



UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE SELF-STUDY DESIGN PLAN

Submitted to:
Maryland State Commission on Higher Education
February 19, 2015

MSCHE Co-Liaisons:
Catherine Finneran Andersen, Ph.D.
Darlene Brannigan Smith, Ph.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Foreword	1
II.	University of Baltimore: An Overview	1
	A. Brief Facts	
	B. Recent Developments	
	C. Mission and Strategic Goals	
III.	Scope and Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study	6
	A. Nature and Scope of Self-Study	
	B. Goals and Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study	
IV.	Organization of the Self-Study Process.....	7
	A. Structure of Self-Study Steering Committee and Working Groups	
	B. Charges for the Steering Committee and the Working Groups	
	C. Guidelines for Working Group Reports: Style and Format	
	D. Self-Study Time Line	
V.	Self-Study Research Questions	12
	A. Working Group 1: Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness	
	B. Working Group 2: Solidifying Collaborative Leadership & Governance	
	C. Working Group 3: Strengthening Commitment to Student Success	
	D. Working Group 4: Aligning Educational Offerings for Enrollment Growth	
VI.	Outline for the Final Self-Study Report	27
VII.	Recommendations for Members of the Visiting Team	28
	APPENDIX: Inventory of Support Documents for Working Groups	29

I. FOREWARD

This document provides a design for the University of Baltimore's decennial Self- Study for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE). The design provides a framework and set of strategies to improve the quality of student learning and completion rates for all students at UB, strategically grow enrollments, and enhance the University's commitment to institutional effectiveness. This Self-Study design supports the University's Strategic Plan – specifically Goals 1, 2 and the resource allocation and planning components of Goal 5. In addition, this plan responds to feedback and direction provided to the University by MSCHE in the 2007, 2008, and 2012 reports.

II. UNIVERSITY OF BALTIMORE: AN OVERVIEW

A. Brief Facts

The University of Baltimore (UB) was founded in 1925 as a private institution. Its founders were Baltimore civic leaders who wanted to provide low-cost, part-time evening study in business and law for working adults. UB became a state institution in 1975 and then part of the University of System of Maryland (USM) in 1988.

As the last university to join USM, UB is one of 12 degree-granting, public institutions that form the University System of Maryland. As a USM member institution, UB is bound by the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland, its policies and protocols. The USM's administrative authority is broad and encompasses such operational matters as the university's mission statement, budget matters, functional policies and program approvals. In addition, as a public university, UB's operations are also routinely evaluated by certain governing authorities including the Maryland Higher Education Commission and other state entities that assess the university's progress and performance in certain key areas.

The University of Baltimore continues to educate business and law students and is the only university in Maryland with a law school and an undergraduate program. UB has added full-time day programs and an array of professionally oriented programs in the arts and sciences and public affairs. In 2007, the university reintroduced lower division education; the last freshmen class was enrolled in 1975. The return to lower division necessitated expansion of UB's General Education program and reallocation of resources in order to provide instructional and student affairs support for new enrollment. Numerous organizational changes have also been undertaken in support of the university's expanded mission and student body. The university now has four colleges: the College of Public Affairs, the Merrick School of Business, the School of Law and the Yale Gordon College of Arts and Sciences. In addition, some programs are offered online, at the Universities at Shady Grove in Montgomery County, Maryland, and in partnership with other USM institutions (i.e., Coppin State University, Towson University).

The current campus is located in the Mt. Royal area of Baltimore. As part of the campus Master Plan, the University has increased campus square footage by 50% and brought \$275 million of capital investment to midtown Baltimore, including \$123 million in private funds. In addition,

the University has achieved a 35% reduction in the campus's carbon footprint, part of its institutional commitment to urban sustainability. The newest facilities include the John and Frances Angelos Law Center (LEED Platinum certified), the Liberal Arts and Policy building, and the Student Center. For the first time in UB's history, students preferring to live near campus now have the option to live in the Varsity, a 323-bed, privately-owned student housing project just two blocks from UB's campus.

In the fall of 2014, the University of Baltimore had total enrollment of 6,422 (Undergraduate: 3,485; Graduate: 1,997, Law: 940). Females represent 58 percent of the student body. The average age of undergraduates is 28; it is 33 for graduate students and 28 for law school students. Eighty-four percent of faculty members hold the highest degree in their field, and the student-faculty ratio is 15:1, the lowest ratio since 2006. The University of Baltimore has a total of 62,983 alumni with 37,662 living in Maryland.

In addition to its MSCHE accreditation, the University of Baltimore is accredited by the following organizations:

- American Bar Association (ABA), Council of the Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar
- Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS)
- Association to Advance Collegiate School of Business (AACSB-International)
- Association of University Programs in Health Administration (AUPHA)
- National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)

B. Recent Developments

Leadership and Organizational Changes:

A new era in UB's history began July 2014 with the arrival of the University's 8th President, Kurt L. Schmoke. President Schmoke brings to the University a wealth of experience in public service, higher education and leadership. Prior to joining UB, he was dean of the Howard University School of Law in Washington, D.C., from 2003-2012. Following that, he was appointed general counsel for Howard University and also served as the institution's interim provost. Schmoke served as the mayor of Baltimore from 1987-1999 and was the Baltimore City State's Attorney from 1982-1987.

In addition to the appointment of a new president, the University of Baltimore has undergone significant changes in leadership and organization since its periodic review. These changes have created a challenging yet opportune context for the MSCHE Self-Study. Since 2012, new deans have been appointed in each of UB's four academic divisions. From 2012-14, all of the colleges completed appointment processes to ensure that each college had an associate dean and at least one assistant dean. The role of assistant deans has evolved to include an increased focus on student advising and retention.

Significant change has also occurred in the Office of the Provost. In 2012, the Office of Institutional Research was moved from the Provost's Office to the Division of Finance and

Administration so that data for external reporting and strategic planning could be more directly deployed. At the same time, an assistant provost position was created to support financial planning within Academic Affairs. In 2013, the new associate provost for academic affairs was hired and is the lead on assessment and the MSCHE Accreditation Liaison Officer. Also in 2013, the Office of Academic Innovation (OAI) was formed and is responsible for supporting, coordinating, and institutionalizing creative and innovative approaches to teaching and student learning. In 2015, the former position of associate provost for academic innovation was redeployed and a new position, associate vice provost of institutional effectiveness, was created to enhance the University's effort in assessment and institutional effectiveness, reporting to the senior associate provost for academic affairs.

The Enrollment Management and Student Affairs (EMSA) division also realigned staffing resources. In 2011, a new Associate Vice President for Admission was appointed with the responsibility for achieving new student enrollment goals and improving the admission evaluation process. The Director of Freshman Admissions resigned in 2012; the new Director is responsible for the admission of all undergraduates, both freshmen and transfer students. As a result of re-structuring in the Offices of Admission, a Director of Community College Relations was named to strengthen transfer initiatives. In 2013, the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services resigned; the replacement manages initiatives related to retention, financial aid and registration and has been responsible for implementation of the University's new Degree Audit system. Student Affairs has continued to evolve. The growing undergraduate population has led to increased focus on community life and student engagement. A residential life initiative is emerging as the population of students choosing to live in UB Mid-Town grows; beginning in Fall 2015, a professional Residence Director will support these students. A new director of the Career and Professional Development Center has implemented a comprehensive program for lifelong career management. In 2013, the Bob Parsons Veterans Center was launched.

Shifting Enrollment Patterns: 2007-2014

The University's enrollment grew from 5415 students in 2007 to a peak of 6558 students in 2012 and has since leveled at 6422 students in 2014, a long-term increase of 18%. Cumulative credit hours attempted by students followed a similar pattern, increasing by 34%. The student population has also become more diverse in ethnicity and geographic origin. Students are more likely to be enrolled full-time (49% in 2014 compared to 45% in 2007). The change is not only the result of incoming, traditional-age freshmen, but also as a result of growth in the number and profile of transfer students.

Undergraduate students represent 54% of UB's students, with 42% of undergraduates enrolled as freshmen or sophomore. Students who enrolled as freshmen now represent 26% of undergraduates. These students are also younger and more likely to enroll full time (61% of undergraduates in fall 2014).

