1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the April 6, 2021 Senate Minutes (Action)

3. Report of the Chair

4. Special Order: Presidential Briefing

5. Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and Guidelines for Expressive Activity (Senate Document #20-21-11) (Action)

6. PCC Proposal to Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Informational Design (Senate Document #20-21-42) (Action)

7. PCC Proposal to Rename the Upper-Division Certificate Program in "Latin American Studies" to "Latin American and Caribbean Studies (Senate Document #20-21-43) (Action)

8. Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (Senate Document #17-18-12) (Action)

9. Special Order
   Maureen Kotlas
   Executive Director, Department of Environmental Safety, Sustainability, and Risk (ESSR)

   Mary J. Dorman
   Assistant Director, ESSR, Office of Research Safety

   Fearless Vision: Achieving Excellence in Research Safety - UMD Research Safety Standard

10. New Business

11. Adjournment

CALL TO ORDER

Senate Chair Laura Dugan called the meeting to order at 3:26 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 3, 2021 SENATE MINUTES

The minutes were approved as distributed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR (INFORMATION)

Meeting Logistics: Dugan reminded Senators and Deans that they can raise Points of Order in the Chat Box and that any questions, comments, or technical difficulties placed in the Chat Box will not be responded to. She stated that any Senator or attendee who has technical difficulty should email senatemeetinghelp@umd.edu for immediate assistance.

Voting: Dugan stated that Senators and Deans must use TurningPoint to vote during Action items on the agenda. She provided instructions for logging into TurningPoint and entering the Session ID for the meeting.

Committee Volunteer Period: Dugan stated that the online system to sign up to serve on one of the 10 Senate standing committees of the Senate for the upcoming academic year is now open. She noted that committee members do not need to be Senators. The deadline to volunteer is April 30th. Dugan encouraged Senators interested in volunteering to submit a volunteer statement on the Senate website, pick their top three committee choices, and describe their interest in serving. She stated that the Senate's Committee on Committees will select volunteers to serve on each committee and notify them of their placement over the summer.

Senate Meeting Schedule Update: Dugan stated that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has modified the Senate meeting schedule for the remainder of the academic year. The next Senate meeting that was previously scheduled for April 21, 2021 has been rescheduled to April 20, 2021 because of a conflict with one of the Presidential Inauguration events. She shared that it is not often that our campus gets to celebrate the inauguration of a new President, so the Senate leadership felt it was important to reschedule the Senate meeting to ensure there was no longer a conflict for those who wished to attend both the Senate meeting and the event.

Dugan stated that the SEC has approved the addition of an extra Senate meeting on May 11, 2021 as the new Transition meeting of the Senate where new Senators will begin their terms and the new Senate will elect its Chair-Elect and initiate the election process for its elected committees and councils. This will allow the current Senate to use the May 4, 2021 Senate meeting as an additional business meeting, which gives committees some additional time to complete their work. Dugan shared that as a result, outgoing Senators' terms will now end after the May 4, 2021 meeting and incoming Senators' terms will now begin on May 11, 2021. All Senate meetings for the remainder of

the semester will continue to be held on Zoom, and details about the schedule changes will be forthcoming from the Senate Office.

PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN SOCIAL DATA SCIENCE (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-35) (ACTION)

Betsy Beise, member of the Programs, Courses, and Curricula (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Beise and opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Lalwani, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, expressed support for the proposal as it provides an opportunity for students both inside and outside of STEM fields to explore interests in data science and is a step towards fulfilling the University's mission to reflect the needs of society, and changing learning dynamics.

Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 119 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstentions. **The proposal passed.**

PCC PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH A POST-BACCALAUREATE CERTIFICATE IN DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-39) (ACTION)

Betsy Beise, member of the Programs, Courses, and Curricula (PCC) Committee, presented the proposal and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Beise and opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

Senator Aparicio Blackwell, exempt staff, expressed support for the proposal as many communities in the area surrounding campus speak languages other than English.

Senator Rozenblit, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, inquired if the College of Education has consulted with experts on bilingual education in the School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures.

Beise explained that students coming into the program will already be bilingual or speak a language other than English as their native language. She stated that the proposed program is about educational strategies for students in K-12 schools.

Melinda Martin-Beltran, faculty, College of Education, stated that the School of Education has consulted with colleagues in the School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (SLLC). She stated that their hope is that the program would be a pipeline to increase bilingual students' interest in studying languages. Martin-Beltran reminded the Senate that the proposed program is a graduate-level program, and the students could also be prepared in world languages. The University already offers bachelor's programs and masters programs in world languages. She stated that the College of Education works closely with colleagues in SLLC to ensure that students are qualified and can take one of the electives in the School if students want to specialize in a language.

Senator Rozenblit clarified that she was concerned about whether the College of Education consulted with experts in bilingualism and acquiring second languages. She stated that she is not in opposition to the proposal.

Senator Lalwani, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, asked if Martin-Beltran could elaborate on what the proposed program will offer for languages other than Spanish. She inquired if the College reached out to programs at bilingual schools that teach French and German.

Martin-Beltran stated that the College of Education has a long-term relationship with SLLC, and works closely to make sure that students placed in the bachelor's and master's programs are taking courses in their language. She explained that the dual language schools in Montgomery County and Prince George's County are majority dual language Spanish programs, and well known French immersion programs. Martin-Beltran stated that the proposed program focuses on dual language pedagogy, which applies across languages. She stated that experts in the College of Education conduct research in those areas.

Senator Callaghan, faculty, College of Arts and Humanities, inquired if the College of Education has been in touch with the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) at the University, which has many resources for bilingual education. She invited the College of Education to contact the NFLC and expressed support for the proposal.

Martin-Beltran stated that she has worked with colleagues at the NFLC on a literature review on best practices for foreign language teaching and hopes that the proposed program will increase the pipeline of bilingual students and teachers.

Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the proposal. The result was 116 in favor, 2 opposed, and 3 abstentions. **The proposal passed.**

REVIEW OF THE SENATE BYLAWS TO ENSURE ALIGNMENT WITH CURRENT SENATE PRACTICES (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-16) (ACTION)

Marcia Shofner, Chair of the Elections, Representation, and Governance (ERG) Committee, presented the proposal and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Shofner and noted that a few amendments needed to be made to the ERG Committee's recommendations based on a recent announcement by President Pines and a minor oversight related to pronouns.

Dugan invited Senator Lanford, faculty, Division of Research, to propose the amendments.

Senator Lanford stated that on March 9, 2021, President Pines announced several leadership appointments, which included changes to the structure and the titles of senior administrators. She explained that the new titles are not reflected in the revised *Bylaws* because the ERG Committee approved its recommendations on March 2, 2021. Senator Lanford explained that two amendments are needed to accurately reflect these changes.

Senator Lanford made a motion that all references throughout the ERG Committee's recommendation to the following administrator titles be updated to reflect the Vice Presidential titles announced by President Pines:

- "Vice President for Administration & Finance" should be updated to "Vice President and Chief Administrative Officer" in Articles 6.2.a, 6.6.a, and 6.9.a; and
- "Associate Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer" should be updated to "Vice President for Finance" in Article 7.1.a.

The motion was seconded.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to update the titles of the administrators; hearing no discussion, Dugan called for a vote. The result was 111 in favor, 1 opposed, and 9 abstentions. **The amendment to update the titles of the administrators in the ERG Committee's recommendation passed.**

Dugan invited Senator Lanford to propose the second amendment.

Senator Lanford stated that the second amendment involves representation on the Campus Affairs Committee. She explained that President Pines also announced that he had selected Brian Ullmann to serve as the Vice President for Marketing and Communications. Senator Lanford explained that after consultation with the President's Office, it became clear that the ex-officio representation for the Campus Affairs Committee should be changed to a representative of the Vice President for Marketing and Communications rather than the stated Vice President for University Relations. This position has historically been filled by a member of the Office of Strategic Communications, and changing the language in the *Bylaws* would align the language with the current practice.

Senator Lanford made a motion that Article 6.2.a.1 of the ERG Committee's recommendation be amended to replace University Relations with Marketing and Communications" as follows:

(1) The committee shall consist of an appointed presiding officer; six (6) faculty members; two (2) undergraduate and two (2) graduate students; two (2) staff members, with one exempt and one non-exempt to the extent of availability; the President or a representative of the Student Government Association; the President or a representative of the Graduate Student Government; and the following persons or a representative of each: the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Vice President for Administration & Finance, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for **Marketing and Communications** University Relations, the Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion, and the Chair of the Coaches Council.

The motion was seconded.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to change the ex-officio representation on the Campus Affairs Committee.

Senator Aparicio Blackwell, exempt staff, requested clarification regarding the title change for the Vice President for Administration & Finance because it is no longer his title.

Senator Lanford stated that the previous amendment that was just approved had already corrected the title change of the Vice President for Administration & Finance to the Vice President & Chief Administrative Officer in this same section.

Dugan stated that each amendment had to be considered separately, so if both amendments are approved they will both be incorporated.

Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 117 in favor, none opposed, and 7 abstentions. **The amendment to revise the ex-officio representation on the Campus Affairs Committee passed.**

Dugan invited Senator Lanford to provide the third amendment.

Senator Lanford stated that the ERG Committee inadvertently missed revising a few instances of gendered pronouns into gender-neutral pronouns during its review. The Senate has been working to make these changes throughout its documents and would like to correct the oversight before the revisions are finalized. Senator Lanford stated that there are six instances in the *Bylaws* where "he or she" should be replaced with "they" and the corresponding verb should be revised to match. Four of the revisions will need to be made as part of the ERG Committee's recommendations.

She explained that two instances of gendered pronouns are in the Appendices in the *Bylaws* for the Library Council and the *Bylaws* for the Information Technology (IT) Council.

Appendix 1 - Library Council Bylaws
Appendix 1 – 4.B. The Chair may present reports and recommendations to the Senate but will not have a vote in Senate proceedings, unless **they are** ~~he or she is~~ a member of the Senate.

Appendix 3 - IT Council Bylaws
Appendix 3 – 3.6.B. The IT Council chair may present reports and recommendations to the Senate but will not have a vote in Senate proceedings, unless **they are** ~~he or she is~~ a member of the Senate.

Senator Lanford stated that the Senate does not have sole purview over the guiding documents of Councils. She shared that the Senate leadership reached out to the administrators to whom these Councils report to ask them to initiate the process to revise their documents so that we can revise our appendices and they are both supportive of making the revisions.

Senator Lanford made a motion to amend the four instances of gendered pronouns and their associated verbs in the ERG Committee's recommendation to be more gender-inclusive:

2.4 If an elected Senator is no longer a member of the constituency by which **they were** ~~he or she was~~ elected, the seat shall be vacated and the Senator shall be replaced according to the following guidelines:

2.4.a If there was a runner-up in the election in which the Senator was elected, the runner-up shall replace that Senator immediately, provided **they are** ~~he or she is~~ still eligible.

2.5 If an elected Senator is no longer in satisfactory standing at the University, **they** ~~he or she~~ shall be replaced immediately in accordance with 2.4.a or 2.4.c above.

8.6.f In addition to the required annual report, the presiding officer shall keep the Chair of the Senate informed of the major issues before the University Council and shall indicate when action or information items are likely to be forwarded for Senate consideration. In submitting recommendations for Senate action, the University Council shall inform the unit director and the designated administrative officer in advance of its recommendations. For purposes of conducting

Senate business, reports from the University Council and floor privileges of the Senate shall be managed in the same manner as standing committees of the Senate defined in these *Bylaws* (3.3.c, 4.4.b). In the case where the presiding officer of the University Council is not a member of the Senate, **they** ~~he or she~~ may report to the Senate and participate in the deliberations of the Senate subject to the provisions of Article 3.3.c of these *Bylaws*.

The motion was seconded.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion of the amendment to revise the gendered pronouns in the ERG Committee's recommendation; hearing no discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the amendment. The result was 109 in favor, 9 opposed, and 6 abstentions. **The amendment to update the gendered pronouns in the ERG Committee's recommendation passed.**

Dugan stated that while the Senate was voting on the first amendment, the Senate Leadership received a correction from the President's Office that the correct title for the Vice President for Finance is the Vice President for Finance and Chief Financial Officer. Dugan asked to make the correction by unanimous consent; hearing no objections, the correction was approved.

Dugan opened the floor to discussion of the ERG Committee's recommendation, as amended.

Senator Katz, graduate student, College of Computer, Mathematical, and Natural Sciences stated that some other University governance organizations include statements in their *Bylaws* that any references to titles of people who are not members of the organization directly can be automatically changed without the approval of the Senate. He asked if it is possible to include such a provision in the Senate *Bylaws*.

Dugan stated that it is possible to include that provision in the *Bylaws* as an amendment but specific language for the provision is needed. She stated that the Senate can add such language at a future Senate meeting and encouraged Senator Katz to coordinate with the Senate Office.

Senator Lanford, faculty, Division of Research, stated that this provision sounds like a substantive change regarding how changes are made to the *Bylaws* and should be made at another Senate meeting. She expressed support for the provision.

Hearing no further discussion, Dugan called for a vote on the revisions to the *Bylaws*, as amended and noted that revisions to the Senate Bylaws require a ⅔ vote in favor to be approved. The result was 116 in favor and 5 opposed. **The revisions to the *Bylaws* passed.**

REVIEW OF THE INTERIM UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE USE OF FACILITIES AND OUTDOOR SPACES AND GUIDELINES FOR EXPRESSIVE ACTIVITY (SENATE DOCUMENT #20-21-11) (ACTION)

Norma Andrews, Chair of the Campus Affairs Committee, presented the proposal and provided background information.

Dugan thanked Andrews and opened the floor to discussion of the proposal.

A Senator requested clarification that External Users are unaffiliated with the University community and inquired if Nyumburu Amphitheatre's location as the only Black space on campus for people to congregate was discussed.

Andrews confirmed that External Users are unaffiliated with the University. She stated that the concerns regarding the use of Nyumburu as a space for External Users to host Expressive Activity events were raised by the University of Maryland Police Department (UMPD) because the location of the Amphitheatre being in a sunken pit could potentially pose a risk to public safety.

Susan Canady, Assistant Director of Stamp Event and Guest Services and member of the Student Affairs Working Group involved in the creation of the interim Policy and Guidelines for Expressive Activity, stated that Nyumburu was excluded as a space for External Users to reserve for Expressive Activity for safety reasons as it is hard to manage the space if there is a potential confrontation.

Dean Dalglish asked if Hornbake Plaza is the only location External Users can reserve for Expressive Activity and inquired where users can view a list of available spaces to reserve for Expressive Activity.

Canady stated that the list of facilities and outdoor spaces available for reservation for External Users is found in Attachment A of the Policy. She stated that Hornbake Plaza is not the only space that External Users can reserve, but the operationalization team would highlight Hornbake Plaza for External Users looking for visibility for expressive activity.

A Senator inquired if there was any consultation with key stakeholders.

Andrews provided background information on the history of the committee's work on the charge. She explained that during the Campus Affairs Committee's previous review of the Policy, the Committee recommended that it be charged with reviewing the Guidelines for Expressive Activity after the Policy was approved. However, a Division of Student Affairs Working Group was convened to develop a proposed draft of the Guidelines for the committee to review.

Canady explained that in addition to posing a physical security risk, the Working Group felt that allowing external groups to reserve Nyumburu for Expressive Activity has the potential for sending an upsetting message that would not match Nyumburu's mission as a cultural center.

Senator Lanford reminded Senators that the Senate committee charge process covers very extensive grounds and typically includes consultations with major stakeholders.

Senators inquired if there was history of past incidents at Nyumburu where it was difficult for UMPD to respond to a confrontation and if Nyumburu was the only location identified as a security risk.

Andrews stated that UMPD provided general examples but not information about specific incidents. She stated that UMPD commented on the possibility of heavy objects being thrown down and hitting people inside the pit, as well as challenges with evacuation from the Amphitheatre. Andrews stated that Nyumburu was identified as a risk for use by External Users.

Dugan clarified that this provision only applies to External Users.

Senators expressed concern about limited spaces on campus available for freedom of expression for Black students. A Senator inquired where the definition of Expressive Activity can be located.

Dugan stated that the definition of Expressive Activity is stated in the Policy.

A Senator shared the perspective that not all aspects of Expressive Activity, such as leafleting, would present safety concerns.

Senator Lanford explained that a concern is that External Users who would choose to reserve that space for Expressive Activity may present issues or standpoints that are in opposition to Nyumburu's mission as a cultural center, which could cause an unsafe situation. She reminded Senators that the Policy does not limit the ability of students or student organizations to use Nyumburu to express their cultural identity on campus in any way.

Senators inquired if Nyumburu staff or members of Black organizations on campus were involved in the Working Group's discussions and if student organizations have to pay for insurance when reserving a space.

Canady stated that members of the Nyumburu staff and student organizations were not involved in the Working Group's discussions. She stated that a representative from the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, representatives from the Student Government Association, and representatives of the Graduate Student Government were included in the Working Group. Canady explained that student organizations are not currently covered by the University's standard liability insurance and sometimes must purchase insurance when they host events, which could potentially involve injury to persons or damage to property. She stated that the University is trying to purchase a policy that would include student organizations.

A Senator inquired if there is data showing that Nyumburu presents a safety concern, and inquired if there have been exponentially more incidents at Nyumburu than other areas on campus. The Senator shared the perspective that having this data would show that prohibiting External Users from holding Expressive Activity events would be driven by safety concerns rather than being misconstrued as cultural factors.

Dugan explained that UMPD has indicated that incidents have occurred in Nyumburu. She explained that the Campus Affairs Committee did not change the Policy to remove Nyumburu as a location for External Users to reserve for Expressive Activity, as the interim Policy currently in place has already removed Nyumburu.

Andrews shared that UMPD explained during the committee consultation that their job is to prevent dangerous situations from happening, and Nyumburu poses safety challenges in their assessment.

Andrea Goodwin, interim Assistant Vice President of Student Affairs and Director of Student Conduct, emphasized that student groups can still sponsor outside groups to utilize campus spaces. She explained that the Policy refers to prohibiting External Users outside of the University that are unassociated to anyone in the campus community. Goodwin further explained that the University has to be content neutral. She stated that safety is the priority, and that if a threat assessment by UMPD indicates that a space on campus could cause potential harm to students, faculty, and staff if external groups hold an event there, the decision of UMPD has to take precedence. Goodwin noted that it can be very difficult for UMPD to control External Users causing issues in a central location

on campus. Goodwin stated that Expressive Activity is welcome on campus, but the safety of campus and students are the University's top priorities.

Dean Lim expressed appreciation for the Policy's work in balancing the need for the safety of the campus community with Expressive Activity and inquired about language inconsistencies regarding the level of disruption in the Policy and shared the opinion that part of the power of Expressive Activity is to cause some disruption.

Andrews stated that this point was not discussed by the committee. She stated that the focus of the Policy was in clarifying differences between Internal Users and External Users, and to clarify that students have the right to hold Expressive Activity.

Goodwin clarified that disruption in the context of the Policy refers to the disruption of the work of the University and academic activities on campus, such as the use of amplified sound to drown out teaching activities or blocking doors to enter classrooms.

Andrews stated that the Policy prevents major interference with the mission of the University.

A Senator inquired if alumni are treated as students or External Users, and noted that many alumni host events at Nyumburu. The Senator inquired if there are alternatives to consider as opposed to implementing the proposed Policy.

Canady stated that an alum is considered an External User within the terms of the Policy.

Dugan stated that the interim Policy would remain in place as the default if the proposed policy was not approved.

A Senator stated that Nyumburu might host an event for an alum who has a connection with Nyumburu and wishes to hold an event there. The Senator stated that an alum would not be considered an External User in that situation.

Dugan reminded Senators that the interim Policy excluding Nyumburu remains in effect if the Senate votes down the proposal. She explained that the Senate is not effectively voting on that piece of the proposal.

Senator Lanford stated that the disruption referred to in the Policy as prohibited conduct is the disruption of students' ability to learn on campus. She explained that the idea of disruption as a social activist method has been valid, however the Code of Student Conduct does not permit the disruption of students' ability to obtain an education. She reminded Senators that the revisions are aligning Policy with current practice, and if the revisions are not passed, the existing policy which includes the exclusion of Nyumburu and the references to disruption would still be in place.

