in consultation with the associate deans, identifies committees of faculty members and administrators for the following academic year. In addition to several standing committees, additional specialized committees and working groups are established to consider current topics. The Faculty Council approves the list of committees, and the Dean provides a charge to each group. Each group develops a plan of action based on the charge, conducts research, including gathering input as appropriate, and develops a proposal. Proposals are presented to the Faculty Council for approval. Administrative Deans of the School serve ex-officio on the Council and various Committees. There are two student representatives who serve ex-officio on the council and students serve ex-officio on various faculty committee as well.

The Student Bar Association (SBA) represents all students in the school. It has an elected executive council and elected representatives from both the day and evening classes. The SBA is the umbrella organization for the more than 40 other student organizations at the School and manages the student fee revenue. Each semester, student organizations submit a request for funds, and the SBA budget committee reviews the requests against predetermined guidelines. Organizations are encouraged to collaborate on events and to plan programs that are educational, social, and recreational as well as public-service-oriented.

(iii) School of Medicine

The Dean is the chief executive officer of the School of Medicine (SOM) as well as the head of the ancillary nonprofit organizations that produce clinical income for the School. He/she presides over and is advised by the Medical School Council, a body consisting of department chairs and elected representatives from each department. The Medical Executive Committee, a subcommittee of the Medical School Council, meets monthly and is able to act rapidly on issues that arise. The Faculty Assembly, an independent body of elected faculty, represents the faculty as a whole. The Faculty Assembly advises the Dean and provides input on major School decisions.

The SOM Student Council consists of a president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, two representatives from each class, and the class presidents. The Council oversees student activities funds and promotes social activities. Student representatives participate on a number of School committees: Year I and II Committee, Clinical Years Committee, School of Medicine Council (11 student representatives), and judicial board. Students are also invited to serve on special task forces and ad hoc committees.

(iv) School of Nursing

The By-Laws of the Faculty Organization of the School of Nursing set forth the

structure and scope of shared governance in the School of Nursing. The Faculty Organization of the School of Nursing consists of the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Council, and standing committees. All regular and adjunct faculty are members of the Faculty Assembly. Faculty Associates hold nonvoting membership. In addition, five students elected by their constituencies (Student Government Association, Graduates in Nursing, and the Doctoral Student Organization) are voting members. The Faculty Assembly meets at least twice during each academic year and is chaired by the chairperson of Faculty Council. The Faculty Assembly acts on policies and recommendations referred to it by Faculty Council, approves the School of Nursing mission statement and objectives and all major curriculum changes, addresses matters of concern to the membership, and elects members of the Faculty Senate and the chair and at-large members of the Faculty Council.

The Faculty Council meets monthly and is the body of authority for the Assembly between Assembly meetings. Elected members include five faculty from each of the two departments, one Faculty Senator, and one associate/assistant dean elected by the Faculty. The dean serves as an ex-officio member. There are five standing committees: Curriculum; Student Affairs; Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure; Process Improvement; and Technology-Enhanced Instructional Resources. Faculty are elected by departments for membership on standing committees with appropriate administrators serving as ex-officio members. In addition, students selected by their peers, representing undergraduate, master's, and doctoral students, serve on all standing committees with the exception of the Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure Committee. The chairperson of each standing committee is elected from the committee membership.

The School holds three Town Hall meetings a semester, chaired by the Dean or one of the associate deans, to hear student issues and concerns. All issues are noted and feedback in the form of an answer or an action is made within a short time.

(v) School of Pharmacy

The School of Pharmacy Faculty Assembly establishes and supervises policies related to the governance of the school's faculty and students. All professorial faculty in the school with at least a half-time position are voting members. The School of Pharmacy Student Government Association appoints a voting member to the Faculty Assembly. All other faculty holding academic appointments are nonvoting members.

The Faculty Assembly has four standing committees. The Curriculum Committee has responsibility for formulation of curriculum policy, review of professional curricula, approval of changes in the curricula, and review and approval of new educational programs. The Faculty Affairs Committee reviews and recommends to the dean actions regarding the appointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty members; supervises appointment, promotion, and tenure procedures; originates and/or reviews proposed policies relating to the welfare of the faculty; supervises and implements faculty grievance procedures; and establishes and carries out election procedures. The Student Affairs Committee formulates and administers school policies on admissions and student promotions, supervision of retention activities, review of student grievances, student affairs and recruiting. The Graduate Studies and Research Committee formulates policies concerning graduate education and research, reviews

and approves new programs or changes in graduate curricula, and reviews and approves internal grants.