Graduate and professional education has also seen enrollment shifts. Graduate enrollment has increased by 6% since 2007, with growth primarily in the College of Public Affairs. Business students made up 38% of graduate students in 2007; in fall 2014 The College of Public Affairs

had the largest representation with 45% of graduate students. Enrollment in the law school, stable for a number of years, declined by 18% since its peak in 2010, following a national trend. Because UB's law school comprises a significantly larger percentage of the University's total student headcount than at most institutions, and because of the differential between undergraduate and graduate/law tuitions, the mix of UB's student population among undergraduate, graduate and law enrollments must be closely monitored moving forward.

Retention and Graduation Rates:

The University of Baltimore returned to four-year undergraduate education in fall 2007. While the number of students who enter as freshmen has remained relatively modest, the freshmen class has been fundamental in re-orientating the University towards a more traditional college campus. Considerable focus has been brought to bear on freshmen graduation and retention rates. Only two classes, fall 2007 and fall 2008, allow for measurement of six-year graduation rates. The 2007 class was unusual in that the first-year tuition costs were wholly subsidized by an outside benefactor. It recorded a six-year graduation rate of 37%. Of the non-returners of the class of 2007, an unusually high percentage were transfer-out students, and some 18% of the original class graduated from another institution within six years. Notwithstanding, this compares favorably with similar institutions as reported by the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE). The graduation rate for the fall of 2008 class was 44%--a notable single year gain. In addition, only 26% of the class had not graduated or were not still enrolled either at UB or at another institution. This places the University of Baltimore appreciably higher in student success than the average rates obtained by institutions with a similar profile.

Budget and Financial Resources:

The University of Baltimore operates under the same budget constraints that all public universities face. Contributing factors include limited state resources, lingering effects of the 2008 recession and escalating mandatory costs. Public support for higher education in Maryland compares favorably with national trends in several key areas, including affordability. In FY2005, tuition and fees at Maryland's public four-year institutions were the seventh most-expensive in the nation. To reduce this burden on students, Maryland instituted a four-year tuition freeze from FY2007 to FY2010. As a result, Maryland tuition now ranks twenty-seventh nationally.

UB's state support grew a moderate 4.8% from FY2011 to FY2014, during a time when many states dramatically cut higher education appropriations. During the same period, tuition revenue grew by 5.9%, continuing the decline in the percentage of the University's budget provided by state funds. In FY2014, tuition and fees accounted for 62% of UB's operating budget, with state support accounting for 29%. The USM received a 1.98% midyear reduction in January 2015, as the state addresses a structural deficit. UB implemented a hiring freeze and reduced academic and non-academic operational budgets, but avoided a mid-year tuition increase and employee furloughs imposed by some USM institutions through contingency planning. A further reduction in state appropriations is anticipated for FY2016. In addition to state support and tuition revenue, the University relies on fundraising and has recently completed the most successful fundraising campaign in its history, exceeding the campaign target by 12.5%. Sound fiscal management and innovative practices, such as the use of public/private partnerships, have

enabled the University to maintain an upward trajectory despite recession and post-recession challenges.

C. Mission and Strategic Goals: *Achievement, Innovation, Community*

In preparation for new presidential leadership, the University undertook a comprehensive strategic planning process in AY 2013-2014. The new plan, *Achievement, Innovation, Community: The University of Baltimore Strategic Plan 2014-17*, was approved by the University's governance entities, and the Chancellor and Board of Regents of the University System of Maryland.

The mission of the University of Baltimore is to provide innovative education in business, public affairs, the applied liberal arts and sciences, and law to serve the needs of a diverse population in an urban setting. A public university, the University of Baltimore offers excellent teaching and a supportive community for undergraduate, graduate and professional students in an environment distinguished by academic research and public service. The University:

- makes excellence accessible to traditional and nontraditional students motivated by professional advancement and civic awareness;
- establishes a foundation for lifelong learning, personal development and social responsibility;
- combines theory and practice to create meaningful, real-world solutions to 21st-century urban challenges; and
- is an anchor institution, regional steward and integral partner in the culture, commerce and future development of Baltimore and the region.

The new strategic plan outlined six strategic goals specifying how the University will fulfill its mission:

Goal 1: The University of Baltimore will enhance student success and career readiness through programmatic innovation, ongoing assessment of student learning and expanded student support services.

Goal 2: The University of Baltimore will strategically grow enrollment in support of student success and in response to market demand, consistent with Maryland's 55 percent college completion goal.

Goal 3: The University of Baltimore will enhance its commitment to innovation across the institution.

Goal 4: The University of Baltimore will strengthen scholarship, research and creative activities across the institution.

Goal 5: The University of Baltimore will be recognized for responsible stewardship of institutional resources and for its prominent role as an anchor institution in midtown Baltimore.

Goal 6: The University of Baltimore will be a preferred workplace and destination of choice for faculty, staff, students and alumni.

III. SCOPE AND INTENDED OUTCOMES OF THE SELF-STUDY

A. Nature and Scope of Self-Study

The University of Baltimore will use a comprehensive, theme-based Self-Study model, because this approach would be most helpful in addressing current mission-oriented needs and strategic priorities. The Self-Study will be linked to Goals 1, 2 and 5 of our recently approved Strategic Plan (2014); the Student Success Report (2014) commissioned by the former president and built around the MSCHE recommendations in the PPR 2012; and our 2014 MSCHE progress report citing the ongoing need for UB to be an evidence-based institution with clear and measurable goals.

The proposed MSCHE Self-Study design is summarized in Figure 1. It has been discussed with the leadership of the University and its governing entities, including the University Governance Steering Council, University Faculty Senate, University Staff Senate, leadership of the Student Government Association, and the faculty senates of each of the four academic divisions. In addition, it was presented to the campus community at a university-wide Town Hall meeting on February 18, 2015.

Figure 1

**Proposed Self-Study Design
The Comprehensive Report with Emphasis**

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT	EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
<p>Working Group 1: Enhancing Institutional Effectiveness</p> <p><i>Standard 1:</i> Mission and Goals <i>Standard 2:</i> Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal <i>Standard 3:</i> Institutional Resources <i>Standard 7:</i> Institutional Assessment</p>	<p>Working Group 3: Strengthening Commitment to Student Success</p> <p><i>Standard 8:</i> Student Admissions and Retention <i>Standard 9:</i> Student Support Services <i>Standard 14:</i> Assessment of Student Learning</p>
<p>Working Group 2: Solidifying Collaborative Leadership and Governance</p> <p><i>Standard 4:</i> Leadership and Governance <i>Standard 5:</i> Administration <i>Standard 6:</i> Integrity</p>	<p>Working Group 4: Aligning Educational Offerings for Enrollment Growth</p> <p><i>Standard 10:</i> Faculty <i>Standard 11:</i> Educational Offerings <i>Standard 12:</i> General Education</p>

	<i>Standard 13: Related Educational Activities</i>
--	--

B. Goals and Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study

Working on our Self-Study and subsequent recommendations will serve as an important blue print in UB’s continued growth and progress. When faced with budgetary challenges, lower than desired graduation and retention rates, and stagnant and declining enrollments, it is critical that we regularly assess effectiveness of our teaching and learning activities, develop an unshakable focus on student success, identify ways to strategically grow enrollments, and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the academic support and administrative aspects of the University. Ongoing assessment of student learning and success and of institutional effectiveness will be an important component of our study process.

Specifically, the goals of the Self Study are to:

1. Achieve reaffirmation of our MSCHE accreditation.
2. Address mission-oriented and strategically-oriented issues.
3. Engage members of the university community in the use of data for improving institutional effectiveness.
4. Provide an honest, fair and forward-looking assessment of the University and foster widespread understanding of the institution’s current circumstances and challenges – take a look forward.
5. Enhance trust and confidence in institutional processes and strengthen transparency.
6. Produce a document that serves as a concise and useful tool for institutional planning and change that is evidence based and supports the development of the next University of Baltimore Strategic Plan.