A Senator inquired when the issue of Nyumburu will be able to be addressed if the Policy is either passed or voted down.

Dugan stated that the Senate tries to keep a policy that is passed for the next year or two in place unless there are major issues with the policy. She stated that if this proposed Policy is voted down, the interim Policy remains in place until the issue is raised again in the future.

A Senator suggested that including a reference in the proposed policy to "places on campus because of their physical attributes that have been deemed unsafe" and listing other places considered unsafe for outside groups to organize Expressive Activity could address Senators' concerns about optics.

A Senator inquired if the issue of Nyumburu could be raised in the upcoming school year if the proposal does not pass.

Dugan explained that if the Policy passes the issue is resolved for now, and another proposal could be submitted and go to committee for review in the future.

A Senator made a motion to extend the meeting by five minutes. The motion was seconded.

Dugan called for a vote on the motion to extend and noted that it required a ⅔ vote in favor to pass. The result was 78 in favor and 27 opposed. **The motion to extend the meeting by five minutes passed.**

A Senator suggested that the Senate vote to send the proposal back to the Campus Affairs Committee to make the change suggested by the Senator to have a general reference rather than singling out Nyumburu.

Director Montfort explained that there needs to be a clear charge of what the committee is being asked to do if there is a motion to recommit the proposal to the committee. She clarified that the Campus Affairs Committee was not tasked with changing anything related to Nyumburu Amphitheater, as that change was already in the interim Policy. Montfort explained that the Policy was only changed because UMPD expressed concerns from a safety perspective about Nyumburu being the only space for External Users to reserve for Expressive Activity after the Campus Affairs Committee had approved the Policy in 2019. The Working Group convened to develop the guidelines, consult with various constituencies and groups on campus, and reviewed peer institution research in order to define specific spaces for Expressive Activity by External Users that was content neutral while preserving spaces for students where they were not in any way adversely affected by External Users. She explained that the Committee was tasked with reviewing the guidelines that the Working Group developed, not looking at the change related to Nyumburu. Montfort explained that recommitting the proposal to the committee would be unrelated to its original charge.

The Senator withdrew the suggestion.

A Senator made a motion to call the question. The motion was seconded.

Dugan called for a vote on the motion to call the question.

Dugan stated that the Senate will vote on this item at the beginning of the next Senate meeting as time for the meeting had expired.

Dugan adjourned the meeting at 5:06 p.m.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity

PRESENTED BY	**Norma Andrews, Chair**
REVIEW DATES	**SEC – March 30, 2021	SENATE – April 6, 2021**
VOTING METHOD	**In a single vote**
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	**VI-4.10(A) - University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces**
NECESSARY APPROVALS	**Senate, President**

ISSUE

In September 2020, the Office of the President informed the University Senate that revisions were needed to the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces (VI-4.10[A]) and the associated Guidelines for Expressive Activity (formerly the Guidelines on Demonstrations & Leafletting, and the Chalking Guidelines) to clarify where Expressive Activity and outdoor Public Speaking by both Internal and External Users could occur. The necessary revisions were time-sensitive, as clarity was needed before the beginning of the Fall 2020 semester. On September 18, 2020, the President approved the revisions on an interim basis, pending Senate review.

On September 25, 2020, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Campus Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy and Procedures and Guidelines for Expressive Activity, consulting with stakeholders, and considering whether the revisions made in the interim Policy and Guidelines were appropriate (Appendix A).

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity (VI-4.10[A]) should be revised as shown immediately following this report.

COMMITTEE WORK

The Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) began its consideration of the charge in October 2020. The committee reviewed the interim Policy and Procedures ("the Policy") and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity ("the Guidelines"); reviewed past Senate action on the policy; consulted with key stakeholders; and reviewed policies, procedures, and guidelines for Expressive Activity at peer institutions.

The CAC's review focused on the new proposed revisions to the Policy and Guidelines made by a Division of Student Affairs Working Group which was convened by the administration to develop a proposal for the committee's consideration. The CAC agreed to make minor revisions to the Policy

to clarify the roles and responsibilities of Internal Users, External Users, and Hosts. The committee agreed to include language added to the Policy by the Working Group regarding criteria for which the University may relocate, reschedule, or cancel a Program in order to have an explanation for why the University may reject a request to reserve a space. In order to ensure that unit heads are made aware of Programs without creating an administrative burden, the CAC agreed to revise the Policy to state that Internal Users in administrative or academic units should report Programs to their unit head when they serve as Hosts to External Users for Programs that are open to a general audience. The committee also agreed that Registered Student Organizations should also report all Programs in advance to the appropriate facility manager and/or the Student Organization Resource Center (SORC). The CAC agreed with revisions made to the interim Policy by the Working Group that External Users should not be allowed to reserve the Nyumburu Amphitheatre for Expressive Activity as its location presents security concerns. The committee agreed to revise the Policy and Guidelines to set parameters regarding the use of amplified sound at outdoor events, and to make structural changes to the Policy so users can easily reference the appropriate provisions.

After considering the Guidelines, the CAC agreed that the Guidelines align with the principles established by the committee during their previous review of the Policy, and revised the Guidelines to include a direct reference to the Statement of Free Speech Values. In order to align with standard policy formatting, the committee agreed to revise the Guidelines from an Attachment to an Appendix, and to make minor revisions to formatting and terminology to ensure consistency.

After due consideration, the Campus Affairs Committee approved its proposed revisions to the interim Policy and Guidelines for Expressive Activity in an email vote concluding on March 22, 2021.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose to reject the recommendation. However, the University would also lose the opportunity to provide more clarity for users regarding policies and procedures for Expressive Activity. The University would also lose the opportunity to ensure that academic or administrative unit heads are appropriately made aware of Programs when their units act as Host for Programs by External Users, as well as lose the opportunity to codify parameters around the use of amplified sound at outdoor events.

RISKS

There are no associated risks to the University

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no known financial implications.

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity

2020-2021 Committee Members

Norma Andrews (Chair, October 2020 – May 2021)
Fulvio Cativo (Chair, August 2020 – September 2020)
Dan Alpert (Ex-Officio – SGA Rep)
Maria Barra (Staff)
Gerald Brust (Faculty)
Yanne Chembo (Faculty)
David Cronrath (Ex-Officio – Provost's Rep)
Leigh Ann DePope (Faculty)
Andrew Fellows (Faculty)
Vanessa Greer (Staff)
Jitendra Sai Gutha (Graduate Student)
Luke Jensen (Ex-Officio – Vice President for Diversity & Inclusion Rep)
Dan Laffin (Ex-Officio – GSG Rep)

Katie Lawson (Ex-Officio – VP University Relations Rep)
Rejanne Le Bivic (Faculty)
Anne Martens (Ex-Officio – VP Administration and Finance Rep)
Andrew Mazer (Graduate Student)
Rebecca Mollet (Undergraduate Student)
Madhulika Nallani (Undergraduate Student)
Allynn Powell (Ex-Officio – VP Student Affairs Rep)
Mark Sherburne (Ex-Officio – Chair of Coaches Council Rep)
Elizabeth Warner (Faculty)

Date of Submission

March 2021

BACKGROUND

In September 2020, the Office of the President informed the University Senate that revisions were needed to the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces (VI-4.10[A]) and the associated Guidelines for Expressive Activity (formerly the Guidelines on Demonstrations & Leafletting, and the Chalking Guidelines) to clarify where Expressive Activity and outdoor Public Speaking by both Internal and External Users could occur. The necessary revisions were time-sensitive, as clarity was needed before the beginning of the Fall 2020 semester. On September 18, 2020, the President approved the revisions on an interim basis, pending Senate review.

On September 25, 2020, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Campus Affairs Committee with reviewing the interim Policy and Procedures and Guidelines for Expressive Activity, consulting with stakeholders, and considering whether the revisions made in the interim Policy and Guidelines were appropriate (Appendix A).

COMMITTEE WORK

The Campus Affairs Committee (CAC) began its consideration of the charge in October 2020. The committee reviewed the interim Policy and Procedures ("the Policy") and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity ("the Guidelines"), the recommendations of the Inclusion and Respect Task Force which underly the Policy and Guidelines (Senate Document #17-18-03), and the CAC's past work on the Review of the University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for the Use of Physical Facilities (Senate Document #18-19-10). Throughout its review of the charge, the committee consulted with key stakeholders represented by a Division of Student Affairs Working Group on the interim Policy and Guidelines, and with the Office of General Counsel. The CAC also reviewed

policies, procedures, and guidelines for Expressive Activity at peer institutions and a history of Expressive Activity at the University for contextual information.

The CAC's review was guided in large part by its recommendations related to the Policy in 2019 and actions taken since then to implement the Policy. During its prior review of the Procedures for the Use of Physical Facilities, the CAC recommended that it should be charged with reviewing the Guidelines for Expressive Activity after the revised Policy had been approved, since the Guidelines were to be based on principles established in the Policy. Since the development of the Guidelines would require a deep understanding of practices and processes, a Working Group composed of key stakeholders was convened by the administration to develop a proposal for the CAC's consideration. The Working Group was chaired by the Director of the Adele H. Stamp Student Union and included representatives from the Student Government Association (SGA); the University of Maryland Police Department (UMPD); the Department of Environmental Safety, Sustainability, and Risk; the Office of Strategic Communications; the Division of Administration and Finance; Facilities Management; the Office of General Counsel; and the Office of Diversity and Inclusion (ODI). It met a number of times beginning in November 2019 to review and develop the Guidelines.

Upon receiving its charge, the CAC consulted with representatives from the Working Group and the Office of General Counsel to learn more about the development of the interim Policy and Guidelines and the legal framework associated with its development. During the development of the Guidelines, the Working Group identified a need to develop a philosophy of free expression at the University. In doing so, the Working Group reviewed existing University policies, reached out to Big 10 and other peer institutions on their policies and procedures related to Expressive Activity, and reviewed case law and American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) findings. The Working Group developed a preamble to the Guidelines to articulate this philosophy. In developing the revisions to the Guidelines on practices and processes, the Working Group also determined that associated changes to the Policy were needed to distinguish between Internal Users and External Users so each group can safely exercise their First Amendment rights in appropriate spaces on campus, and to align the Policy with practices operationalized by the Stamp Student Union staff and UMPD in working with users to plan Expressive Activity events.

Since the Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces was reviewed by the CAC and approved by the Senate in 2019, the committee's charge focused on the new proposed revisions to the Guidelines and on the changes in the Policy the Working Group recommended as a result of its work on the Guidelines. The CAC reviewed the principles decided upon by the CAC and the Senate in its prior review, and worked to ensure that the revised Policy and Guidelines upheld those principles.

The CAC considered the revisions made to the Policy related to Internal and External Users and their roles as Hosts. The committee acknowledged that Internal Users and External Users of University facilities and outdoor spaces have different rights and responsibilities. The vast majority of Expressive Activity events on campus are held by students, who are Internal Users and subject to both this Policy and the *Code of Student Conduct*. The University has little to no jurisdiction over External Users, who may simply be renting a space to hold an event. After consideration, the committee agreed that an Internal User or External User may act as a Host who plans or delivers a Program to which others are invited. A Program may include Expressive Activity. After consulting with the Working Group and Office of General Counsel, the CAC agreed to make minor changes in Sections V.A and V.C of the Policy to clarify these roles. The committee also agreed that the Host should assume fiscal responsibility and liability for Programs. During their discussion, the committee felt that the use of the term "fronting" in the Policy was unclear, and agreed to add a definition to the

Policy to clarify that Fronting is a prohibited practice and differs from an Internal User serving as a Host for an External User's program.

The CAC reviewed language added by the Working Group to Article VII.A of the Policy regarding criteria for which the University may relocate, reschedule, or cancel a Program, and considered whether the new language could potentially interfere with the First Amendment rights of users. After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the committee learned that the added specificity is preferred, as First Amendment issues can arise when Universities lack clear guidelines for which Programs can be canceled. After discussion, the committee agreed to include this criteria in the Policy in order to have an explanation for why the University may reject a particular request to reserve a space, rather than appearing that the decision was arbitrary.

The proposed changes to the Policy by the Working Group included a modification of which Programs need to be reported to unit heads. In the committee's prior work, it recommended that only Programs open to the public should be reported to unit heads, in order to balance awareness of departmental activities while avoiding putting an undue administrative burden on the administrative or academic unit. The Working Group broadened this requirement in the interim Policy to require that all Programs be reported to unit heads, in order to ensure awareness of all events involving External Users. The Working Group also indicated that reporting all Programs would also ensure awareness of support provided by the University for safely facilitating events. In its discussion of the proposed change, the committee acknowledged the importance of ensuring that unit heads are made aware of Programs, but agreed with its prior assessment that reporting all Programs would be unduly burdensome, as it would include reporting activities that have a role in daily academic life, such as speakers visiting classes and colloquia. In order to balance the principles previously established by the committee and the concerns identified by the Working Group, the CAC agreed that Internal Users in administrative or academic units should report Programs to their unit head when they serve as Hosts to External Users for Programs that are open to a general audience. After consulting with the Director of the Adele H. Stamp Student Union, the committee agreed that Registered Student Organizations should also report all Programs in advance to the appropriate facility manager and/or the Student Organization Resource Center (SORC), which has jurisdiction over all Registered Student Organizations.

The interim Policy included revisions from the Working Group to the spaces where Expressive Activity is permitted; the revisions prohibit External Users from reserving the Nyumburu Amphitheatre for Expressive Activity. After consulting with representatives from the Department of Public Safety, the committee learned that safety and security concerns have been identified with Nyumburu Amphitheatre as a location for Expressive Activity for External Users. The Amphitheatre is located in a sunken pit, which creates issues with ingress and egress and potentially limits opportunities for UMPD to prevent physical confrontations, such as throwing bricks and other items at speakers. The Working Group also identified concerns with allowing External Users, who may include contentious users such as hate groups, to gather outside of the Nyumburu Cultural Center, which is dedicated to advancing the multicultural missions of the University. After consideration, the committee agreed that External Users should not be allowed to reserve the Nyumburu Amphitheatre for Expressive Activity. In the interim Policy and Guidelines, External Users are still able to reserve designated sidewalk space outside of the Stamp Student Union and designated space in Hornbake Plaza for Expressive Activity.

In considering the relationship between the Policy and the Guidelines, the CAC considered whether any modifications or structural changes were needed. In keeping with the principle of including broad language in policy and procedural information in guidelines, the committee agreed to revise

Article VI of the Policy to separate provisions related to Programs and Expressive Activity for External Users into different sections. This proposed restructuring allows the Policy to refer External Users directly to the Guidelines for information regarding Expressive Activity. It also makes procedural information on Expressive Activity easier for users to locate, as the same information is not duplicated both in the Policy and the Guidelines.

During its consideration of the Guidelines for Expressive Activity, the CAC acknowledged the challenges of balancing free speech rights with campus safety. The Working Group revised the Guidelines to include a ten-person limit for University students, staff, or faculty to hold Unscheduled Expressive Activity at any location on campus without a reservation. The CAC learned from the Office of General Counsel that the ten-person limit was agreed to as part of a settlement with the ACLU, because ten was thought to be a reasonable number. The Working Group also felt that limiting the number to ten people allows for University staff to quickly deploy to the group's location to ensure the group's safety. The CAC acknowledged that the ten-person limit refers to the location of Unscheduled Expressive Activity and does not limit the content of speech. After discussion, the committee agreed that the Guidelines allow campus community members to engage in Expressive Activity while also providing appropriate spaces for users to reserve to exercise their First Amendment rights. The committee also agreed that the Guidelines align with the principles established by the committee during their previous review of the Policy.

As it reviewed the Guidelines, the CAC expressed great appreciation for the principles outlined in the Statement on University Values and Statement of Free Speech Values, which were approved by the Senate and the President as part of the recommendations of the Inclusion and Respect Task Force in 2018 (Senate Document #17-18-03). To ensure that the Guidelines align with these principles, the committee developed revisions to include a direct reference to the Statement of Free Speech Values. After reviewing the Statements and the language within the Guidelines, the CAC felt that the language was similar but did not conflict, and so it retained the language added by the Working Group for additional context.

The CAC revised the Guidelines for Expressive Activity to align with standard policy formatting. The committee agreed that the Guidelines should be changed from an Attachment to an Appendix; Appendices typically include substantive information that require Senate review before any revisions can be made. This change ensures that the Senate is made aware of any potential future changes to the Guidelines. The committee also agreed to revise the Guidelines into a standard outline format to enhance clarity and ensure that users can easily reference specific provisions. After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, the committee agreed to make a few minor revisions in the Guidelines to keep terminology consistent, such as changing the term "persons" to "individuals" throughout the Guidelines.

In March 2021, the CAC was informed by the Director of the Stamp Student Union of ongoing concerns related to the use of amplified sound at outdoor events. After consulting with the Director and the Office of General Counsel, the committee agreed to add permissions and parameters regarding the use of amplified sound to Article IV.J of the Policy and Section III.A of the Guidelines.

After due consideration, the Campus Affairs Committee approved its proposed revisions to the interim Policy and Guidelines for Expressive Activity in an email vote concluding on March 22, 2021.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Campus Affairs Committee recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity (VI-4.10[A]) should be revised as shown immediately following this report.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Charge from the Senate Executive Committee

VI-4.10(A)   **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE USE OF FACILITIES AND OUTDOOR SPACES**
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991; Amended January 18, 2001; Technical amendment April 24, 2003; Amended and approved September 24, 2019; Amended and approved on an interim basis by the President September 18, 2020)

I. Policy

It is the policy of the University of Maryland, College Park ("University") that its physical facilities and outdoor spaces be used to support the University's central mission as a land grant institution and its goals of achieving excellence in teaching, research, and public service within a supportive, respectful, and inclusive environment that honors freedom of expression and complies with the First Amendment.

II. Applicability

This policy applies to members of the University community (students, faculty, and staff) and other individuals or parties who utilize University facilities and outdoor spaces. The licensed use of University facilities for research-related activities by external users is addressed in the University of Maryland Policy on the Use of University Facilities by External Users for Research-Related Activities [VIII-14.00(A)].

III. Definitions

A. **"Expressive Activity" means verbal or non-verbal expression and assembly protected by the First Amendment, including but not limited to Public Speaking, Leafletting, demonstrations, rallies, picketing, vigils, parades, and marches.** ~~"Host" means an Internal User or External User who plans and/or delivers a Program to which others are invited.~~

B. "External User" means a group or individual that is not a University academic or administrative unit, a Registered Student Organization, a University employee or employees acting within the scope of their employment, or a registered University student.

C. **"Fronting" means an Internal User acting as an agent for an External User to (1) receive access to University facilities and outdoors spaces only intended for use by Internal Users; or (2) receive discounted rates for the use of University facilities or**

outdoor spaces where the Internal User attempts to vacate responsibility for the event, program, or activities that occur after receiving discounted rates. ~~"Internal User" means a University academic or administrative unit, a Registered Student Organization, a University employee or employees acting within the scope of their employment, or an individual or group of registered University students.~~

D. **"Host" means an Internal User or External User who plans and/or delivers a Program to which others are invited.** ~~"Program" is an activity or event that is intended to take place in a University facility or outdoor space, which may include Expressive Activity.~~

E. **"Internal User" means a University academic or administrative unit, a Registered Student Organization, a University employee or employees acting within the scope of their employment, or an individual or group of registered University students.** ~~"Public Speaking" means orally and audibly expressing a message, idea, opinion, concept, principle, or belief directed to a general audience and in a manner other than through a private conversation.~~

F. "Leafletting" means the distribution of non-commercial announcements, statements, handbills, leaflets, pamphlets, magazines, or other materials to individuals, who may accept or decline to accept the materials.