The Student Government Association (SGA) strives to develop academic achievement, to encourage communication between faculty and students, to coordinate activities within the School, to promote educational programming, to enhance professional and social interests, and to encourage community service. All students belong to the SGA. The executive, legislative, and judicial power of the SGA is vested in the Executive Council. The Executive Council is composed of SGA officers, presidents of organizations, class officers, and the yearbook editor. The Council meets periodically with School administrators to discuss important issues. The Pharmacy Graduate Student Association (PGSA) consists of all graduate students and post-doctoral employees in the School of Pharmacy. It acts as an official liaison body to the School; provides a platform for discussions and suggestions on matters involving graduate students; promotes efficient recruitment and orientation of incoming graduate students; and represents the interests of pharmacy students as members of campus-wide organizations.

(vi) School of Social Work

The Faculty Organization (FO) is the faculty governance body of the School of Social Work. It consists of the members of the social work faculty of UMB and of the University of Maryland Baltimore County (UMBC), which offers a bachelor's degree in social work. Except for the administrative divisions of the UMB and UMBC programs, the School is not departmentalized and has a single faculty. The functions of the FO are to enable the faculty to exercise its control over curriculum and related academic matters; participate in the planning, execution, and evaluation of policy regarding the School in its relationship to the University and to the social welfare communities; and attend to all matters related to faculty governance. The FO carries final authority for the curriculum and degree requirements for students. The FO also shares responsibility with the Dean for developing and implementing University and School policies and procedures.

Faculty members who hold at least a half-time position and professorial rank (tenure track or non-tenure track positions) are voting members of the FO. Visiting and emeritus faculty, clinical instructors, and instructors may participate in FO meetings but do not have voting privileges. Students are represented at a ratio of one to every four faculty on all standing committees of the School except the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (APT). Student representatives are offered appointment also to the various curriculum area committees.

Summary of Standard 4

UMB's system of leadership and governance is guided by a clear set of USM policies and reporting structures that hold the UMB President accountable to the Chancellor and BOR. UMB also has a strong commitment to and tradition of shared governance on its campus, manifest in both the campus-wide faculty, staff and student senates as well as faculty and student governance bodies within each professional school. Each school encourages active faculty and student governance bodies, by-laws, and committees, and regular meetings of these bodies provide robust forums where campus policies and initiatives can be

communicated, and decisions about school-level priorities, policies and curriculum are made. UMB leadership and campus-wide bodies have increased their efforts to assess how well these governing bodies are functioning to ensure the health of shared governance at UMB, discussed in greater depth in section III A below.

STANDARD 7: Institutional Assessment

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

UMB has developed and implemented an integrated assessment system, derived in large measure from state mandates (discussed below) and the Strategic Plan Implementation process (addressed above), that is used to evaluate overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals. As reported in its 2006 self-study and 2011 periodic review, UMB has developed and implemented an integrated assessment system to evaluate overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals. That plan is heavily shaped by state and USM reporting and accountability requirements and by the standards established by professional accrediting bodies. These measures have been updated and augmented by additional accountability and assessment processes developed by the University President and leadership team and the implementation of a new Strategic Plan in 2012. The assessment plan ensures that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for students and graduates. Executive Leadership use the assessments and the recommendations made in professional accreditation reports to stimulate improvements in all aspects of the schools' operations and to measure progress.

7.1. State-Mandated Assessment Plans

(i) Managing for Results

Managing for Results (MFR) is a statewide strategic planning process in which state agencies craft mission and vision statements and identify key goals supported by measurable objectives. It is a tool for state agency strategic planning, performance measurement, and budgeting that emphasizes the use of resources to achieve measurable results, accountability, efficiency, and continuous improvement in state government programs. The standards for the assessment plan are established by state law and administered by the State of Maryland's Department of Budget and Management (DBM). DBM has established the format for agency submissions and has general authority to review and approve the components of the plan. Each year, UMB submits its MFR plan to DBM together with its budget request. The Maryland General Assembly also monitors the development of the plan during the legislative session, and legislators and staff provide additional suggestions.

In 2004, MFR was codified through legislation enacted by the General Assembly. The legislation continued the existing practice of agency-based MFR plans, but also required DBM to develop a "super MFR" or State Comprehensive Plan that sets overarching goals and direction for state government. This plan will be reported to the General Assembly each January and will consist of up to 10 goals and 50 to 100 performance measures from across state government. The

Fiscal Note attached to the bill provides a concise assessment of the deficiencies of the then current MFR process.

In spring 2005, UMB's MFR was revised from the ground up. (See Appendix N ??for the MFR report.). Objectives were recast in the timeframe of five years, through FY 2010. Attainment of the objectives is evaluated through the annual reporting of performance measures, which are the data elements specified in the MFR plan. Each goal in the MFR is defined by two or three objectives. Progress toward attaining these objectives is measured by one or more indicators.