The Self-Study will play a significant role in helping our university community identify and better understand our strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities for improvement. Findings will serve as foundation for building an evidence-based plan for strengthening the University of Baltimore and enhancing our ability to achieve our stated goals and objectives.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

A. Organizational Structure of the Self-Study Steering Committee and Working Groups

UB’s Self-Study will be organized around four major themes, each of which will comprise a Working Group. UB’s Committee will be composed of 58 members including 18 members on the Steering Committee and 40 members on the four thematically organized work groups, all consistent with MSCHE recommendations. Under leadership of the Steering Committee, a broad cross-section of the campus community will participate in Working Groups. Each Working Group will be responsible for examining existing data and evaluative reports, gathering new information, and preparing analytical reports on their assigned topics.

Upon review of and feedback from our MSCHE liaison on our Self-Study Design, the University will confirm membership of the Steering Committee and Working Groups. Criteria for selection will include members of the institution who are respected, knowledgeable in the selected focus area, and representative of the diversity of the institution, both in terms of perspective as well as experience with the university.

The Steering Committee will represent broad institutional perspectives that transcend departments and disciplines, and include individuals who have the knowledge and leadership skills to guide specific tasks and ensure long-term use of Self-Study results. Composition of the Steering Committee is as follows:

1. Co-Liaison: Catherine Andersen, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
2. Co-Liaison: Darlene Smith, Professor of Marketing
3. President or Designee
4. Provost: Joseph Wood
5. Academic Dean
6. Co-Chair Working Group 1:
7. Co-Chair Working Group 1:
8. Co-Chair Working Group 2:
9. Co-Chair Working Group 2:
10. Co-Chair Working Group 3:
11. Co-Chair Working Group 3:
12. Co-Chair Working Group 4:
13. Co-Chair Working Group 4:
14. Representative, University Faculty Senate
15. Representative, University Staff Senate:
16. Representative, Student Government Association:
17. Representative, University of Baltimore Foundation or Alumni Board
18. Representative, University System of Maryland Board of Regents

B. Committee Charges

The following is the general charge for the Self-Study Steering Committee:

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of the Middle States Commission on the Higher Education Self-Study accreditation process and requirements, particularly with the 14 standards described in *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation*.
- In addition to the documents provided in this Self-Study design, develop and collect additional support documents for use by the Steering Committees and Working Groups.
- Work collaboratively with the Working Groups to refine Self-Study research questions as we move forward in the data gathering and analysis process.
- Coordinate communication pertaining to the MSCHE Self-Study process to internal, as well as appropriate external, constituencies.
- Provide leadership to, and coordinate responsibilities/deliverables of, the Working Groups.

- Read and provide timely feedback on Working Group reports.
- Assist Working Groups with acquiring access to needed information and resources.
- In an ongoing and iterative process, integrate Working Group reports in a coherent and comprehensive Self-Study document.
- Take on editorial responsibility for the final Self-Study report.
- Engage in a thorough assessment of the final Self-Study report to ensure all MSCHE requirements, with respect to areas to be covered and evidence related to each, are achieved.

The following is the general charge for the Working Groups:

- Develop a comprehensive understanding of the Middle States Commission on the Higher Education Self-Study accreditation process and requirements, particularly with the 14 standards described in *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education: Requirements of Affiliation and Standards for Accreditation*.
- Develop a solid understanding of the “fundamental elements” of each standard for which the Working Group is responsible, both in a general sense and, specifically with respect to the University of Baltimore.
- Review, understand and utilize the University’s inventory of support documents to determine their relevancy to the Self-Study research questions assigned to the Working Group.
- Collect additional data/reports relevant to the Self-Study research questions assigned to the Working Group.
- Work collaboratively with the Steering Committee to refine Self-Study research questions as we move forward in the data gathering and analysis processes.
- Review and utilize information and findings from UB’s Periodic Review Reports.
- Collect and examine evidence that pertains to each standard for which the Working Group is responsible in order to assess how effective the University is in meeting compliance requirements.
- Draft report of findings of review and recommendations for moving forward.

C. Guidelines for Working Group Reports: Style and Format

The following guidelines apply to all Working Group reports that are submitted to the Steering Committee. Although Working Group reports should include relevant descriptions, the bulk of reports should focus on evaluation, assessment and recommendations/strategies for improvement. It is important to note that although a significant amount of information from Working Group reports will be included in the final MSCHE Self-Study report, the Steering Committee has ultimate editorial control of the final Self-Study report.

Throughout each report, the standard and research questions being addressed should be clearly identified. Using the Self-Study research questions assigned to the Working Group, each report should use clear and concise language, be checked for accuracy in spelling and grammar, be written in complete sentences, formatted according to APA guidelines, and submitted as Microsoft 2010 Word document. All abbreviations and acronyms should be completely spelled

out on first reference within the report. Reports should be single-spaced and use Times New Roman, 12-point font.

The following is a proposed outline for the conceptualization of each Working Group's final report. For each standard:

- I. Identify the standard and respective research questions
- II. Describe the approach and methods used in the data gathering, analysis and assessment processes
 - a. List significant documents
 - b. Identify additional sources of evidence
- III. Identify research results
 - a. Provide key evidence that demonstrates how UB meets the standard in question.
 - b. Indicate any challenges that UB faces with respect to enhancing its strengths in the areas encompassed by the standard.
- IV. Discuss key findings and recommendations
 - a. The extent to which there is university-wide understanding, communication, collaboration, and assessment with respect to the standard.
 - b. Discuss any strengths and weaknesses described in section III above.
 - c. Recommendation/strategies for improvement
- V. Conclusion

D. Self-Study Time Line

The Steering Committee will meet monthly starting in spring 2015 and throughout the 2015-16 academic year, with Working Groups meeting every one to two weeks in between. Steering Committee meetings will be used for review and feedback on the evolving reports from each Working Group. Co-liaisons will provide substantive feedback at several points during the year. During fall 2016, the Steering Committee will hold an open-community session to share draft findings and recommendations. Feedback will be solicited and included in the report, as appropriate. Working Groups will conclude their work in November 2016. A Self-Study 2017 website will be created, as well as a Sakai site, to house relevant MSCHE documents. These will be used to provide information and to communicate with the broader University community.

During the summer of 2016, the co-chairs will revise and integrate the Working Group reports, and then draft the Self-Study document which will be sent to the Steering Committee and Provost for input. Once this level of revision is completed, the report will be presented to the President and executive leadership to ensure that (1) it represents a consensus about the current state and future prospects of the institution, (2) all relevant perspectives have been considered, and (3) the institution is accurately portrayed through the institutional "voice" of the report. The document will then be shared with the full University community, including faculty, staff, and the Student Government. The final report will be forwarded to the Chancellor and Board of Regents for approval. A more detailed timeline is provided below:

- Fall 2014
 - Attend the Self-Study Institute (Catherine Andersen, Jack Bates)
 - Discuss process with President and Provost
 - Attend pre-conference workshops and 2014 Annual MSCHE (Andersen, Bates)
 - President appoints Andersen and Smith to lead Self-Study
- Spring 2015
 - Steering Committee commences regular meetings
 - Decision on Self-Study Model
 - Decision on number of Working Groups and assigned standards
 - Presentation on MSCHE to stakeholders across the campus, including Town Hall Meeting on February 18, 2015
 - Development of Self-Study Design Proposal for submission to MSCHE
 - Visit on March 6, 2015 by Middle States Vice President to discuss Self-Study Design Plan and meet with key individuals and groups.
 - Approval of Self-Study Design Plan
 - Appointment of Steering Committee and work group chairpersons
- Summer 2015
 - Appointment of Work Group members
 - Middle States webpage goes live
- Fall 2015
 - Working Groups conduct research in response to questions and submit reports to Steering Committee
 - MSCHE selects Chair of the Evaluation Team
 - Chair of the Evaluation Team and University agree upon dates for the team visit and Chair's preliminary visit.
 - Aggressive communication continues with combination of face-to-face meetings, mail communication and posting information on website/Sakai.
- Spring and Summer 2016
 - Draft of Self-Study is completed and distributed for final comments to Steering Committee and key university individuals.
- Fall 2016
 - Draft of Self-Study posted on web for campus review
 - Governance structure reviews draft Self-Study.
 - Draft Self-Study sent to Evaluation Team Chair.
 - Chair makes preliminary campus site visit
 - University prepares Final Self-Study document
- Winter 2017
 - Final Self-Study distributed to Evaluation Team and MSCHE
- Spring 2017
 - Evaluation Team visit and report
 - University response
- Summer 2017
 - MSCHE action

V. SELF-STUDY RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The Self-Study design is expected to include a set of research questions for each Working Group that (1) will demonstrate compliance with the Commission's standards, (2) deepen the University's self-understanding, and (3) advance institutional self-improvement. The following questions were developed by the MSCHE Co-Liaisons using other institutional Self-Study exemplar reports provided by MSCHE and using the fundamental elements of each of the 14 standards. The expectation is that the Steering Committee, once formed, will work in consultation with Working Groups to develop a final set of research questions.