G. **"Program" is an activity or event that is intended to take place in a University facility or outdoor space, which may include Expressive Activity.** ~~"Expressive Activity" means verbal or non-verbal expression and assembly protected by the First Amendment, including but not limited to Public Speaking, Leafletting, demonstrations, rallies, picketing, vigils, parades, and marches.~~

H. **"Public Speaking" means orally and audibly expressing a message, idea, opinion, concept, principle, or belief directed to a general audience and in a manner other than through a private conversation.** ~~"Registered Student Organization" is a student group that is registered with the Student Organization Resource Center within the Division of Student Affairs as defined by the University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for Student Organizations [V-1.00(F)].~~

I. **"Registered Student Organization" is a student group that is registered with the Student Organization Resource Center within the Division of Student Affairs as defined by the University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for Student Organizations [V-1.00(F)].**

IV. General Guidelines for the Use of University Facilities and Outdoor Spaces

A. University facilities and outdoor spaces are available primarily for Programs offered by and intended for Internal Users as members of the University community.

B.~~A~~ Except as noted in Section VI, all Programs must be hosted by an Internal User.

C.~~B.~~ Internal Users are encouraged to reserve University facilities and outdoor spaces for Programs in advance.

D.~~C.~~ Hosts are responsible for all activities associated with the Program, including all financial and legal liabilities.

E.~~D.~~ Use of University facilities and outdoor spaces is limited to the declared purpose of the reservation and must comply with all relevant University policies and procedures and local, state, and federal laws and regulations.

F.~~E.~~ Fees may be charged for the use of University facilities and outdoor spaces to cover the cost of reservations, personnel, technology, and security. These costs are the responsibility of the Internal User or External User reserving the facility or space.

G.~~F.~~ Insurance may be required, when appropriate.

~~G.~~ ~~Internal Users may not front or act as agents for External Users to receive discounted rates for the use of University facilities or outdoor spaces.~~

H.   Fronting by Internal Users is prohibited.

I.~~H.~~ **Expressive Activity must comply with the** ~~University's~~ **Guidelines for Expressive Activity. See (Appendix A)** ~~Attachment B~~**.**

J.~~I.~~ The following activities are prohibited unless specifically authorized **by the relevant space manager**:

    1. The sale or promotion of commercial goods or services;

    2. The use of amplified sound;

    3. The blocking of pedestrian or vehicular traffic; and

    4. Conduct which the University reasonably deems to cause disruption to campus activities.

K.~~J.~~ Failure to adhere to this Policy may result in revocation of an approved reservation and/or other appropriate administrative action.

L.~~K.~~ Subject to the restrictions in **(Appendix A)** ~~Attachment B~~, nothing in this Policy ~~and Procedures~~ shall be construed to prohibit any person or group who is engaged in a permitted use of University facilities or outdoor spaces from engaging in free expression activities such as private conversation, gesturing, standing, wearing expressive clothing, accessories, buttons, or stickers, or from participating in free expression activities germane to a specific activity or event.

V.   Internal Users: Use of University Facilities and Outdoor Spaces

A. Internal Users may **serve as Hosts for** ~~host~~ Programs proposed by External Users, but **F**~~f~~ronting by Internal Users is prohibited.

B. **Internal Users in** University academic or administrative units **who serve as Hosts to External Users for Programs that are open to a general audience** must report **the** ~~all~~ Programs in advance to **their** ~~the Host's~~ unit head. Registered Student Organizations must report all Programs in advance to **the appropriate facility manager and/or** Stamp **Student Organization Resource Center ("SORC")** ~~Event & Guest Services~~.

C. Except as provided in **s**~~S~~ection VI**. of this Policy** and **Appendix A** ~~Attachment B~~, only University academic or administrative units, and Registered Student Organizations, may **serve as a Host for** ~~host~~ a Program where External Users are invited to participate in Expressive Activity.

D. General Purpose Classroom Space

    1. Course and Classroom Scheduling Services in the Office of the Registrar has first priority to schedule general purpose classrooms for classes.

    2. Subject to **section** ~~paragraph~~ V.D.1**. above**, Internal Users may reserve available general purpose classroom space as set forth below:

        a. Academic or administrative units, faculty, and staff may reserve general purpose classroom space through Course and Classroom Scheduling Services in accordance with internal procedures.

        b. Registered Student Organizations may reserve general purpose classroom space through Stamp Event & Guest Services in accordance with internal procedures.

E. Outdoor Space

    1. Reservations for the use of outdoor space controlled by Stamp Event & Guest Services are made through Stamp Event & Guest Services in accordance with internal procedures **and Appendix A**.

F. Other University Facilities and Outdoor Space**s**

    1. University Facilities and outdoor spaces controlled by academic or administrative units other than those included in **s**~~S~~ections V.D**.** and V.E**.** are managed by the units to which the space is allocated and may be reserved in accordance with internal procedures or through Conferences & Visitor Services.

VI. **External Users: Reservations for Programs & Expressive Activity** ~~Use of University Facilities and Outdoor Spaces~~

A. External Users not otherwise hosted by a University academic or administrative unit or **a** Registered Student Organization may reserve University facilities and **limited** outdoor spaces ~~for Programs~~ in accordance with this ~~S~~section VI. **and Appendix A**.

B. Reservations for Programs ~~University Facilities~~

    1. External Users may directly reserve University facilities **and limited outdoor spaces** for Programs.

        a. External Users may directly reserve the designated University facilities **and outdoor spaces** set forth in **the List of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces Available for Direct Reservations by External Users (**Attachment A**),** through the appropriate reservations office.

        b. External Users may directly reserve University facilities **and outdoor spaces** not listed in Attachment A through Conferences & Visitor Services**.**

        c. Each reservable facility **and outdoor space** will have an approved pricing structure and internal procedures for serving the general public.

C. Reservations for Expressive Activity ~~Outdoor Space~~

    1. ~~Specific o~~**O**utdoor spaces **that** are available to External Users who wish to engage in Expressive Activity, including Leafletting, **and procedures for reserving those spaces are defined in Appendix A** as ~~set forth below~~.

    2. External Users are required to reserve space in advance by requesting a reservation with Stamp Event & Guest Services. **Priority will be given to Internal Users**.

        ~~a. Procedures for Reserving Space~~

            ~~i. Reservation requests are approved on a space-available basis and based on the stated expected use of the space without regard to the content or viewpoint of the Expressive Activity.~~
            ~~ii. Priority will be given to Internal Users. If vacancies are available after giving priority to Internal Users, External User requests will be considered on a first-come, first-serve basis.~~
            ~~iii. Reservation requests may be made five (5) business days or less in advance of the date of anticipated use.~~
            ~~iv. Reservations are valid only for the date and time authorized by Stamp Event & Guest Services.~~
            ~~v. A copy of the Speaker Registration Form must be available for inspection upon request by University officials.~~

        ~~b. Outdoor Spaces Available for Expressive Activity~~
            ~~i. Designated sidewalk space outside of the Stamp Student Union.~~
            ~~ii. Designated Space in Hornbake Plaza.~~

2. Reservations for the use of designated outdoor space for purposes other than Expressive Activity must be through the appropriate reservations offices for the spaces listed in Attachment A, or through Conference & Visitors Services for other spaces, and in accordance with internal procedures.

VII. Facility/Space Use Review

A. The University reserves the right to review any request for the use of its facilities or outdoor spaces in order to ensure compliance with ~~this~~ **the** Policy ~~and Procedures~~ and to prevent substantial disruption of the advancement of the University's teaching, research, and service mission; prevent substantial disruption of normal or scheduled users of University property; facilitate traffic on University property; preserve residential tranquility for students; preserve an atmosphere conducive to learning; preserve University property; and protect the health, safety, and welfare of the University community and **individuals** ~~persons~~ using University property. Based on that review, the University may relocate a Program to a more suitable location, reschedule a Program, or cancel a Program.

B. Reviews will be conducted by an Event Coordination Team (ECT) subject to criteria set forth in **the** ECT ~~g~~**G**uidelines.

Attachment A

List of Ffacilities and Ooutdoor Sspaces Available for Direct Reservation ~~that may be directly reserved~~ by External Users

Adele H. Stamp Student Union
Clarice Smith Performing Arts Center facilities
Intercollegiate Athletics facilities and spaces (e.g., Xfinity Center, Maryland Stadium)
Memorial Chapel
Samuel Riggs IV Alumni Center facilities
School of Music facilities
School of Theatre, Dance, & Performance Studies facilities
University Recreation and Wellness facilities (Eppley Recreation Center, Ritchie Coliseum, Armory, Golf Course Clubhouse)

<div align="center">

Appendix A
~~Attachment B~~
Guidelines for Expressive Activity

</div>

I.   **Rationale**

~~It is the policy of the University that its physical facilities and outdoor spaces be used to support the University's central mission as a land grant institution and its goals of achieving excellence in teaching, research, and public service within a supportive, respectful, and inclusive environment that honors freedom of expression.~~

The **University of Maryland recognizes that the** exchange of ideas and information is central to higher education's foremost obligation of fostering both intellectual development and the discovery and dissemination of knowledge. The University supports the rights of individual students, faculty, staff, and student organizations to engage in the expression of ideas, demonstrate, and leaflet, provided such activities are lawful and consistent with University policies.

The University's Statement on Free Speech Values (https://policies.umd.edu/statement-free-speech-values/) articulates the role of a university in discovering and disseminating knowledge as one that requires a free exchange of ideas within its walls and with the world beyond. Freedom of thought and expression are the lifeblood of our academic community. As a community of scholars and learners, the University is committed to fostering vigorous debate among faculty, staff, students and student organizations. The University also recognizes that a healthy and thriving academic community depends on mutual respect and civility. It is the University's goal to encourage civility and mutual respect and to educate its community about how to communicate effectively and respectfully regarding contentious and disagreeable issues. Exposure to all perspectives, including those that may be deemed disagreeable or offensive, can and should be an essential part of the educational experience and academic life on ~~this~~ campus.

The ideas of different members of the University community may often and quite naturally conflict. Individuals may find some ideas and opinions unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. With certain exceptions, such as threats of physical violence and unlawful harassment, the expression of ideas through speech in University facilities and outdoor spaces is protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution, subject to reasonable time, place and manner restrictions the University imposes.

The University also recognizes its obligation to protect the physical safety of its community members, and to address unlawful conduct including unlawful harassment based on race, color, sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, age, national origin, political affiliation, physical or mental disability, religion, protected veteran status, genetic information or any other legally protected status.

II.   **Principles on Expressive Activity**

A. **The** ~~These~~ Guidelines for Expressive Activity **("these Guidelines")** are intended to guide and apply to those who wish to reserve University facilities and outdoor spaces for Expressive Activity, including both Internal Users and External Users.

B.~~1.~~The University supports the right of **individuals** ~~persons~~ to engage in Expressive Activity, provided such activities are consistent with the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces ~~[~~**(**VI-4.10~~[A]~~**)** ("**the** Policy") and the reasonable time, place**,** and manner restrictions outlined below.

C. Violations of these regulations by students, staff, or faculty may be grounds for disciplinary action under other University policies and procedures, including but not limited to the **University of Maryland Code of** Student ~~Code of~~ Conduct **(V-1.00[B])** *"Code of Student Conduct"*.

III. **Rules for Expressive Activity**

A~~a.~~**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ may not block or otherwise interfere with the free flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic or other transportation modes ~~used by persons on campus,~~ including but not limited to public transit, bicycle, moped, golf cart, scooter, skateboard, rollerblades, etc. The right of way on streets and sidewalks must be maintained.

B~~b.~~**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ may not block or otherwise interfere with ingress and egress into and out of campus buildings.

C~~c.~~**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ shall not obstruct, disrupt, interrupt**,** or attempt to force the cancellation of any Program hosted by the University or by any users authorized to use University facilities or outdoor spaces.

D~~d.~~**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ shall not engage in unlawful**ly** harassing, physically abusive, threatening or intimidating, or lewd or obscene conduct toward any person.

E~~e.~~**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ shall comply with the directions of any University official acting in the performance of their duty.

F~~f.~~Classes or other scheduled activities shall not be disrupted.

G~~g.~~Use of public address systems and amplified sound will not be permitted without prior approval from the University**, through the relevant space manager. Those approved to use amplified sound are generally only permitted to use it at the following days/times: Fridays (5pm – 10pm), Saturdays (10am – 10pm), and Sundays (12pm – 8pm)**.

H~~h.~~Where an invited speaker is the object of protest, **individuals** ~~persons~~ may engage in Expressive Activity outside the building where the speech is taking place. **Individuals** ~~Persons~~ who wish to enter the building must do so as members of the audience and must give the speaker a respectful hearing. Failure to grant the speaker a respectful hearing may result in the offending **individual(s)** ~~persons~~ being asked to leave. Any signs, banners, or similar items carried ~~by individuals~~ into the building must be constructed **of materials that do not present a safety hazard** ~~entirely of soft material such as~~

cardboard, foam board, or cloth, and may not be attached to rigid materials such as sticks or poles. The use of such items may not deprive others of their rights or otherwise violate these Guidelines. The University reserves the right to prohibit or restrict the carrying of such items into a building when there is a reasonable expectation that it will compromise safety, interfere with ingress or egress, or deprive others of their rights such as by interfering with others' ability to see, hear, or participate in the event.

I~~i~~. University property must be protected at all times.

J~~j~~. In accordance with Maryland Code Ann., Educ.§ 26-102, as amended, **individuals** ~~persons~~ on University property may be required to provide identification and evidence of qualification to a University official upon request. Evidence of qualification means evidence that the **individual** ~~person~~ is a bona fide, currently registered student, staff**,** or faculty member at the institution**,** or has lawful activity to pursue at the University.

K~~k~~.**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ engaging in activities on University property are subject to and expected to comply with all applicable University policies and procedures, laws, regulations, and ordinances.

L~~l~~. **Registered** Student **O**~~o~~rganizations who host Expressive Activity will be held responsible for compliance with **the** ~~this~~ Policy. However, this in no way relieves participating individuals of responsibility for their conduct. Each individual participating in Expressive Activity, whether hosted by a **Registered S**~~s~~tudent **O**~~o~~rganization or not, is accountable for compliance with the provisions of **the** ~~this~~ Policy and ~~Procedures VI-4.10(A) and~~ all other applicable **University** policies and procedures, including the *Code of Student Conduct*.

M. Violation of **the** ~~this~~ Policy may be grounds for disciplinary action against both individuals and/or the sponsoring or participating **Registered S**~~s~~tudent **O**~~o~~rganizations and their officers.

IV. **Additional Rules for Leafletting and Chalking**

A~~m~~.**Individuals** ~~Persons~~ may engage in Leafletting in accordance with **the** ~~this~~ Policy and ~~Procedures VI-4.10(A) and~~ subject to the following:

1~~i~~. **Individuals** ~~Persons~~ may set up their own tables for Leafletting and are responsible for disassembly of the tables and general clean-up.

2~~ii~~. Leafletting does not include littering. All **individuals** ~~persons~~ are expected to refrain from littering and may be held responsible for costs incurred as a result of littering. Leaving materials unattended on a surface to be picked up is considered littering.

3~~iii~~.Internal Users may engage in Leafletting without registration or advance approval in any University outdoor space, the use of which is not otherwise restricted or reserved.

4. **External Users may engage in Leafletting in designated areas for Expressive Activity, in accordance with section V.**

Bn. Internal Users may use chalk to create messages on approved surfaces subject to the following:

    1i. Messages may be written only on flat horizontal surfaces of sidewalks.

    2ii. No messages may be written on vertical surfaces, including but not limited to walls, buildings, pillars, posts, benches, fencing, doors, trash receptacles, or kiosks.

    3iii.No messages may be written on roads, paths, **building porches, outdoor athletic facilities**, or walkways other than pedestrian sidewalks. Such prohibited ~~areas~~ **walkways** include but are not limited to stairs, ~~building porches and~~ entryways, ~~outdoor athletic facilities,~~ or memorial garden walkways.

    4iv.Chalked messages may not deface decorative symbols or sculptures, including but not limited to the ODK fountain, the University seal, the sundial, **Testudo statues,** or engraved text in concrete.

    5v. Messages must be written in chalk that is water-soluble. Approved chalk includes commercially sold "sidewalk chalk" but does not include spray chalk or artist pastels.

    6vi.Internal Users who chalk in violation of these rules may be held responsible for costs incurred by the University for removal.

    ~~o. Expressive Activity by ten (10) or fewer University students, faculty or staff may occur at any outdoor area without advance reservation.~~

Vp. **Rules** ~~Guidelines~~ **for Scheduled Expressive Activity by External Users** ~~Registered University Students~~

    Ai. **All External Users** ~~Registered University students~~ who wish to schedule Expressive Activity ~~such as a demonstration, rally or equivalent activity,~~ may request outdoor space as set forth below.

        1. Scheduled Expressive Activity will be permitted at the following locations:

            a. Designated sidewalk space outside of the southeast entry to Stamp Student Union; and

            b. Designated space in Hornbake Plaza.

        2ii. Any such request ~~must~~ **may** be made to Stamp Event & Guest Services **five (5) business days in advance but** no less than one **(1)** business day in advance of the **date of anticipated use or** activity.

        3iii.Stamp Event & Guest Services will respond promptly to any reservation request.

        ~~iv. In the event a request is denied, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Student Affairs who shall respond promptly to any such appeal.~~

        ~~v. Scheduled Expressive Activity will be permitted at the following locations:~~

- ~~McKeldin Mall~~
- ~~Hornbake Plaza~~
- ~~Stamp Student Union (South East Plaza)~~
- ~~Nyumburu Amphitheatre~~

4. **External User requests will be considered on a first-come, first-served basis after giving priority to Internal Users.**

5. **Reservation requests are approved based on the stated expected use of the space without regard to the content or viewpoint of the Expressive Activity.**

6. **Reservations are valid only for the date and time authorized by Stamp Event & Guest Services.**

7. **A copy of a Confirmation Summary for the Speaker Registration Form must be made available for inspection upon request by University officials.**

VI. **Rules for Scheduled Expressive Activity by Registered University Students**

A. **Individual or groups of registered University students are subject to the provisions below.**

1. **Scheduled Expressive Activity will be permitted at the following locations:**

   a. **McKeldin Mall;**

   b. **Hornbake Plaza;**

   c. **Stamp Student Union (South East Plaza); and**

   d. **Nyumburu Amphitheatre.**

2. **Any reservation request must be made to Stamp Event & Guest Services no less than one (1) business day in advance of the activity.**

3. **Reservation requests are approved based on the stated expected use of the space without regard to the content or viewpoint of the Expressive Activity.**

4. **In the event a reservation request is denied, an appeal may be made to the Vice President for Student Affairs who shall respond promptly to any such appeal.**

5. Scheduled Expressive Activity may be held at other locations on campus with the approval of the Vice President for Student Affairs on a first-come, first-served basis after an assessment that such activity will not otherwise interfere with scheduled University use or fail to comply with **the** ~~this~~ Policy ~~and Procedures VI-4.10(A)~~.

VII~~q~~.   Rules ~~Guidelines~~ for Unscheduled ~~Spontaneous~~ Expressive Activity by University Students, Staff, or Faculty

    A.   Expressive Activity by ten (10) or fewer University students, faculty, or staff may occur at any outdoor area without advance reservation.

    B~~i~~. Occasionally, events may occur that result in sudden and immediate public outcry, and it is not the intent of this Policy to limit University students, staff, or faculty members' rights to protest such events.

        1~~ii~~. Unscheduled spontaneous Expressive Activity may be held by University students, staff, and faculty in the areas defined in **section VI.A.1. of these Guidelines** ~~paragraph 1.p.v~~ provided that the activity does not interfere with any functions for which that space has been reserved in advance.

        2~~iii~~.University students, staff, and faculty may not circumvent the usual reservation requirements by claiming to be spontaneous.

        3.   In deciding whether Expressive Activity is spontaneous or planned, the University may consider any relevant evidence, including**:**

           ~~(a.)~~ Whether signs or placards used at the activity were commercially produced~~.~~**;**

           ~~(b.)~~ Whether participants used amplification equipment~~,~~**;**

           ~~(c.)~~ Whether security was alerted, or media contacted, substantially in advance of the activity~~,~~**;** or

           ~~(d.)~~ Whether other circumstances demonstrate advance planning.