(ii) Performance Accountability Plans

The university's assessment plan continues to be driven by state mandates and USM initiatives. Annually, UMB submits to the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) a performance accountability plan. MHEC has responsibility for approving the plan and presenting recommendations to the governor and the state legislature (<http://www.mhec.state.md.us/publications/research/index.asp>). The MHEC process looks at performance retrospectively rather than prospectively, to assess progress towards a benchmark.

MHEC examines four years of trend data and benchmarks on each indicator. Its analyses employ data for the four most recently completed years, while the MFR analyses uses the two previous years and projections of two future years. Institutions are expected to make progress toward achieving their accountability benchmarks. If an institution's performance is below its benchmarks, the institution must submit a report to MHEC identifying actions that it will take to improve performance.

The latest iteration of UMB's MFR plan contains all of the elements required to meet MHEC's standards of excellence: statement of mission, vision, goals, objectives, and performance measures. It is a statewide strategic planning process in which state agencies craft mission and vision statements and identify key goals supported by measurable objectives. It is a tool for state agency strategic planning, performance measurement, and budgeting that emphasizes the use of resources to achieve measurable results, accountability, efficiency, and continuous improvement in state government programs. The standards for the assessment plan are established by state law and administered by the State of Maryland's Department of Budget and Management (DBM). DBM has established the format for agency submissions and has general authority to review and approve the components of the plan. Each year, UMB submits its MFR plan to DBM together with its budget request. The Maryland General Assembly also monitors the development of the plan during the legislative session, and legislators and staff provide additional suggestions.

The UMB Performance Accountability/Managing for Results reports can be found at: <http://www.umaryland.edu/institutionalresearch/accountability/performance-accountability/>.

(iii) Peer-Based Assessments

In 1999 MHEC adopted a peer-based model for the establishment of funding guidelines for all USM institutions. The funding guidelines process includes an annual accountability component. The Commission identified a set of comprehensive, outcome-oriented performance measures by which to compare Maryland institutions with their performance peers. Maryland

institutions are expected to perform at or above the level of their performance peers on most indicators. The FY 2005 Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis can be found at: <http://www.mhec.state.md.us/publications/finance/index.asp>.

Under the Peer Performance process, UMB compares its performance as a whole and that of each of its component schools with that of defined peer institutions. Although UMB's mix of professional schools makes it unique among public academic health centers, five public universities were selected in 1999 as peers for the purpose of the State of Maryland funding guideline calculations. They are the University of California at San Francisco, the University of Alabama at Birmingham, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Michigan, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. All of the peer institutions have schools of medicine, dentistry, and nursing. These same five public institutions are also used in the Peer Performance process. Because only two of these institutions have law schools, three additional public institutions were selected for the purpose of law school comparisons: the University of Connecticut, the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Virginia. In the MFR process, UMB performance and state funding are compared with the performance and state funding of these peer institutions. It should be noted, however, that comparing individual professional schools presents difficulties because the sources of revenue are very different. There is a significant data collection problem as well because professional schools are reluctant to share such data as passing rates on licensure examinations.

A matrix of UMB's peer institutions, detailing which professional schools are compared for each, may be found at: <http://www.umaryland.edu/institutionalresearch/accountability/peer-institutions/>. The Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analyses can be found at: <http://www.mhec.state.md.us/publications/finance/index.asp>.

7.2 Internal Operational Assessments

While institutional assessment is conducted at all levels, three offices – the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, the Office of Budget and Planning, and the Office of Capital Budget and Planning – provide information and analysis to inform ongoing university decision making.

The Office of Institutional Research and Accountability (OIRA) supports individuals and groups who make policies and decisions affecting the University of Maryland, Baltimore by collecting and supplying verifiable data and information, conducting policy analysis, coordinating campus assessment and evaluation activities, and facilitating planning efforts. Because of the diverse nature of programs at UMB, the primary responsibility for assessment belongs to each individual school. The OIRA provides support for the assessment function by collecting and maintaining and verifying the accuracy of institutional data and disseminating this information as needed. Additionally, each year OIRA performs extensive analyses of the data collected on performance and reports the results to USM. These analyses are then used within UMB to identify problems or areas of weakness, and strategies are developed to improve performance. The data generated are reported as part of the MFR and in other reports submitted to USM. The OIRA also supplies data to regulatory agencies, such as IPEDS, and various publications, such as US News and World Reports. Participation in the data collections and

surveys administered by the various publications allows UMB to compare itself to other participating institutions based on the included measures. Many of the reports produced by the OIRA may be found on its web site at <http://www.umaryland.edu/institutionalresearch/>.