The research questions for the Working Groups will be the heart of the Self-Study process because they provide structure for the Working Groups' research, analysis and reporting. However, even these questions and the areas of inquiry may change as the work of the groups' progress. Thus, these initial set of research questions are provided to stimulate thinking about important topics; show how the Self-Study should address the standards through the lens of specific UB issues and concerns; and demonstrate that meaningful questions should require evaluation and judgment and not purely descriptive responses.

Once the Steering Committee and President approve the initial set of analytical questions, the next step will be to identify existing documents that can be used and what new research, if any, will be undertaken during the Self-Study. The final set of analytical Self-Study questions should lead to analysis of the University's strengths and weaknesses and suggestions for improvement.

A. WORKING GROUP 1: ENHANCING INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

Working Group 1 is charged with conducting a comprehensive review of Middle States standards 1, 2, 3 and 7. The mission provides the foundation and guiding direction for the University as well as the manner in which we demonstrate compliance with all the Commission's standards. How an institution approaches strategic planning, the utilization of its resources, assessing its effectiveness, and preparing for the future are essential to its growth, competitiveness, and long-term viability. Through the research questions outlined for this Working Group we will gain a better understanding of how the University engages in short- and long-term institutional planning and the impact of these efforts on the campus. We will also collect data on what resources are available to the University and to what extent we have demonstrated our commitment to being good stewards of these resources. This section will also include an assessment of what processes are in place for evaluating our effectiveness as an institution and how we have used the information to improve who we are and what we do. We will also examine what mechanisms are in place to ensure that the University remains viable, relevant and effective as a public, urban-engaged institution.

***Standard 1 – Mission and Goals:** The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of high education and indicates who the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission and goals are developed and recognized by the institution with the participation of its members and*

its governing body and are used to develop and shape its programs and practices to evaluate its effectiveness.

1. Does UB have a clearly defined mission statement that is understood and embraced by the University community?
2. How well does the mission statement encompass the long-term visions of the new President and the new USM Chancellor, and the various constituents of UB? What entities were involved in its creation?
3. Does the University's mission effectively serve the institution given changes in the higher education environment and in UB's infrastructure, funding and enrollments?
4. What mechanisms are in place for dissemination, collection of feedback and periodic review of the mission statement? How effective are these various mechanisms?
5. How does the four-point mission identify verifiable outcomes that are essential to enable the collection of supporting evidence to show that the University is compliant with this standard?
6. A key component of the university's mission is innovative education, and goal three of the strategic plan states that a priority is to enhance the institution's commitment to innovation. How does the university define and measure this? How does the recently developed Office of Academic Innovation contribute to the fulfillment of this goal?
7. How well does the existing organizational structure ensure that the mission statements of various individual units conform to the university mission and goals? Are there any oversight committees or processes to demonstrate compliance?
8. How are the mission statements of the various colleges aligned with the overall mission statement of UB? How closely aligned is UB's mission and vision with the USM mission and vision?
9. What mechanisms are in place for informing new students and employees about the existence of a mission statement and guidelines for incorporation of these ideals into university life?
10. What are the stated goals and metrics to measure achievement of mission? Do goals reflect SMART criteria (e.g., Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time-bound)? What evidence do we have to show that we achieve these?
11. What institutional processes are used to develop, communicate, implement, and measure achievement of overall goals? How are goals/processes renewed or modified based on results? How participatory has this process been?
12. How do overall institutional goals guide the faculty, staff, and administration in determining program and curricular priorities as well as resource allocation?

Standard 2 – Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal: *An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and goals, develops objectives to achieve them, 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.*

1. What approach does UB take in setting institutional goals and priorities and in allocating resources? How does the university balance short-term needs against long-term goals in its planning and budgeting strategies?
2. To what extent is the goal setting and resource allocation processes collaborative and what mechanisms are in place for process improvement? What processes are in place for periodic assessment of the effective and efficient use of institutional resources?
3. To what extent is the relationship between the institution's strategic plan and the budget process well understood and effectively implemented? How well does the allocation of institutional and college/school resources reflect the strategic priorities of the institution?
4. Is there alignment between the various annual operational plans and the university's strategic plan? Does each college/school and non-academic division/department have annual SMART goals?
5. Does the institution communicate and share strategic and operational goals on multiple levels of the organization (co-plan)? Does the university publish strategic and operational goals for clarity and transparency?
6. How is UB addressing increasing costs, and are strategies in place to help deal with these costs increased efficiency?
7. Does the university have a process responsible for reviewing, assessing and reporting on the university's progress in meeting the goals of the strategic plan? What processes does the university have in place for periodic assessment of the effectiveness of planning, resource allocation and institutional renewal?
8. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the university's current budgeting/resource allocation model? What options are being considered to improve the model?
9. How do the institution's resources and sustainable resource base including faculty, staff and administrative salaries and associated costs compare with those of its peers both within and external to similar institutions in the University System of Maryland? Are there appropriate reasons for any significant differences?
10. How well are institutional planning processes communicated? To what extent are institutional and college/school plans readily accessible to the campus community?
11. How does the university incorporate external funding and large purpose-designated gifts into its budgeting and resource allocation plan?
12. UB, as an urban institution, has an impact on the region, with its law school, business school, professional programming, research institutes and centers. How are the various components of its regional impact factored into the University's planning and resource allocation process?
13. Goals 6 of the University's Strategic Plan identify the desire for the institution to be a preferred workplace and destination for faculty, staff, students and alumni. What is the current culture and environment? Is there collegiality and civility in the workplace? What challenges does the University face in meeting this goal? How will success be defined and measured?
14. How can the institution promote organizational success? To what extent do we use continuous quality improvement to guide our processes?

Standard 3 – Institutional Resources: *The human, financial, technical, facilities, and other resources necessary to achieve an institution’s mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution’s mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution’s resources are analyzed as part of on-going outcomes assessment.*

1. Given the difference sources of the university’s current budget, to what extent are the university’s expenses in line with the institution’s mission, goals and operational requirements? How has the breakdown of revenue and expenditures changed over the past decade? What has been the resulting impact of these changes on the university?
2. What are the most significant challenges facing the institution relative to human resources, technology resources, and physical resources over the next five years?
3. In recent years, the percentage of state support relative to total budget has declined. How has the institution managed resources during a time of budget constraints and competing priorities?
4. What are the challenges in the allocation of resources to UB from the University System of Maryland (USM)? To what extent does the system’s current resource allocation model support UB’s goals and objectives?
5. How efficiently allocated and used are resources for support services? For student learning? What evidence does the University have that the current structure of Academic Affairs and EMSA (Enrollment Management and Student Services) are properly aligned to support increased institutional efficiency and effectiveness?
6. What is the process by which the university engages in periodic assessment of the effective and efficient use of institutional resources?
7. How have the university’s procurement processes and policies related to the acquisition of equipment for education, research/creative and administrative purposes evolved in recent years?
8. What changes have been made to the campus facilities in the last ten years? How often is the facilities master plan updated? What constituencies have been included in that planning process? What problems are endemic to the existing facilities and what plans are in place to address them? What are some of the prime efforts that have undertaken to address important problems? Are these funds to address critical problems?
9. What is being done to ensure the quality of university classrooms, including keep current with innovative teaching and learning technologies? To what degree does the current inventory of classrooms meet the institutional needs of the University? Are the sizes and configurations of classrooms well matched to the institution’s needs and objectives? Are existing instructional spaces optimally used?
10. The University has three fully online degree programs as well as many stand-alone online courses. How has total online enrollments changed? Is there sufficient fiscal and human resources available to meet the instructional support needs of faculty and students? Are online processes fully compliant with federal statues?
11. What efforts have been made to satisfy the IT demands of UB’s diverse constituencies? What plans are in place to ensure that fiscal and human resources will be available to meet future IT needs and demands? Is the funding model sufficient enough to provide continued and enhanced support?