UNIVERSITY SENATE **CHARGE**

Review of the Interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the Guidelines for Expressive Activity (Senate Document #20-21-11)
Campus Affairs Committee | Chair: Norma Andrews

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Dugan request that the Campus Affairs Committee review the interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the associated Guidelines for Expressive Activity.

The Campus Affairs Committee should:

1. Review the interim University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces and the associated Guidelines for Expressive Activity (VI-4.10[A]).

2. Review the recommendations in Inclusion and Respect at the University of Maryland (Senate Document #17-18-03).

3. Review the report and recommendations on Review of the University of Maryland, College Park Procedures for the Use of Physical Facilities (Senate Document #18-19-10).

4. Review similar policies, procedures, and guidelines at Big 10 and other peer institutions.

5. Consult with a representative from the Division of Student Affairs Working Group responsible for overseeing the development of the interim policy and guidelines.

6. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel to understand the legal framework associated with the interim policy and guidelines.

7. Consult with a representative of the Department of Public Safety to better understand the security concerns that led to revisions within the interim policy and guidelines.

8. Consider whether the roles of internal users, external users, and hosts defined in the interim policy are appropriate.

9. Consider which of the defined roles should assume fiscal responsibility and liability for events under the policy.

10. Consider whether the language in the policy related to the facility/space use review process should include language on criteria associated with the review.

11. Consider whether it is necessary for administrative and academic units to report all programs to their Unit Head in advance.

12. Consider whether the spaces where Expressive Activity is permitted by internal and external users are appropriate and whether they are consistent between the policy and the guidelines.

13. Consider whether Registered Student Organizations should report all programs in advance to Stamp Event & Guest Services, or whether reporting those held within the Stamp Student Union is sufficient.

14. Consider whether the Guidelines on Expressive Activity align with the interim policy, the [Statement on University Values](#), the University's [Statement of Free Speech Values](#), and the principles established in Senate Document #18-19-10.

15. Consider whether the roles and responsibilities of internal and external users should be clearly identified in the Guidelines on Expressive Activity.

16. Consider whether the Guidelines on Expressive Activity should be an appendix to the policy instead of an attachment.

17. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy or associated guidelines.

18. If appropriate, recommend whether the interim policy and procedures and/or the associated guidelines should be revised.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 30, 2021**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

Overview of Use of Facilities & Outdoor Spaces Policy and Guidelines on Expressive Activity

The proposed Policy and Procedures for the Use of Facilities and Outdoor Spaces provides guidance on the use of the University's facilities and outdoor spaces by members of the campus community and outside individuals or groups.

- The Policy defines Internal Users as University academic or administrative unit, a Registered Student Organization, a University employee or employees acting within the scope of their employment, or an individual or group of registered University students and External Users as anyone not identified as an Internal User or who do not have an Internal User as a Host, including current employees acting outside the scope of their employment.

- Allows Internal Users to serve as Hosts for External Users but prohibits Internal Users from doing so if it is merely to allow the External User to gain access to facilities only available to Internal Users or discounted rates while otherwise vacating responsibility for the activity.

- Prioritizes the use of the University's facilities and outdoor spaces for programs offered by and intended for Internal Users.

- Prohibits specific activities during events without prior authorization such as sale or promotion of goods or services and use of amplified sound; and also prohibits blocking vehicular or pedestrian traffic; and conduct that disrupts University activities.

- Defines "Expressive Activity" as verbal or non-verbal expression and assembly protected by the First Amendment, including but not limited to Public Speaking, Leafletting, demonstrations, rallies, picketing, vigils, parades, and marches.

- Provides guidance to External Users without a Host about all spaces available for reservation for programs, as identified in Attachment A or reserved through Conferences & Visitor Services, and notes that information on reservations related to Expressive Activity is available in the Guidelines in Appendix A.

- Specifies the University's authority to review all requests to reserve facilities and outdoor spaces in order to ensure compliance with the policy; prevent substantial disruption of the University's teaching, research, and service mission; preserve residential tranquility and University property; and protect the health and safety of the University community and those using University facilities.

The revised Guidelines for Expressive Activity consolidate all information related to reservations for Expressive Activity for Internal and External Users in one document.

- The Guidelines were developed with the recognition that the University must uphold the principles of the First Amendment and the rights of individuals and groups, including those outside our campus community, to engage in free speech and freedom of expression while protecting the rights of the University to further its mission and protect the campus community.

- The Guidelines clarify that the University's review of any requests related to Expressive Activity is **content neutral** and the only restrictions imposed by the University are based on the **time, place, and manner** of the Expressive Activity.

- Based on these principles, the Guidelines provide general information for all users about behavior that is considered disruptive; conduct that is unlawfully harassing, physically abusive, threatening or intimidating, or lewd or obscene; parameters for the use of amplified sound; and pathways for the University to conduct a content-neutral review that could lead to relocating, rescheduling, or canceling a reservation for a program.

- All users are allowed to leaflet within specific parameters that prohibit littering. Internal Users can leaflet anywhere on campus without a reservation. External Users may only leaflet by request and in specific spaces designated for Expressive Activity.

- ONLY Internal Users are allowed to chalk, and they may only do so on flat horizontal surfaces of sidewalks. There are also restrictions on the type of chalk used and limitations on where chalking is allowed.

- The Guidelines limit the spaces available for Expressive Activity by **External Users, who do not have an Internal User as a Host, to designated space in Hornbake Plaza and sidewalk space outside the southeast entrance to the Stamp Student Union**. These two spaces were identified because they allow for the high level of visibility that External Users often seek, provide appropriate ingress and egress spaces if the event must be relocated or evacuated, and allow UMPD to protect the safety of all participants at the event.

- The Guidelines also explain that reservation requests by External Users must be made 1-5 days in advance, are considered on a first come first serve basis, after Internal Users are given priority, and are approved based on the stated expected use of the space **without regard to the content or viewpoint** of the Expressive Activity.

- Registered University Students & Student Groups who want to make reservations for Expressive Activity are permitted to use **McKeldin Mall, Hornbake Plaza, the southeast plaza of the Stamp Student Union, and Nyumburu Amphitheatre**. The reservation requests must similarly be made 1-5 days in advance and will be approved based on the stated expected use of the space **without regard to the content or viewpoint** of the Expressive Activity. The Guidelines also allow students to appeal to the Vice President for Student Affairs in the event that a reservation request is denied or if they would like to use another location other than those specified in the Guidelines for Expressive Activity.

- The Guidelines allow spontaneous Expressive Activity by 10 or fewer members of the campus community in any outdoor location on campus. The Guidelines limit this provision to a group of 10 for safety and management purposes; ten was thought to be a reasonable number that was agreed to with the ACLU and the University's own event staff who feel that it is a manageable size that can be safely moved to another location, if needed.

Establish a Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design (PCC 20069)

PRESENTED BY	Valerie Orlando, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee
REVIEW DATES	SEC – April 09, 2021	SENATE – April 20, 2021
VOTING METHOD	In a single vote
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	N/A
NECESSARY APPROVALS	Senate, President, University System of Maryland Board of Regents, and Maryland Higher Education Commission

ISSUE

The College of Information Studies proposes to establish a Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design. The B.A. in Technology and Information Design (InfoDesign) will teach students to frame important problems at the intersection of people and information; to design solutions for those problems; and to realize, deploy and iterate on those solutions. InfoDesign supports students in their efforts to use technology in the service of the greater good; to apply and expand their creativity; to develop a start-up mentality (in which they must try solutions and fail first in order to succeed); and to engage in rapid development and prototyping grounded by rapid evaluation and assessment. Students participate in hands-on studio and laboratory classes in user-centered design, technology development, problem-solving and cross-disciplinary communication. Students will learn a variety of skills, including the following:

- conducting user research and participatory design
- implementing workflow design, planning and auditing
- performing algorithmic audits on machine learning processes
- creating digital materials and information visualizations
- managing and moderating community at scale
- writing and designing regulations for big data and machine learning.

The program will require 55 credits. Students take foundational courses in programming, statistics and probability, design, information science, and the sociology of social problems. Students also take upper-level courses in innovation, technology development, communication for designers, systemic problem modeling and simulation, and technology, culture and society. Students are also required to take 18 credits of upper-level electives from a selection of information studies courses. Students complete the program with a capstone course.

This program is geared towards students whose interdisciplinary interests make them a poor fit for other, disciplinarily-defined degree programs. Students who are particularly interested in technology or business may discover that they are in fact interested in the intersection between design, information, and technology. Graduates may become designers, planners, technology consultants, project managers, and entrepreneurs, in such wide-ranging fields as user experience, mobile development, healthcare, law, entertainment, policy, smart-city development, libraries and archives.

The administrative infrastructure, faculty resources, and many of the courses already exist within the College of Information Studies. Additional costs will be met through reallocations within the college.

This proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on April 2, 2021.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve this bachelor's degree program.

COMMITTEE WORK

The committee considered this proposal at its on April 2, 2021. The College of Information Studies' Kate Izsak and Wayne Lutters presented the proposal and responded to questions from the committee. The committee approved the proposal

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve this new bachelor's degree program.

RISKS

If the Senate declines to approve this degree program, the university will lose an opportunity to provide an innovative, interdisciplinary major that prepares students for an expanding job market in information and technology design.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The program will be funded through a reallocation of resources within the College of Information Studies.

760: TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION DESIGN

In Workflow

1. INFO Curriculum Manager (emilyd@umd.edu; kworboys@umd.edu)
2. INFO PCC Chair (bsbutler@umd.edu; kworboys@umd.edu)
3. INFO Dean (bsbutler@umd.edu; kworboys@umd.edu; marzullo@umd.edu)
4. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager (mcolson@umd.edu)
5. Senate PCC Chair (mcolson@umd.edu; vorlando@umd.edu)
6. University Senate Chair (mcolson@umd.edu)
7. President (mcolson@umd.edu)
8. Board of Regents (mcolson@umd.edu)
9. MHEC (mcolson@umd.edu)
10. Provost Office (mcolson@umd.edu)
11. Undergraduate Catalog Manager (lyokoi@umd.edu; wbryan@umd.edu)

Approval Path

1. Thu, 07 Jan 2021 18:12:12 GMT
   Katherine Izsak (kworboys): Approved for INFO Curriculum Manager
2. Thu, 07 Jan 2021 18:12:55 GMT
   Katherine Izsak (kworboys): Approved for INFO PCC Chair
3. Thu, 07 Jan 2021 18:13:22 GMT
   Katherine Izsak (kworboys): Approved for INFO Dean
4. Fri, 26 Mar 2021 21:00:40 GMT
   Michael Colson (mcolson): Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
5. Fri, 02 Apr 2021 15:04:28 GMT
   Valerie Orlando (vorlando): Approved for Senate PCC Chair

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: Thu, 07 Jan 2021 18:11:32 GMT

Viewing: 760 : Technology and Information Design
Last edit: Mon, 25 Jan 2021 23:35:54 GMT

Changes proposed by: Katherine Izsak (kworboys)

Program Name

Technology and Information Design

Program Status

Proposed

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Catalog Year

2021-2022

Program Level

Undergraduate Program

Program Type

Undergraduate Major

Delivery Method

On Campus

Departments

Department
Information Studies

Colleges

College
Information Studies

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Bachelor of Arts

Proposal Contact

Kate Izsak, kworboys@umd.edu

Proposal Summary

We propose the creation of a B.A. in Technology and Information Design within the College of Information Studies (iSchool). The B.A. in Technology and Information Design (InfoDesign) teaches students to frame important problems at the intersection of people and information; to design solutions for those problems; and to realize, deploy and iterate on those solutions. Graduates may become designers, planners, technology consultants, project managers, and entrepreneurs, in such wide-ranging fields as user experience, mobile development, healthcare, law, entertainment, policy, smart-city development, libraries and archives.

(PCC Log Number 20069)

Program and Catalog Information

Provide the catalog description of the proposed program. As part of the description, please indicate any areas of concentration or specializations that will be offered.

The B.A. in Technology and Information Design (InfoDesign) teaches students to frame important problems at the intersection of people and information; to design solutions for those problems; and to realize, deploy and iterate on those solutions. InfoDesign supports students in their efforts to use technology in the service of the greater good; to apply and expand their creativity; to develop a start-up mentality (in which they must try solutions and fail first in order to succeed); and to engage in rapid development and prototyping grounded by rapid evaluation and assessment. Students participate in hands-on studio and laboratory classes in user-centered design, technology development, problem-solving and cross-disciplinary communication. Graduates may become designers, planners, technology consultants, project managers, and entrepreneurs, in such wide-ranging fields as user experience, mobile development, healthcare, law, entertainment, policy, smart-city development, libraries and archives.

Catalog Program Requirements:

Course	Title	Credits
Core Courses		
INST104	Course INST104 Not Found (Design Across Campus)	3
INST126	Introduction to Programming for Information Science	3
IDEA258	Special Topics in Innovation (IDEA258A Becoming a Design Thinker: Tools and Mindsets for Innovation)	1
INST201	Introduction to Information Science	3
SOCY105	Introduction to Contemporary Social Problems	3
STAT100	Elementary Statistics and Probability	3
INST204	Course INST204 Not Found (Designing Fair Systems)	3
PLCY380	Innovation and Social Change: Do Good Now (Innovation and Social Change: Do Good Now)	3
INST367	Course INST367 Not Found (Prototyping and Development Technologies Studio)	3
INST406	Course INST406 Not Found (Cross-disciplinary Design Communication Lab)	3
INST454	Course INST454 Not Found (Modeling and Simulating Systemic Problems)	3
INST466	Technology, Culture, and Society	3
INST491	Course INST491 Not Found (Integrated Capstone for Technology and Information Design)	3
Major Electives		**18**
INST311	Information Organization	
INST352	Information User Needs and Assessment	

INST366	Privacy, Security and Ethics for Big Data
INST401	Design and Human Disability and Aging
INST402	Designing Patient-Centered Technologies
INST404	Course INST404 Not Found (Youth Experience Design Studio)
INST405	Course INST405 Not Found (Game Design Studio)
INST441	Information Ethics and Policy
INST460	Course INST460 Not Found (Video Games as Emergent Experiences)
INST463	Course INST463 Not Found (AI and Society)
Additional elective courses may be added to this list upon approval by the Technology and Information Design program committee.	

Total Credits	**55**

Benchmark courses (16 credits)

Failure to complete both sets of benchmark courses within the timeline indicated below may result in dismissal from the program.

Benchmark I - The below courses must be completed with a C- or higher within the first two semesters of the program:

- INST104 Design Across Campus (3). Explores different design meanings and methodologies in various disciplines through modules created by faculty members in INFO, ARCH, ARHU, BSOS, CMNS and ENGR. (NEW)

- INST126 Introduction to Programming for Information Science (3). An introduction to computer programming for students with very limited or no previous programming experience. Topics include fundamental programming concepts such as variables, data types, assignments, arrays, conditionals, loops, functions, and I/O operations.
  - Minimum grade of C- in MATH115 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=MATH115); or must have math eligibility of MATH140 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=MATH140) or higher

- IDEA258 Becoming a Design Thinker: Tools and Mindsets for Innovation (1). Boost your creative confidence. Unleash your inner design thinker. Learn how to see the world like a designer. Become an idea-generating machine by embracing methods and mindset that bolster creativity and lead to innovation in this 1-credit course open to all majors. You'll only pass if you learn how to fail.

Benchmark II - The below courses must be completed with a C- or higher within the first three semesters of the program:

- INST201 Introduction to Information Science (3). Examining the effects of new information technologies on how we conduct business, interact with friends, and go through our daily lives. Understanding how technical and social factors have influenced the evolution of information society. Evaluating the transformative power of information in education, policy, and entertainment, and the dark side of these changes.

- SOCY105 Introduction to Contemporary Social Problems (3). An examination of contemporary social problems through sociological perspectives; ways in which social problems are part of the organization of society; a detailed study of selected social problems including social conflict and social inequality.

- STAT100 Elementary Statistics and Probability (3). Simplest tests of statistical hypotheses; applications to before-and-after and matched pair studies. Events, probability, combinations, independence. Binomial probabilities, confidence limits. Random variables, expected values, median, variance. Tests based on ranks. Law of large numbers, normal approximation. Estimates of mean and variance.
  - MATH110 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=MATH110), MATH112, MATH113 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=MATH113), or MATH115 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=MATH115); or permission of CMNS-Mathematics department; or must have math eligibility of STAT100 (https://academiccatalog.umd.edu/search/?P=STAT100) or higher

Major core courses (21 credits):

- INST204 Designing Fair Systems (3). Explores how policy shapes design and how design can act as de facto policy. Introduces students to interdisciplinary research on fairness, accountability, transparency, and justice in technical systems, bringing together fields such as law, computer science, and political theory. Students will learn how to assess the impact of automated decision-making in domains such as criminal justice and transportation, conduct audits of these systems, and re-design them for increased community input. (NEW)
  - Minimum grade of C- in INST104 and IDEA258

- PLCY388D Innovation and Social Change: Do Good Now (3). Introduces students to the concept of social innovation while exploring the many mechanisms for achieving social impact. It is team-based, highly interactive and dynamic, and provides an opportunity for students to generate solutions to a wide range of problems facing many communities today. Deepens students' understanding of entrepreneurship and innovation practices by guiding them through the creation and implementation process as applied to a project idea of their choice.

- INST367 Prototyping and Development Technologies Studio (3). Builds upon students' experiences with interaction design to develop a deeper understanding of the process of defining, iterating, developing, and researching products. When interacting with systems, people build expectations and mental models of how things work, based upon their previous experience with similar products or processes, and the successful or unsuccessful nature of their interactions determines the success of the design. This studio course is about how to build a product that people find usable, useful, and desirable, and conduct research throughout that building process from contextual inquiry to evaluating the final product. (NEW)
  - Minimum grade of C- in PLCY388D and minimum grade of C- in INST362

- INST406 Cross-disciplinary Design Communication Lab (3). Best practices of writing and sketching for designers. Students learn how to solicit needs from clients and other stakeholders; how to craft proposals, be they technical or process-oriented; how to create visually compelling documents; and how to present written analyses for audiences of varying levels of expertise. (NEW)
    - Minimum grade of C- in PLCY388D and minimum grade of C- in Professional Writing General Education requirement
- INST454 Modeling and Simulating Systemic Problems (3). Growing complexities in organizations and societies have brought about systemic problems that cannot be fully understood and addressed using solely traditional linear approaches, and purely local solutions limited to a single organization. This course explores paradigms, methods and tools for articulating complex, non-linear, feedback-driven relationships in a range of socio-technical systems, which may span distributed organizations and other social structures, through formal models. Those models can then be simulated to identify the root causes of the systemic problems present, and develop solution strategies for addressing those problems. (NEW)
    - Minimum grade of C- from STAT100; 1 minimum grade of C- from (INST201, INST301); 1 minimum grade of C- from (SOCY105, PSYC100); must be in Technology and Information Design or Information Science programs
        - Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST466 Technology, Culture and Society (3). Individual, cultural, and societal outcomes associated with development of information & communication technologies (ICTs), including pro- and anti-social factors. Unpacking how gender, race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disabilities, and political affiliations affect consumption and production of online experiences. Unpacking how structures of dominance, power and privilege manifest at individual, institutional and cultural levels. Understanding the relationship between local and global problems in technology development. Comparing global and historical variation in the design, deployment, use and regulation of technology.
    - 1 minimum grade of C- from (INST201, INST301); 1 minimum grade of C- from (PSYC100, SOCY105); must be in the Information Science or Technology and Information Design programs
        - Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST491 Integrated Capstone for Technology and Information Design (3). Capstone course for the major. Students collaborate in teams on a second semester-long project for a real-world client, bringing together lessons from across the Technology and Information Design curriculum in order to frame the client's problems, design a solution to them, and realize the solution in context. Students apply knowledge they have gained in the program to work with clients to craft design proposals, conduct user and system analyses, and review project successes and failures. (NEW but based on existing INST490)
    - Minimum grade of C- in: INST104, INST126, STAT100, IDEA258, SOCY105, INST201 or INST301, INST204, INST311, INST 357, INST362, INST 406, INST 454, INST466

Major elective options (students will choose 18 credits):

- INST311 Information Organization (3). Examines the theories, concepts, and principles of information, information representation and organization, record structures, description, and classification. Topics to be covered in this course include the methods and strategies to develop systems for storage, organization, and retrieval of information in a variety of organizational and institutional settings, as well as policy, ethical, and social implications of these systems.
    - Must be in the Technology and Information Design or Information Science programs
        - Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST352 Information User Needs and Assessment (3). Focuses on use of information by individuals, including the theories, concepts, and principles of information, information behavior and mental models. Methods for determining information behavior and user needs, including accessibility issues will be examined and strategies for using information technology to support individual users and their specific needs will be explored.
    - 1 course with a minimum grade of C- from (INST201, INST301); minimum grade of C- in INST311
- INST366 Privacy, Security and Ethics for Big Data (3). Evaluates major privacy and security questions raised by big data, Internet of Things (IoT), wearables, ubiquitous sensing, social sharing platforms, and other AI-driven systems. Covers history of research ethics and considers how ethical frameworks can and should be applied to digital data.
    - 1 minimum grade of C- from (INST201, INST301)
- INST401 Design and Human Disability and Aging (3). Focuses on the design of consumer products and information systems to enable their use by persons with a wider range of physical, sensory, and cognitive abilities. Overviews aging and major types of impairment as they relate to resulting problems using consumer products and information systems. Focuses on principles of design of mass market products.
    - Minimum grade of C- from (INST362, INST367)
        - Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST402 Designing Patient-Centered Technology (3). What does it mean to design a human-centered digital health technology specifically for patients? What are the methods we can use to gather design considerations, and how to use the findings to inform the design? Through a combination of project- and lecture-based class, students will learn topics such as Patient-Centered Technology; Co-Design; Health Monitoring; Persuasive System Design; Goal Setting & Gamification; Health Literacy, and Patient-Clinician Communication. We will apply these concepts to support the unique needs of older adults and patients with a variety of conditions (e.g., diabetes, stroke, dietary issues, enigmatic disease), and to support an individual's health and well-being.