The Office of Budget and Finance supports academic and other University units in achieving their business goals by maintaining and providing financial information and services. The office develops the University's budget plans and submissions to USM, provides accurate and timely financial information to the state, is a source of financial expertise for internal offices, and adheres to the highest standards of financial accountability.

The Office of Capital Budget and Planning is responsible for the preparation of the capital budget and its management as well as for the USM-funded construction and capital facilities renewal programs. This office also provides planning support to the campus community on matters related to space, facilities, and historic preservation; the development, updating, and implementation of the Facilities Master Plan; design guidelines; the historic preservation plan; and other planning documents. The director serves as the historic preservation liaison officer for the campus.

(i) Enterprise Risk Management

Even as the university pursues its strategic objectives, enhances its planning framework and processes, and strengthens its accountability and institutional effectiveness program, it is important that it does so with full knowledge of the implications of its decisions and actions. This includes ensuring that the university understands and manages the risks inherent in its activities and that it includes a balanced risk-reward analysis in evaluating potential opportunities available to it. It is with this attention to risk mitigation that Dr. Perman launched the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) initiative.

ERM is a holistic approach to risk management that provides a framework for entity wide risk identification, for prioritization of key exposures, development of operational responses to potentially adverse events and outcomes based on a foundation of accountability and transparency. The university believes that understanding and effectively managing risks that impact our operations is critical to continued success. The ERM initiative is led by the VPPA, working with other key individuals, has developed the structure and process of the program, which the university is currently in the process of implementing.

The ERM structure includes a representative 16-person Enterprise Risk Management Steering Committee and 12 Subject Area Workgroups (SAW). These 12 SAWs are: Academic Affairs; Campus Security and Public Safety; Clinical Practice; External and Internal Relations; Facilities; EHS and Campus Operations; Finance and Internal Controls; Global Activities; Government Regulatory/Compliance; Human Resources; IT Systems and Communication; Research; and Risk Management and Insurance.

(ii) Additional Reporting Mechanisms

Two key reports - The UMB 2013 report on Significant Trends and Institution Assessment and the UMB Managing For Results report FY14 provide an overview of institutional identity, achievement of goals and objectives and performance measures. These reports are a snapshot of

the health of the University by analyzing data from each School as well as the total campus environment. Through the process of examining performance measures and evaluating long range and short term goals, UMB strengthens its system of post-secondary education that promotes diversity, advancement in research and the development of a highly qualified workforce.

(iii) Professional Accreditation and Academic Processes

In addition to the accountability, planning, and risk management processes discussed above, the president, the deans, and the VPAA continue to rely on the assessments and recommendations made in professional accreditation reports to stimulate improvements in all aspects of the schools' operations and to measure progress.

In assessing institutional effectiveness as it relates to student learning, UMB is asked to study "how well are we collectively doing what we say we are doing?" especially in regard to students and clearly articulated learning outcomes. This metric is from the handbook on Understanding Middle States Expectations, Assessing Student Learning and Institution. UMB is uniquely positioned as an institution with a primary focus on professional and graduate education. Thus, in terms of "institutional effectiveness" as it relates to Standard 7, there is a broad focus on achieving and maintaining accreditation for each of the professional degree programs. A core measure from each professional school's accreditation is pass rates on national exams. Through these exams, UMB can document that its students possess the "knowledge, skills, and competencies" expected upon successful completion of their academic program. UMB performs well in both instances.

UMB's assessment process at the institutional level is the review and approval by senior-level administrators of key academic processes: faculty appointment, promotion, and tenure; human subjects research protocols and projects; sabbatical leave requests; minority recruitment; faculty recruitment plans; and central oversight of research compliance and management of conflict of interest.

(iv) School based Assessments

Each Professional School and some specific programs at UMB receive periodic review and accreditation. This process ensures that each School maintains standards requisite for its graduates to gain admission to other reputable institutions of higher learning or to achieve credentials for professional practice. The goal is to certify that the education provided meets acceptable levels of quality. Each accrediting organization establishes operating standards for professional institutions and programs and determines the extent to which the standards are met.

Every School at UMB is currently accredited by its professional licensing and review agency. In addition, within some Schools there are programs which receive specific accreditation for example, the Masters in Public Health in the School of Medicine. Currently, every program required to receive separate accreditation has successfully completed the process

7.3 Assessment through Strategic Plan Implementation

As discussed above, UMB's comprehensive strategic planning process led to the development of specific goals and tactics to be implemented to advance its mission. Each tactic identified was subject to measure by specific metrics and milestones. These metrics and milestones are tracked by the Strategic Plan Executive Implementation Committee and by the individuals and operational units assigned responsibility for implementing the goals and tactics. Goals and tactics are revised – both augmented and, where appropriate, abandoned – through annual reporting processes, followed by analysis, review and recommendation by the Strategic Plan Executive Implementation Committee, a broadly representative committee of Deans and other faculty and staff university leaders.