12. How is the university developing its donor base and aligning gifts received with the institution's mission and goals? What short- and long-term fundraising goals currently exist and what is the anticipated strategic impact for UB if these goals are achieved?
13. What is the policy for indirect cost return to colleges, departments and investigators? How are these discretionary funds used to enhance research?

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.*

1. Has the recently developed Institutional Assessment Plan been implemented?
2. What evidence is there that faculty, administration, staff, students, and external constituencies are involved in the institution's assessment efforts? Is there understanding and acceptance of existing institutional assessment by UB's university community?
3. How does institutional assessment inform strategic planning and resource allocation at the university? What changes have been implemented in recent years as evidence of the influence of institutional assessment on these processes?
4. Is the infrastructure of, and organization for, institutional assessment adequate to support the requirements for the University and MSCHE? What improvements may be needed for increased effectiveness and efficiency?
5. Since the last Self-Study, what efforts have been undertaken to evaluate the institution's core business functions? If so, how have these efforts resulted in changes in operational procedures and staffing?
6. What core assessment measures does the university use to compare itself to peer institutions? How does it compare? Based on recent assessment data, what critical areas might require additional strategic focus in order to position the university to effectively compete and/or compare more favorably with identified institutional peers?
7. Are individual departments within the university expected to review and improve their business processes on an on-going basis? Can the university point to evidence that this culture exists? Can it provide specific examples of recent changes that are the result of departmental review and assessment? To what extent are departments encouraged to do this and recognized why they succeed? (This question applies to both academic and non-academic departments.)
8. Departments are expected to comply with the core mission of the university and work to achieve the goals of the institution. How does the institution assess how successful departments are in meeting departmental and institutional goals? (This question applies to both academic and non-academic departments.)
9. How are the university policies and processes for procurement and equipment acquisition evaluated and revised?

B. WORKING GROUP 2 – SOLIDIFYING COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

Successful colleges and universities are highly dependent upon effective leadership and governance structures, qualified administrators and a distinct set of core values that govern operational functions and set the tone for the behavior of personnel. Standards 4, 5 and 6 work together to address the university's organizational structure and core values, and explore how the institution's leaders and key constituent groups interact and engage in overall decision making to help the university achieve its mission, vision and goals.

***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.*

1. How well does leadership balance the university's missions in education, scholarship /creative activities, community service and economic development?
2. The University leadership reports to the USM Chancellor and USM Board of Regents. The University of Baltimore Foundation's Board of Directors does not have the traditional oversight comparable to a board of visitors/trustees. Would the existence of a formal external oversight board enhance the ability of the University to achieve its mission?
3. What is the process by which the institution engages in periodic assessment of the effectiveness of its institutional leadership?
4. The University Governing Steering Council has representation from faculty, staff, and students. How well does this governing coordinating body balance broad participation and full discussion with the need for timely decision making?
5. In addition to the above referenced Governing Council, the University has three primary governing bodies: the University Faculty Senate, the University Staff Senate, and the Student Government Association. Each of these bodies is affiliated with a senior administrator to whom it gives advice. How well is this association working? How well are these three governance structures working and do they coordinate well with each other? Does the university engage in periodic assessment of the effectiveness of its governance?
6. How effective has the leadership of each governing body been in addressing the needs of their respective constituencies? Does each entity adequately represent its broad base in its advocacy and decision making?
7. Each academic division has its own governance structure? How well are these academic governing structures working? Do they coordinate with each other as well as the University Faculty Senate?
8. In 2007, the MSCHE report identified the need for administration to improve transparency and communication in decision making, and that Human Resources should be afforded a more significant role involvement in decision-making. What actions have been undertaken to address this?

9. How are early career faculty, instructional staff and administrators identified for their leadership potential, and how does the institution develop their potential?
10. What is the process by which UB undertakes periodic assessment of the effectiveness of its institution's leadership and governance? What changes have occurred based on these findings?

Standard 5 – Administration: *The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.*

1. To what extent does the President interact with other administrative leaders to facilitate decision making and gain a better understanding of the overall achievements and challenges of the various administrative units of the institution? How effective are these interactions in developing shared vision and expectations for the university?
2. During the last decade, the University has added programs at USM's Shady Grove campus. Does evidence exist to suggest that the organizational structure and fiscal and human resources are sufficient to operate this site effectively?
3. The University entered into relationships with Towson University and Coppin University to offer joint programs. Is there evidence that these relationships have been effectively leveraged to benefit the University? Are there opportunities to further improve the relationships?
4. To what degree to University administrators have access to adequate institutional and system-wide information to assist in data-driven decision making? How effective and widely utilized are the University's data delivery systems for helping administrator make critical decision related to their identified goals and objectives, and their use of fiscal and human resources?
5. What University and USM structures are in place to evaluate professional performance of the University President? How are other administrators, both academic and non-academic, evaluated as related to their overall performance and their role in providing direct oversight of other institutional personnel and department/unit operations?
6. What recruitment and hiring practices are in place to ensure the selection of the best possible administrative candidates for vacant position? What mechanisms are utilized by the university to ensure the appropriate feedback and involvement by various constituencies in the hiring of key institutional leaders, within the academic ranks and with general university administration? What efforts are made to recruit and hire diverse candidates?
7. Are administrative areas adequately staffed to ensure effective institutional and student services? What standards and/or metrics are used to ensure adequate staffing and how are often administrative units assessed to ensure that sufficient personnel are employed for effective and efficient operations?
8. How does the university assure that its staff is properly trained on campus policies and procedures? Are there any challenges to IB in the size, composition or diversity of its workforce?
9. What strategies are utilized by the University's leadership to ensure two-way communication with institutional stakeholders (faculty, staff, students, alumni, governing boards, etc.) regarding critical issues, decision making and institutional accomplishments.

Which strategies are effective in achieving the desired communication outcomes and where do gaps exist?

10. What processes does UB have in place to periodically assess the effectiveness of its administrative services and services? What changes have occurred based on these findings?

Standard 6 – Integrity: *In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituents it services, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support for academic and intellectual freedom.*

1. How does the university convey its expectations of ethical conduct to the campus community? To what degree are the channels used to convey institutional expectations regarding such conduct effective? In what ways are the members of the campus community expected to acknowledge their acceptance and understanding of the institution's expectations regarding ethical behavior?
2. Does the University have a culture that sets high standards for integrity, respect and fairness in the behavior and actions of supervisory personnel, including group leaders and department chairs? Is the University seen by faculty, staff and students to be proactive in dealing with potential supervisory problems? How effective are the University's policies and procedures for dealing with personnel grievances?
3. To what extent does the University have sufficient policies and guidelines to regulate the ethical operation of administrative offices and appropriately govern the behavior of University personnel? How are institutional policies periodically reviewed and assessed to ensure that they meet the institution's standards related to integrity and ethical behavior? To what extent is professional integrity and compliance in job performance tied to employee performance programs and the evaluation process?
4. What System and University controls and policies are in place to ensure the proper and lawful use of institutional resources? How are they communicated/ Are they effective?
5. How effective is the University in demonstrating its support of the fundamental tenants of academic freedom?
6. How transparent are the student governance units in the administrative of their student activity fee funds? How compliant have student governance bodies been with regards to the policies and procedures set by UB and System pertaining to the operation and management of student funds?
7. Are required and elective courses sufficiently available to allow students to graduate within the publish program length?
8. Does the University make information regarding institutional wide assessments available to prospective students, including graduation, retention, certification and licensing pass rates, and other outcomes as appropriate to the programs offered?