- Minimum grade of C- from (INST362, INST367)
    - Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST404 Youth Experience Design Studio (3). Explores historical, organizational and contemporary contexts for formal and informal learning spaces, principles of teaching and learning, and information literacy. Students will use methods of design thinking specifically in and for youth contexts, including user-centered design, understanding user needs, ideation, contextual design, participatory design, iterative prototyping and visual design. (NEW)
    - Minimum grade of C- from (INST362, INST367)
- INST405 Game Design Studio (3). Games are a structured form of play that are typically undertaken for recreational--but sometimes also educational and even professional--purposes. But what constitutes a successful game? In this course, you will learn the fundamentals of game design: applying elements and principles of game design, such as goals, rules, and challenges to create games, such as board games, card games, and digital games. You will be introduced to the basic tools and methods of game design: paper and digital prototyping, design iteration, design critique, and user testing. As part of the course, you will be designing and remixing several games of different types, each which you will be able to add to your growing portfolio of game design concepts. (NEW)
    - Minimum grade of C- from (INST362, INST367)
- INST441 Information Ethics and Policy (3). Explores via case studies the legal, ethical, and technological challenges in developing and implementing policies for managing digital assets and information. Emphasizes access questions pertinent to managing sensitive information and the roles and responsibilities of information professionals.
    - 1 minimum grade of C- from (INST341, PLCY388D)
    - • Note: requires update in prerequisite information tagged to existing course
- INST460 Video Games as Emergent Experiences (3). Videogames are designed objects that players bring their own history to, resulting each time in a unique emergent experience. If you've ever wondered why you love a certain game but others hate it, why you prefer one genre of game over another, or why the frustration you feel in complicated games is often actually enjoyable, this is the class for you! We will examine design principles instantiated in various games, analyze how failure and feedback support productive gameplay, discuss how mechanics and aesthetics contribute to emergent experiences, and develop an understanding of the field of games scholarship.
- INST463 AI and Society (3). Reviews the technical, legal, and business history of artificial intelligence, and contemporary deployments in domains such as hiring, health, policing, and advertising. Students will discuss both high-level ethical issues and concrete policy dilemmas related to, e.g., self-driving cars, and compare their impact in different social and geographic settings. Students will conduct independent research on the design, testing, deployment, and assessment of AI technologies.

Additional elective courses may be added to this list upon approval by the Technology and Information Design program committee.

Sample plan. Provide a term by term sample plan that shows how a hypothetical student would progress through the program to completion. It should be clear the length of time it will take for a typical student to graduate. For undergraduate programs, this should be the four-year plan.

Sample Freshman Course Plan (starting at 0 credits):

Freshman Fall:

IDEA258 Becoming a Design Thinker

INST104 Design Across Campus

Freshman Spring:

INST126 Introduction to Programming for Information Science

STAT100 Elementary Statistics and Probability

SOCY105 Introduction to Contemporary Problems

Sophomore Fall

INST201 Introduction to Information Science

INST204 Designing Fair Systems

Sophomore Spring

PLCY388D Innovation and Social Change

Junior Fall

INST406 Cross-Disciplinary Communication Lab

Junior Spring

INST367 Prototyping and Development Studio

Senior Fall

INST454 Modeling and Simulating Systemic Problems

INST466 Technology, Culture and Society

Senior Spring

INST 491 Integrated Capstone

+18 credits of electives

List the intended student learning outcomes. In an attachment, provide the plan for assessing these outcomes.

Learning Outcomes

Student will be able to:

LO1: Frame important problems at the intersection of people and information
- LO1sub1: Analyze the interplay of people, information, and technology at various scales (e.g., individuals or small groups, communities or organizations, regions or institutions)
- LO1sub2: Leverage a systems-thinking approach through modeling and simulation
- LO1sub3: Design solutions for these problems

LO2: Implement design thinking skills, including user research, ideation, prototyping, and participatory design
- LO2sub1: Communicate ideas to gather momentum and iterate through sketching, prototyping and data visualization
- LO2sub2: Iteratively assemble existing components to form new solutions within a supportive culture of critique
- LO2sub3: Attend to the ethical and equitable implications of their designs

LO3: Realize, deploy, and iterate on these solutions at appropriately selected scale(s)
- LO3sub1: Assess the scale of the problem and the appropriate deployment of potential solutions
- LO3sub2: Organize people to properly implement solutions through leadership and entrepreneurship skills
- LO3sub3: Evaluate success of a solution in a socially embedded setting, to include the employment of skills such as testing, evaluation, and auditing

The iSchool is developing a set of metrics that will be used to monitor, evaluate, and continually improve the quality of the program. The metrics are based on our shared vision of high standards for the entire learning experience at the iSchool and include standards for the courses and activities, faculty effectiveness, and administrative and technical support services for students. Faculty and content designers will use these metrics to guide the development and any necessary revisions of each course.

The assessment strategies will include direct measures of student learning, such as evaluation of students' performance in integrative design studio courses by supervisors and instructors based upon stated program objectives; the evaluation of students' portfolios; internal and external reviews of studio projects; and performance on examinations given in foundational core and specialization courses. Indirect measures will include job placement data; surveys of graduates and employers; exit interviews; and satisfaction surveys. A curriculum map is attached, indicating which courses will be assessed for which outcomes.

The degree to which InfoDesign is meeting its goals will be assessed by a process that is consistent with that outlined in the UMD Undergraduate Program Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan. The Undergraduate Program Committee will direct the assessment process. Assessments will be conducted annually in the spring semester, beginning in the first year of the program. The assessment report to the Provost each fall will include the results of the assessment and recommendations for program improvement that are based on these results.

Program review will be carried out according to the University of Maryland's policy for Periodic Review of Academic Units, which includes a review of the academic programs offered by, and the research and administration of, the academic unit (http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/2014-i-600a.html). Program Review is also monitored following the guidelines of the campus-wide cycle of Learning Outcomes Assessment (https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/LOA.html). The iSchool faculty are reviewed according to the University's Policy on Periodic Evaluation of Faculty Performance (http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/2014-ii-120a.html).

Please see Appendix II for a curriculum map that further indicates how we will assess each outcome. Please see Appendix III for a curriculum map aligning InfoDesign with the Washington CoLAB microcredentials. Students graduating from InfoDesign will be eligible for the Digital Generalist and Data Analytics Specialist credentials.

New Program Information

Mission and Purpose

Describe the program and explain how it fits the institutional mission statement and planning priorities.

The UMD mission statement includes a desire to create a climate of intellectual growth and mutual respect, that addresses policy issues critical to the state, nation, and world, that sits at the forefront of multi-disciplinary knowledge, and that improves student learning and success through expanded use of innovative teaching methods and opportunities for collaboration and engagement. The iSchool vision statement reads, "We envision a world... where information and technology can be fully leveraged to solve real world problems and foster a culture of trust and respect." The iSchool mission is to use our groundbreaking and innovative research and academics to strengthen information institutions, foster responsible information use, increase information reliability, and ensure equitable access to information.

In support of these goals, InfoDesign will teach students to wield technology in the service of the greater good; to apply and expand their creativity; to approach life and work with a start-up mentality, in which they must try solutions and fail first in order to succeed; to see opportunities for innovation amidst grand challenges; and to engage in rapid development and prototyping and subsequently conduct rapid evaluation and assessment efforts to make their ideas real. The major will teach students the importance of developing a deep understanding of people, places and communities and understanding the dynamics of people, information and technology at the micro, meso and macro scales. Graduates may become user

experience designers, planners, technology consultants, project managers, and entrepreneurs, in such wide-ranging fields as user experience, mobile development, healthcare, law, entertainment, policy, smart-city development, libraries and archives.

Program Characteristics

What are the educational objectives of the program?

This program aims to create and support passionate students with critical thinking skills, optimism, and a desire to spend a lifetime working for the global good. Graduates will know how to design in a way that integrates considerations of people, technology, and institutions. Graduates will know how to design, reason, and act in circumstances with high levels of uncertainty, thus preparing them to respond to grand challenges with long and noisy feedback loops. They will be able to function in complex environments and work across many levels of analysis, because grand challenges typically require integrated efforts across many interlocking levels of a problem. These students will graduate with the ability to:
- Conduct user research and participatory design;
- Apply skills in workflow design, planning, and auditing;
- Perform algorithmic audits to ensure fair, accountable, and transparent machine learning processes;
- Create digital materials and information visualizations with a focus on presenting information in a way that is useful, meaningful and persistent for non-experts;
- Manage and moderate community at scale, whether for hundreds of people in a forum, or for billions;
- Write legislation and design regulations for big data and machine learning while collaborating with domain experts in affected areas, such as health, labor, and criminal justice;
- Understand the local and global needs of distributed organizations;
- Engage wicked problems and grand challenges by identifying or creating opportunities for progress, imagining feasible, impactul and appropriate solutions, and anticipating and participating in the implementation of solutions.

The program will serve and create students who might otherwise fall between the cracks of traditional academic disciplines. These students might be interested in the skills taught in business but feel like their values are mismatched with finance or accounting majors. They might be interested in the content knowledge taught in communications but be looking for a deeper engagement with technology. They might be fascinated by policy but want to simultaneously pursue a career of hands-on making. They might be arts students looking for a professional trajectory beyond that strictly defined by their own media. They might be education students who want to design alternatives to the traditional approaches to teaching and learning. And they might be information or computer science students who are looking for more focus on creativity, design and aesthetics.

Describe any selective admissions policy or special criteria for students interested in this program.

N/A

Summarize the factors that were considered in developing the proposed curriculum (such as recommendations of advisory or other groups, articulated workforce needs, standards set by disciplinary associations or specialized-accrediting groups, etc.).

In 2018, iSchool faculty and administrative leaders worked with the iSchool Leadership, Entrepreneurship, Advocacy and Development (iLead) advisory group, made up of distinguished professionals in the information science field, to identify a set of challenges they expected to shape iSchool education in the coming years. Some of their suggestions included the need for students who would be able to:
- Offset the job displacement resulting from AI, Internet of Things (IoT) and other emerging technologies;
- Grapple with life and work changes arising from AI and robotic automation;
- Foster entrepreneurship in small communities and among underrepresented groups; and
- Gather and analyze impact data.

Building on these recommendations, a 2019 group of iSchool faculty came together to engage in a design fiction exercise in relation to a second-generation iSchool undergraduate major. Design fiction is a design practice aimed at exploring and criticizing possible futures by creating speculative scenarios--in this case, they asked, how will the world be better because of the creation of a new iSchool major? The collaborative process identified an additional series of needs for the future of iSchool education:
- More engaging news across multiple media;
- Jobs that balance equity and productivity;
- Technology professionals who understand their organization and its ethical and political impact;
- Citizens who understand the platforms that govern their finances, social networks and news consumption and understand how to demand changes of them; and
- A federal "data regulator," a monitoring body doing the work for big data that the FDA does for food and drugs.

Identify specific actions and strategies that will be utilized to recruit and retain a diverse student body.

The iSchool is dedicated to supporting gender and ethnic diversity as well as those working for organizations that support and advocate for underrepresented groups. Over one-third of our undergraduate students are from diverse ethnic backgrounds -- traditionally underrepresented in STEM fields. Currently, the iSchool sponsors the iDiversity Student Group and the iSchool Student of Color Collective, both of which are dedicated to promoting awareness of diversity, inclusivity, and accessibility within the information professions and supporting BIPOC students in the field. Undergraduate students from underrepresented groups are also supported through affinity group spaces/events such as the Black InfoSci Student Social offered every semester, and student-driven groups like the Ladies in Tech Group at the Shady Grove campus.

Also important, the iSchool's educators and scholars serve as powerful thought leaders in anti-racism scholarship. An example is the TRACE Research and Development Center, which is a pioneer in the field of technology and disability and which applies engineering, computer science, disability

studies, public policy, and information science to prevent barriers to information and telecommunication technologies, with a stated goal of a "world that is accessible and usable by people of all ages and all abilities." And the program itself is grounded in the importance of applying DEI principles across the curriculum. InfoDesign courses include content important in understanding diversity issues including serving underrepresented groups and institutions, meeting unique needs for diversity promotion, and developing capacity in all sizes and types of organizations. The College has also implemented TerrrapinSTRONG onboarding for all new undergraduates and has programs aimed at helping faculty members build more DEI content into their courses, for example, the Anti-Black Racism Teaching Symposium, which funds faculty members to include DEI principles in courses across iSchool curricula.

Relationship to Other Units or Institutions

If a required or recommended course is o#ered by another department, discuss how the additional students will not unduly burden that department's faculty and resources. Discuss any other potential impacts on another department, such as academic content that may significantly overlap with existing programs. Use space below for any comments. Otherwise, attach supporting correspondence.

Letters from Mathematics, Sociology, Public Policy, and the Academy for Innovation and Entrepreneurship are attached. Please see Appendix IV.

Accreditation and Licensure. Will the program need to be accredited? If so, indicate the accrediting agency. Also, indicate if students will expect to be licensed or certified in order to engage in or be successful in the program's target occupation.

N/A

Describe any cooperative arrangements with other institutions or organizations that will be important for the success of this program.

As described in the attached letters of support, the iSchool is working with the School of Public Policy, the Academy for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, and the Departments of Mathematics and Sociology to offer both benchmark and core courses in the InfoDesign program.

Faculty and Organization

Who will provide academic direction and oversight for the program? In an attachment, please indicate the faculty involved in the program. Include their titles, credentials, and courses they may teach for the program.

All courses in the program will be taught by regular, full-time faculty or part-time faculty who have been approved for teaching by the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) Committee of the iSchool. Regular, full-time College Park faculty will teach a high proportion of the courses and the majority of the tenured and tenure/track faculty will participate in the creation of courses and delivery of the program. Approximately half of the current faculty will play a significant role in the development of the curriculum and expect to teach program courses. Information about the credentials of these faculty members may be found in Appendix II. The iSchool's website (http://ischool.umd.edu/fac-staff) provides information about all faculty members in the College. Please see Appendix I for a list of faculty members with relevant expertise.

Indicate who will provide the administrative coordination for the program

The program will be managed by a Faculty Director, who will be appointed by the Dean for a three-year term and may be reappointed. The Faculty Director, in collaboration with the Assistant and Associate Deans, academic administrators, and members of the faculty, will provide intellectual leadership for the proposed major. The Faculty Director will chair a curricular committee to provide faculty oversight of academic and pedagogical strategies, policies for student recruitment, and curricular planning for the major.

Resource Needs and Sources

Each new program is required to have a library assessment prepared by the University Libraries in order to determine any new library resources that may be required. This assessment must be done by the University Libraries. Add as an attachment.

Attached. Please see Appendix VI.

Discuss the adequacy of physical facilities, infrastructure and instructional equipment.

Existing iSchool facilities and instructional resources will be used to deliver this program with plans for several additions:
- A design is in development for a comprehensive community space for the iSchool, including and beyond undergraduates in this program. This design, codenamed TinkerTech, includes six separate but interconnected spaces: a studio space outfitted with digital media (e.g. videogames, virtual and augmented reality experiences, etc.); another studio space outfitted with the technology needed to develop such digital media, directly connected so that students can transition easily between developing and playtesting; a computer lab with computers as well as spaces for laptops; a break room with board games, tables, and comfortable chairs; a small makerspace for developing physical components of digital systems; and office spaces for faculty and graduate students to increase availability to students. TinkerTech will provide easy access to expensive software, technology, and tools, and the space to collaboratively design, test, and iterate new digital and physical media.
- The College is building studio-friendly classrooms and team workspaces as it expands into more of the ground floor of Hornbake.
- The program will also explore possibilities for the use of new education technologies like PeerStudio, which is currently in use at the UC San Diego design lab, and which aims to scale up design instruction through carefully scaffolded peer feedback.

Discuss the instructional resources (faculty, staff, and teaching assistants) that will be needed to cover new courses or needed additional sections of existing courses to be taught. Indicate the source of resources for covering these costs.

This program will require the appointment of a Faculty Director, to be selected from the pool of existing iSchool faculty members. Existing iSchool faculty members will teach courses, and TA positions will be filled by the growing number of students in iSchool graduate programs. We do not anticipate that this program will result in an overall increase in campus enrollment at College Park, but that enrollment would represent a shift from other degree programs. As a result, no new tuition revenue is assumed. Resources for delivering the program will come from internal reallocation from the Office of the Provost and from the iSchool, depending on program growth.

Discuss the administrative and advising resources that will be needed for the program. Indicate the source of resources for covering these costs.

Existing administrative and advising resources will be used to oversee and support the program. These resources include a Director of Undergraduate Operations, a team of undergraduate advisors, and two coordinators. The College will hire an advisor in Spring 2022 to support the new major, and will hire additional advisors at each point that the program grows by 200-250 students. Resources for delivering the program will come from internal reallocation from the Office of the Provost and from the iSchool, depending on program growth.

Use the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) commission financial tables to describe the program's financial plan for the next five years. See help bubble for financial table template. Use space below for any additional comments on program funding.

Attached. Please see Appendix V.

Implications for the State (Additional Information Required by MHEC and the Board of Regents)

Explain how there is a compelling regional or statewide need for the program. Argument for need may be based on the need for the advancement of knowledge and/or societal needs, including the need for "expanding educational opportunities and choices for minority and educationally disadvantaged students at institutions of higher education." Also, explain how need is consistent with the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education **(https://mhec.state.md.us/About/Documents/2017.2021%20Maryland%20State%20Plan%20for%20Higher%20Education.pdf).**

There is a regional, statewide, and national need for this program. In particular, the program will advance technology-based knowledge about information and design, and contribute specifically to a societal need for students and citizens who are well informed and trained to contribute to our rapidly changing world. This program addresses three components within the Maryland State Plan for Postsecondary Education: increasing retention and graduation rates; continuing Maryland's reputation for higher education innovation; and supporting students in their career paths towards well-paying and highly skilled positions.

First, this degree program is geared towards students whose interdisciplinary interests make them a poor fit for other, disciplinarily-defined degree programs (as discussed above). Students who begin their undergraduate degree believing that they are particularly interested in computer science, business, or education (for example), may discover that they are in fact interested in the intersection between design, information, and technology. By having this degree program available for such students - and, in fact, designed specifically to support such students - we will increase the likelihood of retention and graduation.