Given that *Redefining Collaboration: University of Maryland Strategic Plan 2011 – 2016* was the first comprehensive, broadly participatory strategic plan in UMB's history, it has come to form a framework around which other state-mandated and internal assessment processes are now being aligned. Now that implementation of the Plan is underway and the viability and usefulness of identified metrics has had some time to be tested, UMB is poised to more fully align its various assessment activities into a coordinated and comprehensive program.

Summary for Standard 7

The institution of The University of Maryland Baltimore, is only as effective as the sum of its parts, the professional Schools and programs. A mission of each school is to graduate well-educated, high quality professionals who will impact the communities they serve. The Schools provide a rich and unique foundation upon which the institution of UMB can achieve its mission. When the University considers institutional success, a core component is the effectiveness of each School and program. As stated earlier, every school and specific programs pass through a rigorous accreditation process from discipline focused accrediting bodies. This means that each school has met substantial objectives to be accredited. Consistently the foundation of UMB which are the professional schools, achieve successful accreditation that reinforces the deliverables – excellence in education, research, patient care and public service.

Through a detailed quality improvement process, the success and well-being of the University of Maryland Baltimore is identified and assessed by key accountability measures and indicators. The objectives used are 1) quality, 2) outcome, 3) input, 4) efficiency and 5) demographics monitoring.

UMB's assessment process evaluates overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals. Document 2.3 in the Appendix is a summary of University wide metrics. UMB and its Schools and programs demonstrate compliance with accreditation standards and embody a performance accountability process that engages the University community, internal and external stakeholders. A summary report (attachment UMBfy2014MFR) submitted to the University of Maryland System provides estimated and actual data/results of performance measures, listed by University key goals and objectives.

Summary of Compliance with Standards.

The working group believes that the University is in compliance with these three standards. The UMB Strategic Plan is anchored in broad themes, within the framework of the

strategic plan for the entire university system, and builds upon the mission, goals, and planning efforts of the professional schools, which include trends in the professions and professional accreditation criteria. Despite the fact that the budget involves multiple revenue sources and diverse operations and needs, decisions are made quickly on resource allocation; they fundamentally flow from mission and strategic goals at both the University and school levels. Institutional renewal at UMB occurs at two levels; through school based planning and assessment, in keeping with the requirements of school-based accrediting bodies, and at the institutional level, through the Strategic Plan Implementation process.

The Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland (USM), appoints the president of UMB, who serves as the chief executive officer. The president of UMB appoints the deans of the professional schools and the Graduate School, and the administrative officers including a chief academic and research officer and a chief operating officer. UMB adheres to the USM system of shared governance, in which faculty, staff, and students discuss and provide input on major issues affecting UMB, through UMB governance structures and school-based committees.

UMB has developed and implemented an integrated assessment system to evaluate overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals. Through the process of examining performance measures and evaluating long and short term goals, from each School as well as the total campus environment, UMB ensures that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for students and graduates.

III. Research Questions

A. Question 1: How could UMB design and operationalize an institutional decision-making framework that promotes the University's *Core Values* and positions the institution to realize its strategic objectives?

The health and implementation of shared governance at UMB cuts across each of UMB's core values. The shared governance protocol identifies points of *accountability* for decision-making, fosters *collaboration* and *civility* in campus decision-making, capitalizes on the great *diversity* at UMB to arrive at high quality decisions reflecting multiple perspectives, and can help UMB develop *leadership* and achieve *excellence* in the creation of *knowledge* critical to tackling tough social problems in the State of Maryland and beyond.

Methodology

Within the past year, the UMB Faculty Senate conducted a campus-wide survey to capture perceptions of shared governance among faculty; and the Middle States Self-Study Steering Committee conducted a survey of faculty, staff, and students that included questions on shared governance. Both surveys were disseminated on-line using the on-line survey tool Campus Labs Baseline and respondents were given a few weeks to complete the surveys. The faculty senate survey resulted in 163 faculty responses out of a possible 1900 faculty who received the survey. The middle states survey was disseminated to faculty, students and staff, and resulted in a total of 1836 respondents (841 Students; 282 faculty; and 713 staff). WG4 reviewed the results of these surveys, along with materials and website from the staff and faculty senates and USGA, and elicited feedback from these bodies about our research question. The group also reviewed a 2014 report from the Council of

University System Faculty (CUSF), which made recommendations related to effective assessment and reporting of the health of shared governance on each USM campus, and interviewed two key campus leaders, Dr. Bruce Jarrell and Mr. Peter Gilbert, to gain their reaction to the campus survey results and the 2014 CUSF Report as well as hear their perspectives on strategies to maintain a strong culture of shared governance at UMB. The Council of University System (CUSS), which is celebrating its 20th anniversary of its codification by the Legislature of Maryland, is currently developing a plan to assess and measure the effectiveness of shared governance at the 12 institutions of the USM. The assessment tool is being developed during the spring of 2015 with plans to implement in the fall, as CUSS adamantly supports a strong shared governance philosophy as well.