C. WORKING GROUP 3: STRENGTHING COMMITMENT TO STUDENT SUCCESS

Student success is linked to both admitting appropriately qualified students, providing them a comprehensive range of support services, and ensuring that they graduate with the requisite knowledge, skills and competencies. Student learning outcomes should be articulated to prospective and current students so that they understand the benchmarks by which their performance will be measured. For these reasons, Working Group 3 has been charged with the task of addressing Standards 8, 9 and 14 as part of a linked set of issues.

Standard 8 – Student Admissions and Retention: *The institution seeks to admit students whose interest, goals and abilities are congruent with its mission and seeks to retain them through the pursuit of the students’ educational goals.*

1. Do the University’s admission policies reflect the University’s mission? Are they clearly stated to allow prospective students to make informed decisions about how to apply to, and enroll in, the University?
2. What is the relationship between the University’s admissions policy and student success? How do we know recruited and accepted students are succeeding/graduating based on our admission standards? What is the progress of students? The retention rates of first-time students and transfer students? Of graduate students? What policies and programs are in effect to improve retention?
3. Generally, UB’s undergraduate students are admitted to the institution and not to specific programs. Does this general admission policy impact student success by program? In other words, how does the institution ensure that students matriculate to programs best suited to their skill sets?
4. Are the goals of the admission process for the institution sufficiently clear, realistic and consistent with its mission?
5. What do demographic trends suggest will be the future of the University’s student base? How is the institution positioning itself to handle any anticipated demographic changes, and what else should it consider doing?
6. Goal 1 of the University’s Strategic Plan identifies the importance of growing enrollments. How will the institution know this goal has been met? How is this goal linked to annual enrollment targets and enrollment plans?
7. What strategies have been used to increase enrollment and how effective have these strategies been? How do we assess effectiveness? Have resources been allocated to the most effective strategies? How effective are the processes in yielding a talented and diverse student body?
8. Does the University have an enrollment plan? If so, is it review to ensure congruence with recruitment, admissions, retention, marketing and advertising?
9. To a large extent, the University has a “local” orientation in its admission and recruiting efforts. How would expanded regional, national and/or international recruitment impact the university’s growth? Is it compatible with the University’s urban / Baltimore orientation?
10. How effective in the University in making clear to all undergraduates their Path to Graduation?

11. What processes are in place to assess student progress along the Path to Graduation, and how is this information used to make change?
12. Is the University effective in the timely identification of students in need of remedial help, and once they are identified, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the University's efforts to provide that help? What pre-collegiate level courses and/or support services are available to these students? How are these services evaluated?
13. Does UB communicate pertinent information on expected learning outcomes for its prospective students and assessments of its educational offerings across the University's fields of study?
14. Does UB effectively use placement and diagnostic testing results in guiding student advisement to enhance student success?
15. How clearly does UB communicate the policies and procedures that govern transfer?
16. How effectively does the University use financial aid support as a recruiting tool as well as means of helping students along the path to graduation? Does UB communicate effectively to students and prospective students the range of options available for various forms of financial aid? What are the criteria by which the University makes decisions about offers of scholarships and other forms of financial aid?

Standard 9 – Student Support Services: *The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.*

1. The first goal of the University's Strategic Plan is to enhance student success and career readiness through program innovation, ongoing assessment of student learning and expanded student support services. To what extent are academic and non-academic student support services available, and to what extent do students utilize them? How does UB meet the needs of various members of its student population (e.g., commuter students, transfer students, students with disabilities, international students, graduate students, etc.?)
2. How effective is the University's orientation program in informing students of available academic and support services such as advising for freshman, freshmen with relatively weak secondary school preparation and transfer students?
3. What support services are available in the sophomore year, including academic support and advising the students in choosing a major?
4. How does the University assess the effectiveness of its student advising and support services? How does it determine which services to initiate, enhance or reduce? Are the methods for coordinating services effective in avoiding duplication or gaps in service? For example, what are the sources of student advising, and are these sources coordinated?
5. Are qualified professionals available in sufficient number to supervise and provide the academic and non-academic student support services and programs? How does the University determine the appropriate number of necessary staff?
6. In what ways are faculty made aware of and make use of student support services that assist students on their path to graduation?
7. What support services does the University offer to students at academic risk? How are these students identified and notified of available services? How effective are these programs in assisting students at academic risk?

8. What are the policies and procedures for addressing student complaints or grievances (both academic and non-academic)? Are they effective and known to students?
9. What career and life-after graduation initiatives and programs are available to students?
10. How are student grievance policies and procedures created, assessed, updated and disseminated to students, faculty and professional staff? How are these records maintained?
11. How effective is the University in helping to place students after graduation? Is the University's Career Center adequately staff and supported? Are the institution's students, alumni and employers satisfied with the breadth of depth of services and programs? What percentage of students use the services provided in the Career Center? What mechanisms are in place to assess the effectiveness of the career center? What changes have been made based on these findings?
12. What security mechanisms, policies and procedures are in place to guarantee appropriate confidentiality of student records?
13. Are the University's public safety policies and procedures accessible and known to students? How effective is the process for notifying students, faculty and staff of emergency procedures, emergency resources and emergency situation? How are these policies and procedures evaluated?
14. What are the policies and procedures regarding the initiation and continuation of student-run clubs and organizations? How are these evaluated? What resources does the University provide to these clubs and organizations? How do these activities support the mission and goals of the University?
15. Are the policies, procedures and resources available for the initiation and continuation of the University's athletic programs regularly assessed and modified, as appropriate? How do these activities support the mission and goals of the University?
16. What information technology support services are available to the University's students, and how effective are they at meeting students' needs?
17. In what ways is the University succeeding in fostering a positive environment for student campus life, and where is improvement most needed?

Standard 14 – Assessment of Student Learning: *Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution's students have knowledge, skills and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals.*

1. In what ways are expected student learning outcomes stated at the University level? By department or program? At the level of individual courses? How well are expected learning outcomes integrated across all those levels?
2. To what extent does UB employ a well-documented, organized, systematic, and sustained assessment process to evaluate and improve student learning? Does the institution use multiple qualitative and/or quantitative measures that maximize the use of existing data and information?
3. What evidence is used to assess student learning, and how well do such assessment reflect the breath of the learning experiences available at UB?
4. To what extent are students, faculty and staff involved in collaborative exercises to develop and assess student learning objectives?

5. UB offers programming online and face-to-face classes on its Baltimore campus and at the USM Shady Grove campus. What procedures are in place to ensure that student learning outcomes and curriculum are consistent across these delivery channels?
6. What evidence is there that assessments of student learning are appropriately disseminated and used to improve the student learning experience?
7. What do assessment results indicate about how well students are achieving learning outcomes in UB's courses, academic programs, and across the University?
8. How consistently does UB evaluate the effectiveness of its student learning assessment processes?
9. Is the assessment of student learning part of faculty work expectation? If so, is the work reflected in their annual evaluations?
10. Are there sufficient and sustained resources to support faculty and staff in the developing their skills in assessment?
11. What is UB's vision for what is meant by providing innovative education in business, public affairs, the applied liberal arts and sciences, and how does the University assess its success or failure to do so?
12. What are the distinctive aspects of what we a UB education to mean?
13. What evidence is there for a "value added" analysis of a UB education, and whether our graduates are prepared to be leaders in their chosen fields?
14. How does UB assess student satisfaction with it diverse core of living, learning, support services, and extracurricular activities? How does the University use data obtained from these assessment vehicles to improve the quality of life on the campus? Is there any evidence that level of student satisfaction have improved (or declined) over the years?
15. Does the University regularly survey its alumni base to access the educational and occupational benefits they derive from a UB education? If so, what has the University learned from this data, and what improvements were made based on this information?

D. WORKING GROUP 4: ALIGNING EDUCATION OFFERINGS FOR ENROLLMENT GROWTH

The University of Baltimore's mission is to provide innovative education in business, public affairs, the applied liberal arts and sciences, and law to serve the needs of a diverse population in an urban setting. For that reason, analysis of its education offerings must be linked to the faculty who are actively engaged in the University's instructional programs and the means by which these programs are delivered. For these reasons, Working Group 4 has been charged with the task of addressing Standards 10, 11, 12 and 13 as part of a linked set of issues.