Second, as the Secretary notes in his opening to the Maryland State Plan, Maryland is well known for its quality of higher education, and its reputation as "the most innovative state in the nation." This degree program - the first of its kind in Maryland, and one of very few across the nation - will advance both. In particular, we have developed an innovative education program that will graduate students who are well placed in a high demand industry (see below for projected rates of growth).

Third, as part of the "student success with less debt" goal, we are providing alternative education trajectories for students partially through their undergraduate experience, which lessens the likelihood that they will leave with debt and without a degree. Furthermore, the market demand for the primary skills this degree will provide ensures that our graduates will have access to well-paying jobs that assist in rapidly paying down any student debts that they accrue.

Present data and analysis projecting market demand and the availability of openings in a job market to be served by the new program. Possible sources of information include industry or disciplinary studies on job market, the USBLS Occupational Outlook Handbook **(https://www.bls.gov/ooh/), or Maryland state** Occupational and Industry Projections **(http://www.dllr.state.md.us/lmi/iandoproj/) over the next five years. Also, provide information on the existing supply of graduates in similar programs in the state (use MHEC's Office of Research and Policy Analysis** webpage **(http://mhec.maryland.gov/publications/Pages/research/) for Annual Reports on Enrollment by Program) and discuss how future demand for graduates will exceed the existing supply. As part of this analysis, indicate the anticipated number of students your program will graduate per year at steady state.**

The USBLS Occupational Outlook Handbook shows a projected rate of growth of 12% from 2018 to 2028 in Computer and Information Technology Occupations (CITO), and note that this rate of growth is "much faster than the average for all occupations." Within CITO, there are two subcategories that are a particularly good fit for graduates of this degree program: Computer and Information Research Scientists; and Web Developers. The increase projection for Computer and Information Research Scientists is 16%, and USBLS notes that such scientists "are likely to enjoy excellent job prospects, because many companies report difficulties finding these highly skilled workers." The increase projection for Web Developers is 13%, and driven specifically by the "growing popularity of mobile devices and ecommerce."

Within Arts and Design Occupations, Graphic Designers is the only relevant occupation. Graphic Designers are only projected to increase 3%, less than average. USBLS notes that Graphic Designers face challenges on the market - we anticipate that the focus on information and technology will set our graduates apart.

Last but not least, within Business and Financial Occupations, the career of Management Analysts (also known as Business Analysts or Process Consultants) is an apt fit, and projected to increase 14%. USBLS notes that "demand for the services of these workers should grow as organizations continue to seek ways to improve efficiency and control costs."

Currently, there are no similar programs in the state (see below), and consequently we expect the fast increase in demand to continue exceeding the existing supply of skilled workers, making this degree program a crucial contributor to industry and society. We anticipate 80 students graduating per year, beginning three years after implementation of this degree.

Please note, however, that our facilities and teaching resources can scale to accommodate larger numbers of students, if they become interested. For evidence of this, please refer to our success in quickly expanding the scope of the B.S. in Information Science, for which we expected 300 students, but which, after a few years, is currently housing more than 1300 students.

Identify similar programs in the state. Discuss any di#erences between the proposed program and existing programs. Explain how your program will not result in an unreasonable duplication of an existing program (you can base this argument on program di#erences or market demand for graduates). The MHEC website can be used to find academic programs operating in the state: http://mhec.maryland.gov/institutions_training/pages/HEPrograms.aspx

Creation of InfoDesign will not result in unreasonable duplication of an existing program within the state. Programs in the area with some curricular similarity to InfoDesign fall into two categories, more or less: 1) those with a business or entrepreneurship focus; and 2) those with a fine arts and physical design focus. As will be discussed further below, these programs represent pieces of the new proposed major, but not the overall curriculum or the innovative combination of skills and content proposed therein.

Morgan State and Mount Saint Mary's offer programs in entrepreneurship that have some overlap with InfoDesign. But Morgan State's major in Entrepreneurship is housed within their business school and is heavily focused on skills like commercialization, customer identification and validation, business plan development and intellectual property protection. The Morgan State program therefore does not have the emphasis on design and creativity emphasized in InfoDesign. Mount Saint Mary's Entrepreneurship is similar in construction, with emphasis on skills like financial management, small business development, business plan design, and social media and marketing. InfoDesign will include some emphasis on these types of skills, but they will be integrated with the discussion of design principles. The University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) offers an Entrepreneurship minor and supporting coursework most closely aligned with the computer science and information systems undergraduate programs in the College of Engineering and Information Technology. This is a supplementary, not stand-alone, program that does not have a dedicated design focus.

The Maryland Institute College of Arts (MICA) offers a BFA in Interactive Arts, which shares some similarities to InfoDesign. Focused on "crafting interactions across an array of media and forms," however, the Interactive Arts program more narrowly emphasizes human-computer interaction, with specific attention to technologies such as P2P/Blockchain, Artification Intelligence (AI), and Virtual Reality/Augmented Reality (VR/AR). Students are focused on coding and immersive media, rather than the broader cycle of iterative design that underpins InfoDesign. Students in the MICA program also take a first year of fundamentals in fine arts, making the program inaccessible to students not interested in developing traditional drawing and color theory skills. MICA also offers a Game Design concentration (similar to a minor) that teaches design skills, but again, specifically within a narrow focus, and it is only 15 credits. The University of Baltimore offers a similar program, a B.A. in Simulation and Game Design, which focuses primarily on coding skills, without discussion of design principles applied to broader subject matter.

Much closer to InfoDesign is MICA's Product Design BFA. The Product Design program is a hands-on curriculum focused on reimagining objects and inventing new ones through the same type of ethical values and iterative design processes that underpin InfoDesign. The Product Design BFA, however, is focused on the design of physical objects, rather than the proposed major's broader focus, which includes design of intangible products, as well. Like the Interactive Arts program, the Product Design program is also only open to fine arts students who take a first year of fundamentals in fine arts, making the program inaccessible to students not interested in developing traditional drawing and color theory skills.

While not in Maryland, Virginia Tech could prove to be a relatively local competitor to InfoDesign with its B.S. in Industrial Design or its BFA in Creative Technologies. However, the Industrial Design program is constructed similarly to MICA's Product Design program, which focuses on the creation of tangible objects. And the Creative Technology program focuses on design within the limited scope of digital and new media technologies.

Discuss the possible impact on Historically Black Institutions (HBIs) in the state. Will the program affect any existing programs at Maryland HBIs? Will the program impact the uniqueness or identity of a Maryland HBI?

Because there is no analogue to the program in the state, the creation of the proposed major will not impact the identity of a Historically Black Institution.

Supporting Documents

Attachments

InfoDesign Appendix I.pdf
InfoDesign Appendix VI.pdf
InfoDesign Appendix V.pdf
InfoDesign Appendix IV.pdf
InfoDesign Appendix III.pdf
InfoDesign Appendix II.pdf

Key: 760

Appendix I: InfoDesign-Affiliated Faculty Members

Elizabeth Bonsignore, Assistant Research Scientist
Ph.D., Information Studies, UMD
Areas of expertise: participatory design, interactive technology to support learning, user experience

Joel Chan, Assistant Professor
Ph.D., Cognitive Psychology, University of Pittsburgh
Areas of expertise: augmentation of human experience and creativity

Tamara Clegg, Associate Professor
Ph.D., Interactive Computing, Georgia Tech
Areas of expertise: technology to support learning environments, participatory design

Vedat Diker, Principal Lecturer
Ph.D., Information Science, SUNY Albany
Areas of expertise: modeling and simulation of socioeconomic systems

Niklas Elmqvist, Professor
Ph.D., Computer Science, Chalmers University of Technology (Sweden)
Areas of expertise: information visualization, visual analytics

Dan Greene, Assistant Professor
Ph.D., American Studies, UMD
Areas of expertise: technology and work, privacy and surveillance, values in design

Jonathan Lazar, Professor
Ph.D., Information Systems, UMBC
Areas of expertise: accessibility in design

Alex Leitch, Lecturer
M.Des., Art, Media and Design, Ontario College of Art and Design
Areas of expertise: MakerSpaces, environment design, web design

Wayne Lutters, Associate Professor
Ph.D., Information and Computer Science, UC Irvine
Areas of expertise: computer-supported cooperative work, social computing, usable privacy and security

Katie Shilton, Associate Professor
Ph.D., Information Studies, UCLA
Areas of expertise: social and ethical implications of emerging technologies, information policy, social values and technology

Mega Subramanian, Associate Professor
Ph.D., Information Studies, Florida State
Areas of expertise: youth learning and technology, youth digital practices

Jessica Vitak, Associate Professor

Ph.D., Media and Information Studies, Michigan State
Areas of expertise: computer-mediated communication, social media, privacy, social capital

Caro Williams-Pearce, Assistant Professor
Ph.D., Curriculum and Instruction, University of Wisconsin
Areas of expertise: game design, online interactive lesson design

Appendix II: Curriculum Map

SLO / Core Course Mapping	IDEA258	INST126	INST104	INST201	SOCY105	STAT100	PLCY338D	INST362	INST367	INST406	INST454	INST466	INST491
Frame important problems at the intersection of people and information													
FRAME: Analyze the interplay of people, information, and technology at various scales (e.g., individuals or small groups, communities or organizations, regions or institutions)					2		3	3					4
FRAME: Leverage a systems-thinking approach through modeling and simulation	1										4		
Design solutions for these problems													
DESIGN: Implement design thinking skills, including user research, ideation, prototyping, and participatory design	2		1				3	3		3			4
DESIGN: Communicate ideas to gather momentum and iterate through sketching, prototyping and data visualization	1		1	2	1		1	2	4	4			4
DESIGN: Iteratively assemble existing components to form new solutions within a supportive culture of critique	1	3											4
DESIGN: Attend to the ethical and equitable implications of their designs			1	3						2		4	
Realize, deploy, and iterate on these solutions at appropriately selected scale(s)													
REALIZE: Assess the scale of the problem and the appropriate deployment of potential solutions	1										4		2
REALIZE: Organize people to properly implement solutions through leadership and entrepreneurship skills	2						2	2					4
REALIZE: Evaluate success of a solution in a socially embedded setting, to include the employment of skills such as testing, evaluation, and auditing	1		1				3	2	2				4

Levels of Mastery
1: Awareness
2: Content Literacy
3: Expert Experience-Guided
4: Expert Experience-Independent

Appendix III: Washington CoLAB Curriculum Map

InfoDesign students will be eligible for both the Digital Generalist credential and the Data Analytics Specialist credential with the Washington CoLAB.

Washington CoLAB Outcomes X Technology and Information Design Courses	INST104 Design Across Campus	INST126 Introduction to Programming for Information Science	IDEA258 Becoming a Design Thinker	SOCY105 Introduction to Contemporary Social Problems	STAT100 Elementary Statistics and Probability	INST204 Designing Fair Systems	PLCY388D Innovation and Social Change	INST367 Prototyping and Development Technologies Studio	INST406 Cross-Disciplinary Design Communication Lab	INST454 Modeling and Simulating Systemic Problems	INST466 Technology, Culture, and Society	INST491 Capstone Project
Digital Generalist Credential												
Role of Data and Analytics	Introduced	Introduced		Introduced		Emphasized		Introduced	Introduced	Emphasized	Emphasized	Emphasized
Probability and Descriptive and Inferential Statistics					Introduced and Emphasized					Emphasized		Emphasized
Data Manipulation		Introduced							Introduced	Emphasized		Emphasized
Data Ethics		Introduced				Emphasized	Introduced	Introduced	Emphasized	Introduced	Emphasized	Emphasized
Data Security		Introduced				Emphasized		Introduced	Introduced		Emphasized	Emphasized
Specialist Credential: Data Analytics												
Data Management and Governance		Introduced				Emphasized		Introduced	Introduced	Introduced	Emphasized	Emphasized
Data Manipulation		Introduced							Introduced	Emphasized		Emphasized
Probability and Descriptive and Inferential Statistics					Introduced and Emphasized					Emphasized		Emphasized
Data Visualization and Communication	Introduced								Emphasized	Emphasized	Emphasized	Emphasized
Foundations of Systems Development Life Cycle						Emphasized	Introduced	Emphasized	Introduced			Emphasized
Data Ethics		Introduced				Emphasized		Introduced	Emphasized	Introduced	Emphasized	Emphasized

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND　　　　　　　　　　**Katherine Worboys Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu>**

Fwd: Including STAT100 as benchmark for new undergraduate major

Ron Padron <rapadron@umd.edu>　　　　　　　　　　　　　Mon, Oct 19, 2020 at 7:22 PM
To: Katherine Worboys Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu>

See below.

Ron

Ron Padrón, MS | Interim Director of Undergraduate Operations
{Pronouns: He, His, Him}
College of Information Studies
4130 Campus Drive | College Park, MD 20742
301.405.1040 (P) | ischool.umd.edu

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **Doron Levy** <dlevy@umd.edu>
Date: Mon, Oct 19, 2020 at 7:12 PM
Subject: Re: Including STAT100 as benchmark for new undergraduate major
To: Ron Padron <rapadron@umd.edu>
Cc: Antoine Mellet <mellet@umd.edu>

Hi Ron,

Thanks for reaching out. I confirmed with our undergraduate chair (Antoine Mellet, cc-ed), and we are happy to have Stat 100 listed as a benchmark requirement for your program.

Best regards -
Doron

_____
Doron Levy
Professor and Chair
Department of Mathematics
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
Web | Twitter | LinkedIn | 301-405-5051

[Quoted text hidden]

Addition of SOCY 105

Nicole Marie Cousin-Gossett <cgossett@umd.edu>   Mon, Apr 6, 2020 at 2:10 PM
To: Katherine Worboys Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu>

Hello Katherine,
It was a pleasure speaking with you today. As we discussed, please proceed with adding SOCY 105 as a benchmark to the new undergraduate major in Information, Design and Technology.
Best,
Nicole

--
Nicole Cousin-Gossett, Ph.D.
pronouns: she/ her/ hers
Director of Undergraduate Studies & Senior Lecturer
Department of Sociology
University of Maryland
2108D Parren J. Mitchell Art-Sociology Bldg.
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-7365

                                                          Katherine Worboys Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu>

Re: New major proposal

Dean Chang <deanc@umd.edu>   Tue, Apr 14, 2020 at 1:45 PM
To: Katherine Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu>
Cc: Erica Estrada-Liou <eestrad3@umd.edu>, Brian Butler <bsbutler@umd.edu>

Hi, Kate.

Thanks for the helpful call today. AIE is excited to partner with the iSchool on the new IDT major. As we discussed, IDEA258A seems like an ideal place for an initial collaboration, with the possibility of other future areas as well.

To confirm our understanding, we would offer another section of IDEA258A when the the first IDT cohort soft launches in Fall 2021 with 20-30 students. That section in the first year would be co-taught by an instructor from the iSchool and an instructor from AIE with a "train the trainer" goal of the iSchool instructor eventually becoming the primary instructor without the AIE co-instructor. However, that would not preclude additional or ongoing collaborations, e.g., iSchool and AIE working together to evolve/improve IDEA258A. (Also, it remains to be determined whether we would want to try to intermix the IDT students among other IDEA258A sections for more diversity of majors, and how teaching would be shared in this scenario.)

In the following year of Fall 2022, the IDT program is expected to grow to a steady state incoming cohort size of 80 students. We will need to re-assess at that time to determine what's possible and what makes sense from AIE's perspective. It is hoped that some of the successful practices developed from the ongoing AIE-Carillon partnership can serve as a model for how AIE would continue working with IDT as it grows. The AIE-Carillon partnership has a multi-person Carillon team in Undergraduate Studies with an AIE team member primarily leading the train the trainer and curriculum development efforts as well as some additional AIE involvement in teaching, recruiting/orientation, etc.

Please let us know if I missed some aspect of what we discussed. We really appreciate the opportunity to be part of this!

-Dean

Dean Chang, Ph.D.
Assoc VP for Innovation & Entrepreneurship
University of Maryland
1118 Edward St. John Center
College Park MD 20742
301-314-8121 office | 301-356-4479 cell
deanc@umd.edu | innovation.umd.edu
Want to meet? calend.ly/deanchang
UMD Innovation Ranked #7 ter.ps/IETop10Again

On Mon, Apr 6, 2020 at 4:22 PM Dean Chang <deanc@umd.edu> wrote:
> Hi, Kate.
>
> I'm so sorry I missed your initial email when you sent it, so thanks for the follow-up to make it visible at the top of my inbox! :-) Here are some quick thoughts after I excitedly glanced at your slides.
>
> I love that you'd like IDEA258A as part of your design degree program. We've been gradually growing that course from one section limited to about a dozen students when it first launched, to a section of 30 students this year, and now to two planned sections of 30 students this fall (one in Freshman Connection). In general, we hope it can be offered more broadly to more and more students of all majors, and the design degree seems like an ideal fit. Key questions that come to mind include:
>
> - Would there be a special section just for these design students? Or should they be mixed with the open sections of IDEA258A to benefit from a diversity of majors?
> - How many students? Who will teach these new students (AIE person, iSchool person, shared, etc.)? And how will that instructor be identified, trained, etc. As you know, we've got only 4 full-time team members at AIE, so generally we will work with a faculty member for a year or two before they are off and running on their own. Then

that frees us up to identify another new faculty champion to work with and repeat the process. But there may be some cool collaboration opportunities with this program that warrant a slightly different model.

- Will this program be offered at Shady Grove? If so, we could leverage some unique benefits of USG.
    - I've already been working with with Tetyana on Design Your Purpose, which might be a good module include somewhere in the program
    - USG is in the process of hiring a new director of their center for innovation and entrepreneurship, and that person happens to be someone who has been working part-time with AIE this semester. So we might have another collaborator on the effort if it were at USG.

Those are just some initial thoughts, but it would be great to get together and discuss more. How about if you and I meet, and I'll check with Erica if she's also able to join. Here's my calendly to find a time:
https://calendly.com/deanchang/work-with-aie
If you don't find any times that work well for you or want to meet sooner, just let me know so I can find some more options.

-Dean

Dean Chang, Ph.D.
Assoc VP for Innovation & Entrepreneurship
University of Maryland
1118 Edward St. John Center
College Park MD 20742
301-314-8121 office | 301-356-4479 cell
deanc@umd.edu | innovation.umd.edu
Want to meet? calend.ly/deanchang
UMD Innovation Ranked #7 ter.ps/IETop10Again

On Mon, Apr 6, 2020 at 2:13 PM Katherine Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu> wrote:
Hi Dean and Erica,

I hope you're both well! I just wanted to see if you might have had the chance to discuss the possibility of using your 1-credit design thinking course as a benchmark in our new proposed program. Completely understand that there are a million other things going on!

Many thanks,
Kate

Katherine Worboys Izsak, Ph.D. (she, her, hers)
Director of Academic Programs|Lecturer|College of Information Studies (iSchool)
Affiliated Faculty Member|Department of Anthropology
University of Maryland**|**College Park, MD**|**kworboys@umd.edu**|**301-405-1246

On Tue, Mar 24, 2020 at 1:17 PM Katherine Izsak <kworboys@umd.edu> wrote:
Dean and Erica,

I hope you're both well!

At the iSchool, we're developing a new undergraduate major: a Bachelor of Design (B.Des.) in Information, Design and Technology. The program will teach students to frame important problems at the intersection of people and information; design solutions for those problems; and realize, deploy and iterate on those solutions. Students will participate in hands-on studio and laboratory classes in interaction design, technology development, problem-solving, visual design, and cross-disciplinary communication. The program aims to prepare students for careers as designers, planners, technology consultants, project managers, and entrepreneurs, in fields such as user experience, mobile development, health-care, law, entertainment, policy, smart-city development, libraries, and archives.

We would like to share the draft proposal for the program (attached) and we would be grateful for an opportunity to meet to discuss the program further, including any thoughts or concerns you have and/or interest in partnering in the program.