Findings

The websites, reports and feedback from the staff and faculty senates and the USGA indicate all three have been working hard over the past few years to enhance visibility, transparency and participation in decision-making. Table 2.1 “Highlights of Shared Governance” in Appendix lists the many accomplishments of the three Senates in recent years.

Results from the Faculty Senate survey on shared governance and the Middle States Self-study survey are summarized in Table 2.2 : “Summary of Faculty Senate Survey” in Appendix. While the response rate was low for the senate survey (163 of 1900 faculty responded), those who responded generally perceived the President to be genuinely committed to shared governance and the campus administration to provide adequate support for shared governance to function. However, faculty were fairly evenly split in their perception of the health of shared governance overall, the inclusion of faculty in budgetary decisions, and the effectiveness of communication between administration and senate leadership. The Middle States survey (N=1836) also revealed a fairly even split among faculty, staff, and student respondents when asked if shared governance was sufficient at the campus and school levels. Qualitative comments in the Faculty Senate survey indicated variability and some concern about shared governance at the school level, leading the Faculty Senate to suggest in their report on shared governance that “Shared governance at the school and department levels need to be addressed in the future.” Staff Senate, as well, has experienced this apparent divide.

Question 1 - Summary of Findings

The review of documents and websites, and conversations with the senate and campus leadership all reveal an increased emphasis and commitment to fostering a strong sense of shared governance on the UMB campus since the University’s last Middle States Self Study. Indeed, in the interview with Dr. Bruce Jarrell and Mr. Pete Gilbert, they both stated that President Perman is genuinely committed to shared governance and made this one of his priorities when he became president. The level of activity within the senates and the increased level of communication and dialogue between campus leadership and the senates demonstrate how President Perman’s strong support for shared governance is being implemented. Nevertheless, the two surveys conducted this past year that included questions regarding shared governance and leadership also indicated that there were mixed perceptions among the faculty, staff and student respondents about the health of shared governance on the campus and particularly within each professional school. Given the lower than desirable response rates to the surveys and the mixed results, the campus should take the mixed results seriously and commit to follow-up surveys to assess adequately whether or not the increase in shared governance efforts results in shifts in the perceptions of campus stakeholder groups. The campus is well-positioned to build upon this solid foundation and foster even greater engagement among faculty, staff, and students in future campus decisions and governance,

which will only enhance UMB's potential to promote its core values.

B. Question 2: What are the key metrics by which the University measures institutional effectiveness, and are they still appropriate and relevant in determining UMB's baseline performance?

Methodology

The Working Group began its research by building a "topography" of various metrics measured and publicly reported by the University. These metrics were found in a range of contexts:

1. The University Strategic Plan
2. The Maryland state-mandated *Managing for Results* performance accountability program administered through the State Department of Budget and Management
3. The Maryland Higher Education Commission Performance Accountability Programs
4. Peer Performance Analysis
5. Reporting to Accrediting Agencies of the Schools

These metrics were collated into a document linking them to important university goals. From this large list of metrics, the Group targeted a set of metrics to include on a survey to the University community to determine the extent to which the community found these metrics to be important for decision-making. Interviews were held with key university leaders and the websites of peer institutions examined for their use of metrics

Findings

To answer the question what are the key metrics and are they still appropriate and relevant? The group researched and reviewed the range and type of metrics employed by each School and the University as a whole. We selected metrics that seemed common to the schools and of interest to the University. A list of the most important metrics was developed and it was included in a campus wide Middle States Survey. The survey sought input from the University community, and asked them to evaluate the metrics and criteria used by the University for their importance and usefulness as an institutional evaluation tool. In general the respondents felt the various metrics were of importance to measuring overall effectiveness in achieving its mission.

As previously mentioned, the uniqueness of UMB is the fact that it is strategically positioned as an institution with a primary focus on professional and graduate education. As such it has a decentralized structure and the University's Institutional Effectiveness is built upon the mission, goals and planning efforts of the professional schools, which, in turn, are based on many factors including professional accreditation criteria.