***Standard 10 – Faculty:** The institution's instructional, research and service programs are devised, developed, monitored and supported by qualified professionals.*

1. How does UB gauge the performance of faculty? Do performance evaluations differ for tenure-track faculty? Tenured faculty? Adjunct faculty? Instructional staff?
2. How does the University preserve academic freedom and intellectual vitality where department chairs serve for long periods?

3. UB offers programming online and at the USM Shady Grove campus. What procedures are in place to ensure that hiring practices and expected credentials are consistent for those who teach face-to-face classes on the main campus?
4. What does faculty perceive as the current distribution of faculty time between teaching, scholarship and service?
5. Does faculty have time and incentives for professional and personal development to design and update educational curricula and programs?
6. What procedures are in place for handling faculty concerns about promotions, salary inequities and disparity in workload? Are promotion and tenure standards effectively communicated to faculty and are standards consistently followed?
7. Consulting and engagement in the professional community are indicators of faculty expertise. To what extent is this encouraged and recognized? Since this may be considered as a self-promoting activity, does the institute provide guidelines for what may be considered acceptable?
8. Because it is a public university, the people and organizations of the surrounding area have expectations for how UB should provide services for the local community. How well does the faculty fulfill the needs of the various community groups, such as high school students seeking research internships and teachers seeking relevant workshops, local industry's need for pro-bono consultants and serving as judges for various business/science/engineering competitions, and the general population seeking programs for public outreach?
9. What efforts are in place to build sustainable faculty succession in light of aging expertise?
10. Innovation is defined as a core component of the UB mission. How does UB nurture the entrepreneurial spirit among its faculty? Does this create disparities in faculty workload?
11. Recently, UB transitioned to web-based teaching evaluations. How effective has this conversion been and has it improved data collection and increased feedback to faculty and students? Does UB utilize any other procedures for evaluating teaching effectiveness?
12. How effective is the Center for Teaching and Learning in promoting and assisting faculty in effective teaching practices? In incorporating the latest software and technology into classroom instruction? In using experiential and project based learning? What type of need-assessment is undertaken to ensure alignment between the Center's offerings and the needs of instructional faculty.
13. What institutional strategies and programs are in place to deal with the challenge of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty?
14. What proportion of instruction is accounted for by tenure and tenure-track faculty? Are institutional practices for appointment, supervision and review of part-time or adjunct faculty appropriate and effective in maintaining academic excellence among students? What type of courses does part-time and adjunct faculty regularly teach, and how is this group of faculty evaluated?
15. What information technology support services are available to the University's faculty, and how effective are they at meeting the faculty's needs? To what extent does faculty use instructional technology to advance their teaching, curricula and course delivery? What mechanisms exist to encourage them to do so?
16. Does faculty perceive they have sufficient resources for scholarship?

Standard 11 – Educational Offerings: *The institution’s educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution defines learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.*

1. How well does UB monitor its educational offerings to ensure that they are congruent with its core mission?
2. What are the University’s criteria for determining whether it is meeting its mission to provide education that is innovative and serving the diverse needs of a diverse, urban population?
3. Do we have sufficient program diversity and nimbleness to respond and compensate to shifting enrollment patterns?
4. UB’s mission is to provide innovative education. What evidence is there that UB delivers on its mission?
5. Are UB’s undergraduate, graduate and professional programs designed to achieve the goal of fostering a coherent learning experience, and what procedures are in place to ensure attainment of that?
6. The freshmen-sophomore program has yielded less than the initially forecasted level of enrollments with current enrollments being relatively flat. What evidence do we have that the recent University’s decision to realign the program (and admissions policies and practices) with UB’s professional profile is viable? How will success be measured?
7. The University has undertaken an initiative to strengthen transfer enrollments? Has this been successful and what impact does this have on educational offerings?
8. Are program offerings in alignment with workforce needs, career trends and employment opportunities? What evidence exists that programs are periodically assessed to enhance this alignment? To what extent are and should be program offerings linked to professional certifications as a means of ensuring that students are career ready?
9. Does each program have clearly stated goals that reflect the needs of their students? Are program goals stated in terms of student learning outcomes? How are those goals formulated and how is their success evaluated?
10. What evidence is that the University’s undergraduate programs are of sufficient content, rigor and depth to be characterized as collegiate?
11. Is there evidence for the effectiveness of UB’s curricula, co-curricular and extra-curricular experiences, and what procedures are in place for the assessment of that effectiveness?
12. To what extent are evaluation results used as a basis for improving student development programs and for enabling students to understand their own educational progress?
13. How does the University access the staff and resources necessary for its libraries and educational support services?
14. How well does the University address the need for its students to be trained in information technology and information/library literacy? How well is that training integrated into the broader curriculum? What evidence is there that students make effective use of information technology?
15. How does the University ensure that standards, policies and procedures are followed at its additional locations (Shady Grove, Towson, and Coppin) and via distance education?

16. How often are the Undergraduate and Graduate catalogs revised? What procedures are in place to ensure accuracy of the course offerings?

Standard 12 – General Education: *The institution’s curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.*

1. To what degree is the content of UB’s general education program the result of a coherent University-wide plan that is reflective of its mission statement, and to what degree has it developed from the departmental level?
2. Is there evidence to assess whether or not UB’s general education program is of sufficient scope to achieve intellectual breadth?
3. What evidence is there for determining how successful the University is in breadth without sacrificing depth in its academic offerings?
4. How effective is the University in making sure that students make informed choices in tailoring their own programs of general education? How is the general education curriculum linked to upper division programs? In other words, how well do general education courses prepare students for their major course work?
5. How are essential skills, include oral and written communications, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technology competency, addressed in the general education curriculum and the degree programs? How effective in the general education program at fostering the core competencies needed for effective citizenship and a culture of inquiry? In other words, to what extent is this responsibility for the “general education: shared among all members of the faculty?
6. How does UB assess the success of its general education program? How is that assessment related to other assessments of student learning? Is there evidence that the University has adapted and improved its general education curricula in response to previous assessments?

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities: *The institution’s programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, model of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.*

1. Are the learning objectives and program goals for certificate and non-credits programs clearly communicated? What support services are available to these students? How are these program evaluated?
2. What opportunities for experiential learning does UB provide? What percentage of students participate in experiential learning? If students do not participate in these high-impact processes, do we know why they do not? What have we done to increase participation?
3. To what extent does the University use internships to help support its educational and academic programs? What percentage of students graduate with one or more internship experiences? How does the institution evaluate students’ preparation for and performance at internships?

4. How well does the University leverage its links with non-academic institutions for the benefits of its undergraduates through meaningful opportunities with internships and other career-advancing extra-curricular and co-curricular experiences?
5. What facilities are available for faculty to develop on-line course material? Is this facility and staff sufficiently resourced given on-line programming at UB?
6. What distance education programs does the University offer, and how are these programs evaluated? How does the University determine which programs are appropriate and suitable for distance delivery? How are workforce needs taken into account when developing educational outreach programs?

VI. OUTLINE FOR THE FINAL SELF-STUDY REPORT

- A. Executive Summary
- B. University of Baltimore: An Overview
- C. Self-Study Methodology
 - a. Nature, Scope and Intended Outcomes of the Self-Study
 - b. Organization of Standards and Their Respective Working Groups
 - c. Procedures for Gathering, Evaluating and Assessing Evidence
 - d. Final Inventory of Support Documents
 - e. Final Self-Study Timeline
- D. Working Group 1
 - a. Final Questions and Evidence for Standards
 - b. Strengths and Weaknesses
 - c. Recommendations for Improvement
- E. Working Group 2
 - a. Final Questions and Evidence for Standards
 - b. Strengths and Weaknesses
 - c. Recommendations for Improvement
- F. Working Group 3
 - a. Final Questions and Evidence for Standards
 - b. Strengths and Weaknesses
 - c. Recommendations for Improvement
- G. Working Group 4
 - a. Final Questions and Evidence for Standards
 - b. Strengths and Weaknesses
 - c. Recommendations for Improvement
- H. Conclusion
 - a. Summary Comments
 - b. What We Learned and How the Findings Will be Used
 - c. University of Baltimore's Vision for the Future

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

The University of Baltimore respectfully recommends that the Chair of the Evaluation Team be a President/Chancellor or Provost of an urban comprehensive university, and preferably from a state institution that is also a member of a larger university system. We also request that one member of the Evaluation Team serve as the Chief Planning Officer of a public, comprehensive university that is a member of a university system. We also respectfully request that one member of the Evaluation Team be affiliated with a university that has a law school.