Question 2 - Summary of Findings

The data collected by the various Schools and units contribute to the body of knowledge about the university as a whole and are appropriate and relevant in determining UMB's baseline performance. However, as one might predict in a highly decentralized University, these metrics are developed around specific unit functions and school-based accreditation and reporting requirements. In

many instances there is commonality of the type of metrics collected and reported by each School. In some cases the metrics are exclusive to that particular school or profession.

The University community and stakeholders and the general public's understanding and information about key benchmarks and metrics would be enhanced by a more comprehensive plan to share key metrics across and among Schools and units linked to the University's Core Values and Strategic Plan. But that in no way diminishes from the importance of the current key metrics which are robust and contribute much needed information to students, faculty and staff and add value to the University's processes by which it measure institutional effectiveness.

C. Question 3: How could UMB capitalize on the robust culture of accreditation among its schools to design a conceptual framework to create a culture of assessment that holistically evaluates student learning outcomes on a graduate and professional campus?

Methodology: Subgroup 3 examined key documents from each school, especially the most recent accreditation, to determine the current assessment measures used by each to evaluate graduate and professional student learning outcomes. Our particular goal was to decide whether the current assessment tools in any specific school might be applicable to all the schools, thus furthering the goal of "7 schools-1 university", and allowing each school to achieve its best results.

What follows is a set of metrics that we recommend be used by all schools. They are derived from accreditation documents of each school.

Findings: Each of the UMB's professional schools has an evaluation plan where an array of information is gathered, and students' activities and satisfaction from admission to post graduation are tracked.

The School of Pharmacy (SOP) tracks student scholarly activities, national recognition/award for academic excellence, board pass rate, job placement upon graduation, increase in fellowship and residency placement, recognition for improved patient outcomes in the community, and patent number. In addition, satisfaction rate, faculty retention, and alumni participation in continuing education are tracked as well as track extramural funding, faculty publications, and participation in collaborative NIH-sponsored grants, multi-investigator grants.

The School of Nursing (SON) has a master evaluation plan (Appendix 1A-6) where academic programs (undergraduate, graduates, students, faculty, governances, partnerships and initiatives) are evaluated regularly, (semiannually, yearly or every 5 years). Each program in SON is evaluated for its effectiveness by measuring completion, licensure, certification and employment rates (Appendices: IVA-1, IVA-3, IVH-1)

The School of Medicine (SOM) has no overall, summative matrix for trainees evaluation; however, assessment at different levels and for both undergraduates (medical students) and postgraduates (medical residents) is been performed. The assessment of students in all clinical experiences, as well as the residents is done via standard evaluation forms that are competency-

based. Tracking is done of students' performance on internal exams, shelf exam, and national licensing exams as well as their acceptance in one of their first three choices of residency training programs, as well as first year students' participation in community service projects. Students services, adequacy of learning environment, and are also evaluated.

The School of Social Work (SSW) had no overall, summative matrix for student assessment. Data are gathered from alumni surveys, from student evaluation surveys, from evaluations by field instructors and from the results of the state licensing exam.

The School of Dentistry (SOD) performs a large outcomes assessment and internally they review objectives of student assessment, results, dissemination, and improvement in the areas of education (admissions, curriculum, graduation, facilities, patient satisfaction) and patient care (quality, safety).

The School of Law (SOL) has extensive documentation of statistics for student entry into the school. The outcomes assessment includes data on progression through the school and statistics on success post-graduation, such as an employment summary, Bar passage rates, and job placement rates.

Question 3 – Summary of Findings

For an overall evaluation of the education at UMB, WG4 generated a matrix template with a variety of domains, which builds on the schools' assessment processes and outcomes (Attachment 2.6). A table like this should be stored in a centralized place where UMB administrators can find all data and use it to decide on improvements to student outcomes. The format of the table can be transparent, with the actual results available to central administration and the level of access, beyond faculty, determined by central administration and/or by each school. Public access and publicity may be based on material compiled from the table. A summary of commonly tracked students' activities and learning outcomes will allow UMB to improve the learning environment and allow self-reflection, as well as better planning and allocating resources for the future.

IV. Recommendations

Recommendation 1, Level 2. Each school and the UMB might adopt the matrix of Question 3 for review of its objectives/domains. Each school can identify its own domains. The categories include assessment results and modifications based on the results. The matrix would allow the individual school, the UMB, and individual faculty members to better understand the process and success of the school in reaching its mission.