APPENDIX

INVENTORY OF SUPPORT DOCUMENTS FOR WORKING GROUPS

The following represent an initial list of relevant documents that will be available to the Steering Committee and Working Groups. This list will continue to evolve as the work progresses.

Reports/Documents Useful to Multiple Standards or for General Information

- UB Fact Sheet
- Institutional Maps
- Previous Middle States Self-Study reports/Follow up Reports/Periodic Reviews/Substantive Change Proposals
- President's Task Force on Campus Climate: Report and Action Plan
- List of Institutional Diversity Programs and Committees (including Structure, funding emphases, coordinating office, etc.)
- Specialized Accrediting/Self-Study Reports
- Institutional Policies and Procedures Documents
- Institutional/Department Consultant or external specialized reports
- UB Economic Impact Studies
- UB Research Report
- Faculty/Staff Recruitment and Hiring Guideline/Hiring Applications/Disciplinary Dismissal Procedures
- Public/Media Relations/Institutional Communications Processes
- Department School reports to Accrediting Agencies
- UB Academic Calendars
- Cooperative Agreements for Inter-institutional collaboration and resource sharing
- Bargaining unit backgrounds/union contracts/collective bargaining agreements

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

- UB Mission Statement
- CAS Mission
- CAS Strategic Plan
- CPA Mission
- CPA Strategic Plan
- MSB Mission
- MSB Strategic Plan
- SOL Mission
- SOL Strategic Plan

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal

- Previous 5-yr Plan
- Facilities Master Plan
- Operating Budget
- Budget Planning and Process Documents
- Libraries Strategic Plan
- Faculty/Staff Hiring Plans
- Institutional Technology Hiring Plan
- Institutional Advancement Fundraising Plan
- Plans, Policies and Procedures for Adding & Eliminating Academic Programs and Administrative Units

Standard 3: Institutional Resources

- Resource Acquisition, Planning and Assessment Reports
- Annual independent Audit Reports
- Annual Fundraising Reports
- Budget Projection (other Resource Forecasting Documents)
- Facilities Inventory
- Annual UB Research/Grants Activities Reports
- Institutional Environmental/Sustainability Report
- Faculty Staffing Goals and plans / Existing Personnel Stats Document
- Financial Statements for affiliated organizations
- Endowment Management/Performance Reports

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance

- Job description, qualifications, roles and reporting structure for President and Chancellor
- USM Board of Regents By-laws/Policies/ Bios/Meeting Minutes
- UB Foundation Board of Directors/By-laws/Policies/Board Roster and Bios
- University Senate By-laws/Organizational Structure/Current Leadership/Meeting Agenda and Minutes/Surveys/Resolutions
- Student Government Association By-laws/Meeting Minutes/Current Leadership
- System and Institutional Policy Documents outlining governance structure and responsibilities
- Listing of Standing University Committees, their role/function, coordinating office and members

Standard 5: Administration

- University Organizational Charts (including charts of each Vice Presidential Area)
- New Employee Orientation Packet and Employee Handbook (General and by Bargaining Unit)
- CV/Resume/Bios for Senior Administrators
- Job descriptions and qualifications for Senior Academic and non-academic Administrators
- Human Resources Training Series Schedule
- Presidential Evaluation Instrument/Board review process

Standard 6: Integrity

- Descriptions of MD, USM and UB policies related to conflict of interest and research ethics
- Descriptions of UB hiring and review processes, student grievance policies and protocols, academic honesty policies, procedures for progressive discipline and other practices and expectations related to integrity
- Office of Diversity and Affirmative Action /EEO/Title IX policies and procedures documents and reviews
- Annual Diversity Report
- Institutional policies related to plagiarism, the use of copyright materials, intellectual property and trade secrets
- Institutional statements and policies related to academic freedom
- UB Institutional Review Board Policies and Procedures

Standard 7: Institutional Assessment

- Institutional IPEDS Reports
- UB institutional Effectiveness Plan/Master Schedule/Periodic Reports
- Results from UB, USM, community and national surveys related to students, faculty, staff, alumni and other external constituencies and institutional offerings and reputation
- Performance Programs and Evaluation Documents
- Campus-wide Strategic Plans indicating the use of assessment results
- USM Report Card Documents (w/accompanying UB Report Card Data
- AAU Reports and Data comparing UB to peer institutions within the Association

Standard 8: Student Admission and Retention

- Enrollment and Retention Management Reports and Strategic Plans
- UB Admission, Retention and Graduation Statistics
- Admission Statements and other printed and electronic documents which include Admission Criteria and Policies
- UB information and Application Packets for Prospective Students
- Supplemental documents provided to applicants and interested students regarding the admission process, financial and transfer options, admissions requirements, etc.
- New student orientation documents (graduate/undergrad/transfer/international)
- Diversity Admission/Enhancement Programs and Related Statistics

Standard 9: Student Support Services

- UB Student Code of Conduct
- UB Academic Judiciary/Student Grievance Policies and Procedures/related Committee Listings
- Annual reports and Strategic Plans for Units with Student Affairs
- Policies related to student records and the release of student information
- Outline procedures to ensure student safety and wellbeing on campus
- Documents outlining Academic/Career Counseling and Advising Policies and Procedures

Standard 10: Faculty

- UB Faculty Roster (full-time and adjunct) with Credentials
- Faculty facts (including faculty by department, student-teacher ratios, etc.)
- Faculty Handbooks
- Faculty hiring and diversity plans and related documents
- Intellectual property rights/protections policies document
- Academic Freedom statement/policy
- Faculty/Department Accomplishment Documents
- Faculty Evaluation Instruments/reports
- Faculty Promotion and tenure policies and procedures/Related statistics and reports
- Documentation related to faculty orientation
- Institutional/departmental plans and strategies for faculty development
- Procedures and policies related to adjunct faculty
- Results from course and teaching evaluations and documentation on how this information is used

Standard 11: Educational Offerings

- Undergraduate/Graduate catalogs and course bulletins outlining course offerings, programs, degree requirement, etc.
- Internal/External department evaluation/Curriculum and Course Review/Audit documents
- Samples of course syllabi, which incorporate expected learning outcomes
- Curriculum Committee meetings agendas and reports
- Specialize Accrediting Agency Reports which addresses departmental or institutional course/program offerings
- Articulation Agreements and Printed Credit Transfer policies

Standard 12: General Education

- General Education Plan/Assessment Documents
- Documents describing General Education at UB (inside and outside the major)
- Documented expectations regarding General Education Learning Objectives
- Identified Tools for Assessing General Education and evident of how the results of any assessments have been used to improve the teaching and learning process
- Reports/Recommendations from Internal and External reviews of UB's general education program

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities

- Facts and Plans related to UB and Shady Grove locations (documents outlining current programs, challenges, successes, etc.)
- Documents/contracts related to UB affiliated Programs
- Documents related to UB's community service commitments/service learning programs and requirements/fact related to UB and Community Engagement
- Documents identifying UB's Certificate programs/Distance Learning Programs/Courses and related policies and student requirements
- Study Abroad/Exchange Programs

Standard 14: Student Support Services

- UB Student Learning Assessment Plans
- Institutional/Departmental/System Policies and Guideline for Student Learning
- Documentation related to Training Programs/Workshops/Conference Offered to Faculty/Administrators on the Assessment of Student Learning
- List of Campus Personnel/Departments with responsibilities for the Assessment of Student Learning and Evidence of how efforts are coordinated
- Statements/Philosophies outlining expected learning outcomes