Recommendation 2. Level 2. Revise and tailor the 2014 Faculty Senate survey on shared governance to match UMB's needs and have it discussed and implemented at the school-level to increase responsiveness and accountability. For instance to respond to concerns about the level of commitment to shared governance by each school, campus leadership could require each Dean to respond to the results of their school's concerns. WG4 also learned from the interview with Dr. Bruce Jarrell that the faculty senate survey was grounded in questions designed by CUSF and

that the survey could be redesigned to gather a more nuanced picture of faculty, staff and student perceptions of shared governance at UMB annually, again at both the campus and school levels annually. Other metrics could also be collected annually to assess levels of participation in governance activities, such as participation rates in meetings of campus senate and school-level bodies and voting rates for campus senate elections.

Recommendation 3, Level 2. Build upon the strong foundation of collaboration between all three shared governance bodies and the Executive Cabinet to hold an annual “Shared Governance Summit.” The summit could celebrate accomplishments from the prior year, analyze and disseminate data collected during the year from the shared governance survey, discuss current topics or innovations in shared governance practices nationally, and identify action steps for practice and assessment improvements for the coming year. The executive committees of each senate, the Executive Cabinet and the Chairs of each school’s faculty governing body could be invited to attend, which would not only elevate the importance of the topic of shared governance but generate new ideas to be implemented campus-wide. Senate leadership and both Dr. Jarrell and Mr. Pete Gilbert expressed interest in increasing the level of time and attention dedicated to identifying and implementing “best practices” in shared governance, and were very supportive of the idea of an annual summit.

Recommendation 4, Level 3. The University should develop a relatively short list of critical metrics (10 to 15) that will form the basis of a university-wide dashboard of key indicators, linked to the high level goals of its Strategic Plan and Core Values. These key indicators and goals can help build understanding of the institution’s mission and its progress toward it. They can help tell a more compelling and robust story of concrete accomplishments. And they can broadly aide decisions regarding allocation of resources in mission areas of focus. Metrics developed in the context of state and MHEC performance accountability programs do not paint a complete picture of the University’s current clearly articulated goals, core values and collaborative initiatives. Consequently this list of critical metrics will enhance the University’s institutional evaluation.

Recommendation 5, Level 2. The campus’ ‘culture of assessment’ could be enhanced by having campus and school leadership address specific findings revealed during the various assessment processes. The following activities could enhance this culture:

- During their “State of the University/School Address”, the President and the individual Deans could focus on the results of the various assessment processes conducted during the previous year and what has been done in response to those findings.
- The University’s Executive Council should spend time reviewing assessment results and strategies for quality improvement UMB based on those results. The Council should make these issues and targeted strategies public.
- Within each school, meetings of Associate Deans (Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, etc.), could do the same – discuss assessment findings and develop quality improvement strategies.

The key is that the campus community sees that assessment is important; that strategies will be developed to address various issues using appropriate university personnel and resources; and that eventually, the outcomes of these strategies will be made public.

V. Conclusion.

The goal of this chapter was twofold, to provide the Middle States Commission on Higher Education with the information and analysis necessary to make a decision about the institution's reaccreditation, and to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses relative to each accreditation standard and to use this information to make recommendations for improvement.

1. Provide the Middle States Commission on Higher Education with the information and analysis necessary to make a decision about the institution's reaccreditation.

Standard 2: The University and its schools followed a comprehensive strategic process that led to the development of clearly stated goals and objectives used for planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal. Evaluation following implementation is used to make necessary adjustment to improve and maintain the institution educational quality.

2. To identify institutional strengths and weaknesses relative to each accreditation standard and to use this information to make recommendations for improvement.

UMB is unique because it is strategically positioned as an institution with a primary focus on professional and graduate education, and thus a decentralized structure. The University's Institutional Effectiveness is built upon the mission, goals and planning efforts of the professional schools, where there is a substantial evidence of quality improvement activities and significant documentation of improvement efforts. A more comprehensive plan to share key metrics across and among Schools and units, such as a summary of commonly tracked students' activities and learning outcomes, will greatly enhance the University community and stakeholders and the general public's understanding and information about key benchmarks and metrics. It will also allow UMB to improve the learning environment, self-reflection, and better planning and allocating resources for the future.

VI. Appendices. Table of contents

Appendix 1. Documentation of Compliance to the Standards.

Middle States Accreditation Compliance Documentation Chart.

Appendix 2. Documentation of Support for Questions 1-3.

2.1. Highlights of Shared Governance. Page 25

2.2. Summary of Faculty Senate Survey. page 25

2.3. UMB Metrics page 23

2.4. School Metrics

2.4d Nursing

2.4a Dentistry

2.4b Law

2.4e Pharmacy

2.4c Medicine

2.4f Social work (not attached)

2.6. Accountability table for Professional Schools. Page 28

Appendix 3: Suggestions for UMB