Many thanks,
Kate

Katherine Worboys Izsak, Ph.D. (she, her, hers)
Director of Academic Programs|**Lecturer**|College of Information Studies (iSchool)
Affiliated Faculty Member|Department of Anthropology
University of Maryland|College Park, MD|kworboys@umd.edu|301-405-1246

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	
PERSONNEL						
Faculty Director (Academic Year) -TBD (20%)	24,000	24,720	25,462	26,225	27,012	FT Faculty
Fringe (29.3%)	7,032	7,243	7,460	7,684	7,915	FT Faculty
Faculty Director (Summer) - TBD (1 months)	12,000	12,360	12,731	13,113	13,506	FT Faculty
Fringe (5.4%)	648	667	687	708	729	FT Faculty
Assist. Dean, Acad. Affairs - Kate Izsak (5%)	4,738	4,880	5,027	5,177	5,333	FT Faculty
Fringe (29.3%)	1,388	1,430	1,473	1,517	1,562	FT Faculty
Course Instructors - 8 Courses/Year Y1&2 then 16 Courses/Year	80,000	80,000	160,000	160,000	160,000	PT Faculty
Fringe (29.3%)	23,440	23,440	46,880	46,880	46,880	PT Faculty
Director of Undergrad Operations - Ron Padron (20%)	15,400	15,862	16,338	16,828	17,333	Admin Staff
Fringe (35.4%)	5,452	5,615	5,784	5,957	6,136	Admin Staff
Program Coordinator - TBD (100%) starting year five	-	-	-	-	50,000	Support Staff
Fringe (35.4%)	-	-	-	-	17,700	Support Staff
Adviser - TBD (100%) starting year three	-	-	52,000	53,560	55,167	Support Staff
Fringe (35.4%)	-	-	18,408	18,960	19,529	Support Staff
Hourly Student TA Support - 8 Courses/Year Y1&2 then 16 Courses/Year (one 10 hour/week grader and two 20 hour/week UTAs per course)	132,000	132,000	264,000	264,000	264,000	TA
Fringe (5.4%)	7,128	7,128	14,256	14,256	14,256	TA
PERSONNEL TOTAL	**313,226**	**315,346**	**630,505**	**634,866**	**707,058**	
OPERATIONAL						
Equipment	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
Course Development	12,648	13,027	13,418	13,821	14,235	
Instructional Material	5,000	5,150	5,305	5,464	5,628	
Marketing	20,000	20,600	21,218	21,855	22,510	
OPERATIONAL TOTAL	**62,648**	**63,777**	**64,941**	**66,139**	**67,373**	
Facilities and Administration (20%)	**75,175**	**75,825**	**139,089**	**140,201**	**154,886**	
	112,823	**114,602**	**179,030**	**181,340**	**197,259**	
ANNUAL TOTAL	**451,049**	**454,948**	**834,535**	**841,206**	**929,317**	
Student Total Estimates	*30*	*80*	*120*	*160*	*200*	
# of Classes/Year Estimtes	*8*	*8*	*16*	*16*	*16*	

DATE: January 5, 2021

TO: Katherine Izsak

               Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, College of Information Studies

FROM: On behalf of the University of Maryland Libraries:

               Rachel Gammons, Liaison to the School of Information Studies

               Maggie Saponaro, Director, Collection Development Strategies

               Daniel Mack, Associate Dean, Collection Strategies & Services

RE: Library Collection Assessment

We are providing this assessment in response to a proposal by the Katherine Iszack in the College of Information Studies (iSchool) to create a Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design. The iSchool asked that we at the University of Maryland Libraries assess our collection resources to determine how well the Libraries support the curriculum of this proposed program.

Serial Publications

The proposed Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design is an undergraduate program focusing on the intersection of people and technology that blends coursework in Information Studies with courses in Art, Architecture, and Sociology. In line with the existing Bachelor of Science in Information Sciences, it is expected that the program will rely heavily on online resources. The University of Maryland Libraries currently subscribe to a large number of scholarly journals in online format that focus on human computer interaction, information science, data science, and data analytics, as well as community planning, business, communications, art and design, and architecture.

The Libraries subscribe to most of the top ranked journals that are listed in Information Science and Computer Science categories in the Social Sciences Edition of *Journal Citation Reports.** These journals include the following, all of which are available online:

- *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*
- *International Journal of Information Management*
- *Information Systems Journal*
- *Information Processing & Management*
- *MIS Quarterly: Management Information Systems*
- *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*
- *Information Communication & Society*
- *Computers & Society*

The Libraries subscribe to top-ranked journals in aligned disciplines, including the following, all of which are available online:

- *American Journal of Sociology*
- *Computers, Environment, and Urban Systems*
- *Design Studies*
- *Social Problems*

*Note: *Journal Citation Reports* is a tool for evaluating scholarly journals. It computes these evaluations from the relative number of citations compiled in the *Science Citation Index* and *Social Sciences Citation Index* database tools.

Databases

The Libraries' *Database Finder* (http://www.lib.umd.edu/dbfinder) resource offers online access to databases that provide indexing and access to scholarly journal articles and other information sources. Several of these databases cover subject areas that would be relevant to this proposed program. Databases that would be useful in the field of in Information Science and Human-Computer Interaction are *ACM Digital Library* and *Library and Information Science Source Information*. Other subject area databases that would be relevant to this curriculum include *ARTbibliographies Modern (ABM), ARTStor,* and *Avery Index to Architectural Periodicals.* A general/ multidisciplinary database, *Academic Search Ultimate* is also a good sources of articles relevant to this topic.

In many-and likely in most-cases, these indexes offer full text copies of the relevant journal articles. In those instances in which the journal articles are available only in print format, the Libraries can make electronic copies available to students through the Libraries Interlibrary Loan System.

Monographs

The Libraries regularly acquire scholarly monographs in Information Science, Human Computer Interaction, and allied subject disciplines. Monographs not already part of the collection can usually be added upon request.

A search of the University of Maryland Libraries' WorldCat UMD catalog was conducted, using a variety of relevant subject terms. This investigation yielded sizable lists of citations of books that we own. A search for "design thinking" yielded 5,500 monographs, 2,500 of which were e-books. A search for "information design" yielded 43,000 monographs, 20,300 of which were e-books. A further search revealed that the Libraries' membership in the Big Ten Academic Alliance (BTAA) dramatically increases these holdings and citations. A search for "cybersecurity" from BTAA holdings yielded 15,000 books and "threat intelligence" yielded 113,000 books.

Interlibrary Loan Services

Interlibrary Loan https://www.lib.umd.edu/access/ill is a free service that enables UMD users to borrow books and obtain online articles and book chapters from materials not held in the University System of Maryland.

The article/chapter request service https://www.lib.umd.edu/access/ill-article-request scans and delivers journal articles and book chapters within three business days of the request--provided that the items are available in print on the UM Libraries' shelves or in microform. In the event that the requested article or chapter is not available on campus, the request will be automatically forwarded to the Interlibrary Loan service (ILL).

Additional Materials and Resources

In addition to serials, monographs and databases available through the University Libraries, students in the proposed program will have access to a wide range of media, datasets, software, and technology. Media in a variety of formats that can be utilized both on-site and via ELMS course media is available at McKeldin Library. Students can also take advantage of the Architecture and Art Libraries on campus. Additional research support is available through the Research Commons (http://www.lib.umd.edu/rc) and technology support and services are available through the Terrapin Learning Commons (http://www.lib.umd.edu/tlc).

The subject specialist librarian for the College of Information Studies, Rachel Gammons (rgammons@umd.edu), also serves as an important resource to programs, such as the one proposed. Through departmental partnerships, subject specialists actively develop innovative services and materials that support the University's evolving academic programs and changing research interests. Subject specialists provide one-on-one research assistance online, in-person, or via the phone. They also provide information literacy instruction and can provide answers to questions regarding publishing, copyright and preserving digital works.

Other Research Collections

Because of the University's unique physical location near Washington D.C., Baltimore and Annapolis, University of Maryland students and faculty have access to some of the finest libraries, archives and research centers in the country vitally important for researchers. These include the Library of Congress, the National Archives, and the Smithsonian, to name just few.

Conclusion

With our substantial journals holdings and index databases, as well as additional support services and resources, the University of Maryland Libraries have resources to support teaching and learning in Technology and Information Design. These materials are supplemented by a strong monograph collection, the majority of which are available as e-books. Additionally, the Libraries Scan & Deliver and Interlibrary Loan services make materials that otherwise would not be available accessible to users. As a result, our assessment is that the University of Maryland Libraries are able to meet the curricular and research needs of the proposed Bachelor of Arts in Technology and Information Design.

Rename the Upper Division Certificate in "Latin American Studies" to "Latin American and Caribbean Studies" (PCC 20109)

PRESENTED BY	Valerie Orlando, Chair, Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses Committee
REVIEW DATES	SEC – April 09, 2021	SENATE – April 2, 2021
VOTING METHOD	In a single vote
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	N/A
NECESSARY APPROVALS	Senate, President, University System of Maryland Chancellor, and Maryland Higher Education Commission

ISSUE

The Latin American Studies Center within the College of Arts and Humanities proposes to rename its Upper Division Certificate in "Latin American Studies" to "Latin American and Caribbean Studies." The Center is in the process of changing its name to the Latin American and Caribbean Studies Center to reflect the inclusion of Caribbean Studies in its activities. The Center also offers a recently renamed minor in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, and currently has a proposal for a new Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies that is currently making its way through the approval stages at the University System of Maryland and Maryland Higher Education Commission. In order to have each of their program titles aligned, the Center also requests to change the name of their Upper Division Certificate. This program requires 12 credits of core courses and nine credits of electives from a list of courses that include topics in Caribbean Studies. The curriculum for the program will not change.

This proposal was approved by the Senate Programs, Curricula, and Courses committee on April 2, 2021.

RECOMMENDATION(S)

The Senate Committee on Programs, Curricula, and Courses recommends that the Senate approve this name change.

COMMITTEE WORK

The committee considered this proposal for its meeting on April 2, 2021. A presentation was not required for the proposal as it followed the recent proposal to establish a Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, which the committee reviewed and approved in December, 2020. At that time, the committee heard of the Center's plan to change its name to include Caribbean Studies in its title.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could decline to approve this new program title.

RISKS

If the Senate declines to approve this program title change, the current program will not adequately describe the program curriculum.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no significant financial implications for program title changes.

493: LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN STUDIES CERTIFICATE

In Workflow

1. ARHU Curriculum Manager (bauerr@umd.edu; myuen@umd.edu)
2. ARHU PCC Chair (acaneque@umd.edu; bauerr@umd.edu; myuen@umd.edu)
3. ARHU Dean (bauerr@umd.edu; myuen@umd.edu)
4. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager (mcolson@umd.edu)
5. Senate PCC Chair (mcolson@umd.edu; vorlando@umd.edu)
6. University Senate Chair (mcolson@umd.edu)
7. President (mcolson@umd.edu)
8. Chancellor (mcolson@umd.edu)
9. MHEC (mcolson@umd.edu)
10. Provost Office (mcolson@umd.edu)
11. Undergraduate Catalog Manager (lyokoi@umd.edu; wbryan@umd.edu)

Approval Path

1. Wed, 24 Feb 2021 20:13:44 GMT
   Betsy Yuen (myuen): Approved for ARHU Curriculum Manager
2. Tue, 02 Mar 2021 17:20:02 GMT
   Alejandro Caneque (acaneque): Approved for ARHU PCC Chair
3. Tue, 02 Mar 2021 17:29:46 GMT
   Ralph Bauer (bauerr): Approved for ARHU Dean
4. Fri, 26 Mar 2021 20:50:16 GMT
   Michael Colson (mcolson): Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
5. Fri, 02 Apr 2021 15:03:16 GMT
   Valerie Orlando (vorlando): Approved for Senate PCC Chair

History

1. Oct 17, 2019 by William Bryan (wbryan)
2. Jan 14, 2021 by Eric Tomala (etomala)
3. Jan 15, 2021 by Michael Colson (mcolson)

Date Submitted: Fri, 29 Jan 2021 00:17:14 GMT

Viewing: 493 : Latin American and Caribbean Studies Certificate
Last approved: Fri, 15 Jan 2021 14:31:04 GMT
Last edit: Tue, 23 Mar 2021 20:59:24 GMT

Changes proposed by: Merle Collins (collinsm)

Proposed Action

Rename Program

Program Name

Latin American and Caribbean Studies Certificate

Program Status

Active

Effective Term

Fall 2021

Catalog Year

2021-2022

Program Level

Undergraduate Program

Program Type

Undergraduate Certificate

Delivery Method

On Campus

Departments

Department
Arts and Humanities

Colleges

College
Arts and Humanities

Program/Major Code

9Z005

MHEC Inventory Program

Latin American Studies

CIP Code

050107 - Latin American Studies.

HEGIS

030800

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Certificate, Upper Division

Proposal Contact

Eric Tomalá

Proposal Summary

(PCC Log Number 20109)

Program and Catalog Information

Provide the catalog description of the proposed program. As part of the description, please indicate any areas of concentration or specializations that will be offered.

The interdisciplinary certificate program in Latin American Studies is open to University of Maryland, College Park, undergraduates in any major who are interested in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Catalog Program Requirements:

The undergraduate certificate in Latin American Studies will be awarded to students who have completed 21 credits with a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better in the following areas:

Course	Title	Credits
Core Curriculum for All Certificate Students		
LASC/SPAN/PORT234	Issues in Latin American Studies I	3
LASC/SPAN/PORT235	Issues in Latin American Studies II	3
Select one of the following:		3
LASC/HIST250	History of Colonial Latin America	
LASC/HIST251	Latin America Since Independence	
LASC/SPAN458	Senior Capstone Course in Latin American Studies	3
Additional Courses in Latin American Studies		

Nine credits of additional courses must be chosen from an approved list and from at least two different departments [1]	9
Foreign Language Competency [2]	
Total Credits	**21**

[1]   At least six credits must be at the 3xx- or 4xx-level. See Latin American Studies advisor for details.

[2]   All certificate students must demonstrate their competence in a language spoken in Latin America or the Caribbean. Competence may be proven with a grade of "C+" or above in an intermediate-level language course or higher. Fluent speakers of Spanish or Portuguese, or students with extensive experience, should consult with the Latin American Studies advisor for procedures to demonstrate their language competence.

An overall GPA of 2.0 in the certificate is required for graduation.

Program Modification Information

Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.

The modification is to effect a name change. Students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of the change will not be affected. Required courses remain available.

Linked Programs

Renaming Program

Provide a rationale for renaming the program.

To bring the undergraduate offering in line with the new Latin American and Caribbean Studies Graduate Certificate.

Key: 493

Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 01/28/21 7:17 pm

Viewing: **493 : Latin American and Caribbean Studies Certificate**

Last approved: 01/15/21 9:31 am

Last edit: 03/23/21 4:59 pm

Changes proposed by: Merle Collins (collinsm)

Catalog Pages Using this Program

Latin American Studies Certificate

Proposed Action	**Rename Program**
Program Name	

In Workflow

1. ARHU Curriculum Manager
2. ARHU PCC Chair
3. ARHU Dean
4. Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager
5. Senate PCC Chair
6. University Senate Chair
7. President
8. Chancellor
9. MHEC
10. Provost Office
11. Undergraduate Catalog Manager

Approval Path

1. 02/24/21 3:13 pm
   Betsy Yuen (myuen):
   Approved for ARHU
   Curriculum
   Manager
2. 03/02/21 12:20 pm
   Alejandro Caneque
   (acaneque):
   Approved for ARHU
   PCC Chair
3. 03/02/21 12:29 pm
   Ralph Bauer
   (bauerr): Approved
   for ARHU Dean
4. 03/26/21 4:50 pm
   Michael Colson
   (mcolson):

Approved for Academic Affairs Curriculum Manager

5. 04/02/21 11:03 am Valerie Orlando (vorlando): Approved for Senate PCC Chair

History

1. Oct 17, 2019 by William Bryan (wbryan)
2. Jan 14, 2021 by Eric Tomala (etomala)
3. Jan 15, 2021 by Michael Colson (mcolson)

Latin American **and Caribbean** Studies Certificate

Program Status	Active
Effective Term	Fall 2021
Catalog Year	2021-2022
Program Level	Undergraduate Program
Program Type	Undergraduate Certificate
Delivery Method	On Campus

Departments

Department
Arts and Humanities

Colleges

College
Arts and Humanities

Program/Major Code	9Z005
MHEC Inventory	Latin American Studies

Program

CIP Code   050107 - Latin American Studies.

HEGIS   030800

MHEC Recognized
Area(s) of
Concentration

Degree(s) Awarded

Degree Awarded
Certificate, Upper Division

If other, new
degree award:

Proposal Contact
   Eric Tomalá

Proposal Summary
   (PCC Log Number 20109)

Program and Catalog Information

Provide the catalog description of the proposed program. As part of the description, please indicate any areas of concentration or specializations that will be offered.

The interdisciplinary certificate program in Latin American Studies is open to University of Maryland, College Park, undergraduates in any major who are interested in Latin America and the Caribbean.

   Catalog Program Requirements:

The undergraduate certificate in Latin American Studies will be awarded to students who have completed 21 credits with a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or better in the following areas:

Course	Title	Credits
Core Curriculum for All Certificate Students		
LASC/SPAN/PORT234	Issues in Latin American Studies I	3
LASC/SPAN/PORT235	Issues in Latin American Studies II	3
Select one of the following:		3
LASC/HIST250	History of Colonial Latin America	

Course	Title	Credits
LASC/HIST251	Latin America Since Independence	
LASC/SPAN458	Senior Capstone Course in Latin American Studies	3
Additional Courses in Latin American Studies		
Nine credits of additional courses must be chosen from an approved list and from at least two different departments 1		9
Foreign Language Competency 2		
Total Credits		21

1At least six credits must be at the 3xx- or 4xx-level. See Latin American Studies advisor for details.

2 All certificate students must demonstrate their competence in a language spoken in Latin America or the Caribbean. Competence may be proven with a grade of "C+" or above in an intermediate-level language course or higher. Fluent speakers of Spanish or Portuguese, or students with extensive experience, should consult with the Latin American Studies advisor for procedures to demonstrate their language competence.

An overall GPA of 2.0 in the certificate is required for graduation.

List the intended student learning outcomes. In an attachment, provide the plan for assessing these outcomes.

Program Modification Information

Impact on current students. It should be specifically acknowledged that students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of any curriculum change may complete their program under the old requirements if they wish. The courses required must remain available, or suitable substitutions specifically designated.

The modification is to effect a name change. Students enrolled in the program prior to the effective date of the change will not be affected. Required courses remain available.

Linked Programs

Indicate in the space below all programs to which this program is formally linked (e.g., approved combined bachelor's/master's programs, dual master's programs, or joint-programs with other universities). If the proposed modification will affect the linked program, provide as an attachment the new curriculum for each arrangement and provide supporting correspondence from the director of the linked program.

Renaming Program

Provide a rationale for renaming the program.

To bring the undergraduate offering in line with the new Latin American and Caribbean Studies Graduate Certificate.

Supporting Documents

Attachments

Administrative
Documents

Reviewer
Comments

Key: 493

Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

PRESENTED BY	Lisa Taneyhill, Chair
REVIEW DATES	SEC – April 9, 2021 | SENATE – April 20, 2021
VOTING METHOD	In a single vote
RELEVANT POLICY/DOCUMENT	IV-1.00(A) – University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes
NECESSARY APPROVALS	Senate, President

ISSUE

In September 2017, Provost Rankin asked if the Senate could conduct a comprehensive review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]). The Policy was created in 1991 and had not been reviewed since, and Provost Rankin noted that implementation and enforcement of the Policy was inconsistent throughout campus. The University has grown and its educational and research missions have evolved and the Policy must be revised to align with that evolution, best practices, and consistent standards. The review was delayed to allow for broader input, and the Research Council was formally charged on June 3, 2019.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Research Council makes the following recommendations in (I) Policy Revisions & Development, and (II) Administrative Recommendations:

I. Policy Revisions & Development

1. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes be revised as shown immediately following this report.

2. The Research Council recommends that the new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]) as shown immediately following this report be approved.

3. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes as shown immediately following this report be approved. The Guidelines may be updated periodically and should be comprehensively reviewed by the Senate along with the Policy in 2026.

4. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) be amended to remove the requirement that centers be reviewed with academic units, as shown immediately following this report.

II. Administrative Recommendations

1. The provisions within the revised Policy should be applied to all existing entities at the University of Maryland, and all new entities should be created in alignment with the processes specified in the Policy.

2. The Division of Research should create and maintain a central repository of information on all University centers and institutes. The repository should include an online public-facing list of all centers and institutes, as well as an internal database that can be used to track key details about each center and institute. The database will need to be maintained and updated regularly.

3. The University should create a standard application form or template to ensure that all proposals for new centers and institutes address key elements outlined in the Guidelines.

4. The University should develop guidance on establishing and reviewing centers and institutes to assist Deans and department chairs in conducting review processes that are in alignment with the Policy and Guidelines. The Division of Research should provide unit heads with advanced notice of an upcoming review to allow units to prepare for the review process.

5. Each Approval Authority should establish a staggered schedule for reviewing existing centers and institutes under the provisions of the revised Policy to ease implementation. Schedules should incorporate entities that already have an existing review cycle, but should also establish a review cycle for centers and institutes that have not been reviewed on a periodic basis. All existing centers and institutes should be reviewed under this structure within five years of adoption of the revisions to the Policy.

6. Unit Heads should consider conducting annual discussions with center and institute Directors to broadly assess progress towards annual objectives, including challenges and opportunities that the center or institute faced that year and tangible outcomes, where appropriate.

7. Approval Authorities should consider the name of any existing center or institute that does not align with the naming conventions specified in the revised Policy at the time of the entity's next review, and may approve the continued use of the existing name as an exception to the naming conventions in the Policy. In these cases, the entity will be governed by the Policy specifications that are associated with the level at which they operate, rather than those associated with the name of the entity. New entities created under this Policy should be created with names that align with the level at which they operate, unless the name of the entity is dictated by an external funding agency or other external needs.

8. The University Senate should conduct a review of the Policy and the Guidelines and their implementation in 2026 to determine whether additional modifications are needed.

COUNCIL WORK

The Research Council began working on its charge in September 2019 and initially divided its work into two phases. In Fall 2019, the Council focused on gathering information related to its charge, and in late Spring 2020, the Council started developing Policy revisions based on that information.

The Council reviewed data gathered from each College on existing centers and institutes, the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee, and the current Policy.

The Council engaged key stakeholder groups to solicit feedback throughout its review. In Fall 2019, the Council held open forums and meetings with center and institute directors and faculty, the deans, and graduate students engaged in centers and institutes to get preliminary feedback on current implementation and potential issues with the current Policy. The Council sent out a survey to center and institute directors, faculty, and students to solicit additional input and feedback. The information from that feedback was compiled and distilled into preliminary directions for the Policy revisions, which was presented to the University Senate, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and key stakeholder groups for additional feedback in March 2020.

The Research Council refined the preliminary directions based on the feedback that it received and used them to develop Policy language. The Research Council presented the revised Policy draft to key stakeholder groups and solicited additional feedback. As the Council worked to finalize the Policy revisions, the COVID-19 pandemic moved the University to the virtual environment in March 2020 and made it challenging for the Council to continue its work. Therefore, the Council was unable to meet its deadline in Spring 2020 and reconvened under the leadership of its new chair in Fall 2020.

In September 2020, the Research Council reviewed a revised draft of the Policy, which incorporated a new section related to reviews of directors of centers and institutes, and solicited additional input on that aspect of the Policy from key stakeholder groups including the Senate, the Council of Deans, the Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the Research Directors, the Academic Leadership Forum, and Provost Rankin. The feedback received included input on the director review, as well as on other aspects of the draft Policy. The Council spent the remainder of Fall 2020 incorporating the additional feedback received from the key stakeholder groups. In January 2021, the Council also solicited feedback from interim Provost Wylie. The Council developed a revised version of the Policy and solicited final suggestions from the deans, the Vice President for Research, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and interim Provost Wylie.

In the course of its review, the Research Council found that it would be necessary to develop a Policy to review the directors of centers and institutes similar to the one used for department chairs. That new Policy was developed in collaboration with John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and was modeled after the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]). In addition, procedural and implementation elements associated with the centers and institutes Policy were separated out into a new University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes that will provide more specific guidance on the processes associated with the Policy. Finally, the Research Council found that a minor amendment was necessary in the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) in order to remove a conflict with a new provision in the centers and institutes Policy that allows Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to decide whether center and institute reviews "should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides." The amendment would simply remove the clause, "Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit." The revised Policy, the new Guidelines, and the new director review Policy were distributed to the deans, the Vice President for Research, and the Senior Vice President and Provost for additional feedback before they were finalized. The Policies and Guidelines were also reviewed by the Office of General Counsel. The Research Council approved its final recommendations in an email vote on April 1, 2021.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose not to accept the recommendations. However, the University would then lose an opportunity to establish consistent processes for establishing, reviewing, and dissolving centers and institutes as well as develop standard implementation practices.

RISKS

There are no known risks to the University in adopting these recommendations.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are financial implications associated with some of the aspects of the recommendations, such as with developing the central repository of all centers and institutes.

Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes

2020-2021 Council Members

Lisa Taneyhill (Chair)
Eric Chapman (Ex-Officio VP Research Rep)
Michele Eastman (Ex-Officio President's Rep)
Blessing Enekwe (Ex-Officio Graduate School Rep)
Cindi Hale (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)
Wendy Montgomery (Ex-Officio Dir. of ORA Rep)
Doug Roberts (Ex-Officio Undergraduate Studies Rep)
Peter Chung (Faculty)
Niklas Elmqvist (Faculty)
Valentine Hacquard (Faculty)
Ming Hu (Faculty)

Amy Pate (Faculty)
Debra Shapiro (Faculty)
Kathleen Stewart (Faculty)
Arpita Upadhyaya (Faculty)
Rubie Mize (Staff)
Grace Henry (Graduate Student)
Charlee Bezilla (Graduate Student)
Ngoc Bui (Undergraduate Student)

Date of Submission

April 2021

BACKGROUND

In September 2017, Provost Rankin met with the Senate leadership and asked if the Senate could conduct a comprehensive review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]) (Appendix 2). The Policy was created in 1991 and had not been reviewed since, and Provost Rankin noted that implementation and enforcement of the Policy was inconsistent throughout campus. The Senate leadership brought the proposal to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), which voted to charge the University Research Council with a review of the Policy in September 2017.

The Research Council's review was delayed in order to allow the new Vice President for Research an opportunity to provide input on the charge to the Council. Provost Rankin also suggested that the Research Council should consider the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee (Appendix 3) to inform its work, resulting in an additional delay. The Research Council, chaired by George Hurtt, was formally charged (Appendix 1) on June 3, 2019. The initial deadline for the Research Council to complete its work on the charge was March 30, 2020 but the COVID-19 pandemic in the Spring 2020 semester delayed the Council's work and resulted in the need for a delay to the deadline. The Research Council returned to its work under the leadership of its new chair, Lisa Taneyhill, at the start of the Fall 2020 semester.

CHARGE

The Research Council was charged with reviewing the report and recommendations of the Research Institute Advisory Committee; similar policies on the establishment and review of centers and institutes at Big 10 and other peer institutions; data on the number, size, structure, and administration of existing centers and institutes at the University; best practice models in colleges that have developed new guidelines for their centers and institutes; the existing procedures for periodic reviews; and the definitions of the types of centers and institutes in the current Policy. The Council was also asked to consult with a representative of the Office of the Senior Vice President

and Provost, faculty and graduate students actively engaged in interdisciplinary research within centers and institutes, and the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee. As part of its review, the Council was tasked with considering whether the current Policy is aligned with the University's educational and research missions; the role of graduate students in centers and institutes and the impact of potential organizational changes on their research; whether the establishment of centers and institutes should include sunset provisions; and whether new entities should be initiated with a probationary status before attaining permanent status. The complete charge to the Research Council is included in Appendix 1.

CURRENT PRACTICE

The current Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes was created in 1991. Since that time, the University has grown and its educational and research missions have evolved. Over the past 30 years, the Policy has been implemented inconsistently and enforcement has been sporadic and uneven across campus.

The Research Institute Advisory Committee (RIAC) investigated a set of existing centers and institutes that have annual expenditures of over $2M a year, including the Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research (IBBR), the Institute for Systems Research (ISR), the Language Science Center (LSC), and the National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START), among others. The RIAC's report identified wide variation in centers and institutes in terms of funding sources, governance structures, clarity of mission, review processes, and other details. The committee also noted the existence of significant overlap and duplication amongst centers on campus. For example, there are several dedicated cybersecurity centers and another group of language centers. The report also highlighted several best practices that are not currently used at the University that should be considered, such as the use of probationary periods to implement corrective measures or writing in sunset clauses when a center or institute is established.

Based on information received from the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, it was clear that there is no current centralized repository of information on all existing centers and institutes that includes general information on each, and no tracking of review processes or timelines. This lack of centralized information has led to some of the duplication and makes it challenging for the University to take advantage of funding opportunities that may arise if there is no awareness of what types of centers and institutes are available to leverage those opportunities.

COUNCIL WORK

The Research Council began working on its charge in September 2019 and initially divided its work into two phases. In Fall 2019, the Council focused on gathering information related to its charge and in late Spring 2020, the Council started developing Policy revisions based on that information. The Council reviewed data gathered from each College on existing centers and institutes, the report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee, and the current Policy.

The Research Council gathered and reviewed information on policies and practices at Big 10 and other peer institutions, including University of Texas, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, University of California-Berkeley, and University of California-Los Angeles. Findings from peer data show that most institutions have a more organized process for centers and institutes. The current University Policy touches on many of the key elements identified in best practices, but the Policy is ambiguous and does not give enough structure to the process to ensure that it is consistently followed or enforced. Peer institutions typically have detailed levels for different types of entities,

which guide a defined proposal and establishment process and a detailed periodic review process. Peers also typically address issues related to administrative structures, funding models, termination processes, and sunsetting plans in more detail. A summary of the peer institution best practices can be found in Appendix 5; full details on peer institution policies can be found in Appendix 6.

The Council engaged key stakeholder groups to solicit feedback throughout its review. The main themes of the feedback gathered from key stakeholder groups are summarized in Appendix 4. In Fall 2019, the Council held open forums and meetings with center and institute directors and faculty, the deans, and graduate students engaged in centers and institutes to get preliminary feedback on current implementation and potential issues with the current Policy. The Council sent out a survey to center and institute directors, faculty, and students to solicit additional input and feedback. The information from that feedback was compiled and distilled into preliminary directions for the revisions, which was presented to the University Senate, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee, and key stakeholder groups for additional feedback in March 2020.

The Research Council refined the preliminary directions based on the feedback that it received and used them to develop Policy language. The Research Council presented the revised Policy draft to key stakeholder groups and solicited additional feedback. As the Council worked to finalize the Policy revisions, the COVID-19 pandemic moved the University to the virtual environment in March 2020 and made it challenging for the Council to continue its work. Therefore, the Council was unable to meet its deadline in Spring 2020 and reconvened under the leadership of its new chair, Lisa Taneyhill, in Fall 2020.

In September 2020, the Research Council reviewed a revised draft of the Policy, which incorporated a new section related to reviews of directors of centers and institutes, and solicited additional input on that aspect of the Policy from key stakeholder groups including the Senate, the Council of Deans, the Associate Deans for Faculty Affairs, the Research Directors, the Academic Leadership Forum, and Provost Rankin. The feedback received included input on the director review, as well as on other aspects of the draft Policy. The Council spent the remainder of Fall 2020 incorporating the additional feedback received from the key stakeholder groups. In January 2021, the Council also solicited feedback from interim Provost Wylie. The Council developed a revised version of the Policy and solicited final suggestions from the deans, the Vice President for Research, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and interim Provost Wylie.

In the course of its review, the Research Council found that it would be necessary to develop a separate policy to review the directors of centers and institutes similar to the one used for department chairs. That new Policy was developed in collaboration with John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and was modeled after the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]). In addition, procedural and implementation elements associated with the Centers and Institutes Policy were separated out into a new University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes that will provide more specific guidance on the processes associated with the Policy. Finally, the Research Council found that a minor amendment was necessary in the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) in order to remove a conflict with a new provision in the Centers and Institutes Policy that allows Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to decide whether center and institute reviews "should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides." The amendment would simply remove the clause, "Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit." The revised Policy, the new Guidelines, and the new director review Policy were distributed to the deans, the Vice President for Research, and the Senior Vice President and Provost for

additional feedback before they were finalized. The Policies and Guidelines were also reviewed by the Office of General Counsel.

The Research Council approved its final recommendations in an email vote concluding on April 1, 2021.

RESEARCH COUNCIL FINDINGS

The Research Council compiled feedback from the forums, survey data, and the peer policy information that it had gathered. The Council used these findings to develop key principles for the Policy that were presented to the Senate in March 2020. The Research Council developed a draft Policy based on the principles and worked closely with key stakeholder groups to refine the draft. Based on those discussions, the Council identified the need for a separate Policy on the review of center and institute directors and guidelines that support the implementation of the Policy. The key principles that underpin the Policy and guidelines include the following:

- A central repository of all centers and institutes is needed, with a public-facing list and internal data components;
- Current levels of group, center, and institute should be retained;
- More detail is needed on the different levels of centers at the University;
- Flexibility is needed for the unit head and the approval authority to be able to adapt processes to the needs of a specific Unit or entity;
- There should be a standard formal proposal with key elements to create new centers or institutes and a defined approval pathway;
  - Standard elements for a proposal should include aspects that reflect how the entity would fit within the context of the University, such as alignment with the University's mission, graduate student engagement, and how it differs from existing entities at the University.
- Proposals from external funding opportunities should be able to be a substitute for the formal University proposal to establish a center or institute, and the University proposal review process should not create additional burdens or delays that impede the external processes;
- The University's research, teaching, and service missions should be considered in proposals and reviews;
  - Contributions to all three aspects should not be required, but all three should be considered in the proposal and review processes to assess how the entity fits within the broader context of the University; and
  - Including graduate students should be encouraged as one way of addressing the educational mission.
- Probationary periods or sunset provisions should not be required to be built in from the outset;
- Centers should be able to be reviewed independently or as a part of the academic unit within which it resides, at the discretion of the Unit Head and Approval Authority;
- Review processes for centers and institutes should be more clearly specified, and should vary based on the level at which the center or institute operates.
  - Review processes should not be needed for groups; and
  - Elements from external funding agency reviews should be able to be used in the University's review process.
- Review cycles should be established for new and existing entities;
- Procedures for sunsetting a center or institute in the wake of a negative review should be specified as a potential outcome;

- Reorganizations, restructurings, and renamings should be addressed in the Policy as options following a periodic review;
- Implementation of the revised Policy should apply to existing centers and institutes through the periodic review process at the time of their next review;
- Termination processes should be defined both as a potential outcome of a periodic review and as an option outside of a review cycle, if warranted;
- A Director review process should be established;
- There should be separation between the Policy and implementation processes; and
- There should be provisions that speak to oversight and enforcement of Policy implementation.

OVERVIEW OF PROPOSED POLICY REVISIONS

The Research Council has developed various revisions to the University of Maryland Policy & Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers & Institutes (IV-1.00[A]) that align with the principles that it developed following extensive feedback sessions with key stakeholder groups. The Council also developed a new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]), as well as implementation guidance in the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes. The proposed Policy revisions and Guidelines are included in the recommendations, and seek to:

- Clarify the scope of the Policy to exclude any entities with the term "center" in the name that are not intended to be covered by this Policy, such as the Health Center, Xfinity Center, Teaching & Learning Transformation Center, Extension Centers, and others by renaming the Policy to add "Academic and Research-Based Centers & Institutes" and adding related modifiers to language throughout the Policy;
- Add and clarify definitions within the Policy and ensure consistency in definitions across all policies and guidelines related to centers and institutes;
- Specify implementation and tracking mechanisms in the Policy and Guidelines by tasking the Division of Research with tracking all centers and institutes and notifying Unit Heads of the need to conduct a periodic review on schedule (Policy) and by indicating that any approvals of new entities or changes to existing entities should be reported to the Division of Research for tracking purposes (Guidelines);
- Describe and define Groups and Institutes while establishing specific levels of organization for centers with Department Level Centers, College Level Centers, and Intercollegiate Level Centers;
- Specify the Unit Head and Approval Authority for each level at which entities operate and indicate the duties and roles of the Unit Head and the Approval Authority in the proposal review and periodic review processes, as well as in determining outcomes following periodic reviews;
- Broaden language on funding models in recognition that existing entities vary widely on levels of internal and external support;
- Clarify provisions on faculty appointments with respect to tenure home, joint appointments, and primary appointments for professional track faculty;
- Require a formal proposal and specify suggested proposal elements as well as the proposal review process for establishing a center or institute;
- Include an element in the proposal and proposal review processes on how the entity contributes to the research, teaching, and/or service aspects of the University's mission with an understanding that graduate student participation is one way of addressing the University's educational mission;

- Indicate that when entities are established as the result of an external funding opportunity, the proposal associated with the external process may be substituted for the proposal within the University's process, and the proposal review process will be routed through the appropriate pathway for such a proposal rather than through the standard approval process;
- Create a formal periodic review process for new and existing entities, with an initial review for a new entity after five years and a standard seven-year cycle for established entities;
- Provide flexibility to Unit Heads and Approval Authorities to modify specific aspects of the proposal review and periodic review processes to fit the needs of their Unit or the entity being reviewed, as appropriate;
- Ensure that periodic reviews measure progress against benchmarks and metrics for success specific to the entity being reviewed, and that reviews consider additional elements as specified in the Guidelines;
- Indicate that components of external funding agency reviews can be used to fulfill elements of a periodic review at the discretion of the Unit Head;
- Require a formal comprehensive review of the Director of all centers and institutes in the last year of their current appointment or on a five-year cycle for Directors with ongoing terms, which includes a representative review committee and specific review components and specified outcomes that may follow such a review;
- Identify and distinguish from each other potential outcomes from a periodic review process including probation, sunsetting, and termination;
- Provide a pathway for reorganizing or renaming existing entities following a periodic review;
- Ensure the continuation of graduate student support when entities are sunsetted or terminated;
- Provide a pathway to terminate entities that are in violation of USM or University Policy, federal regulations, or state or federal law at any time, including outside of a periodic review process; and
- Provide guidance on implementation of the new Policy provisions for existing entities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Research Council makes the following recommendations in (I) Policy Revisions & Development, and (II) Administrative Recommendations:

I. Policy Revisions & Development

1. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes be revised as shown immediately following this report.

2. The Research Council recommends that the new University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic or Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00 [D]) as shown immediately following this report be approved.

3. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes as shown immediately following this report be approved. The Guidelines may be updated periodically and should be comprehensively reviewed by the Senate along with the Policy in 2026.

4. The Research Council recommends that the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units (I-6.00[A]) be amended to remove the requirement that centers be reviewed with academic units, as shown immediately following this report.

II. Administrative Recommendations

1. The provisions within the revised Policy should be applied to all existing entities at the University of Maryland, and all new entities should be created in alignment with the processes specified in the Policy.

2. The Division of Research should create and maintain a central repository of information on all University centers and institutes. The repository should include an online public-facing list of all centers and institutes, as well as an internal database that can be used to track key details about each center and institute. The database will need to be maintained and updated regularly.

3. The University should create a standard application form or template to ensure that all proposals for new centers and institutes address key elements outlined in the Guidelines.

4. The University should develop guidance on establishing and reviewing centers and institutes to assist Deans and department chairs in conducting review processes that are in alignment with the Policy and Guidelines. The Division of Research should provide unit heads with advanced notice of an upcoming review to allow units to prepare for the review process.

5. Each Approval Authority should establish a staggered schedule for reviewing existing centers and institutes under the provisions of the revised Policy to ease implementation. Schedules should incorporate entities that already have an existing review cycle, but should also establish a review cycle for centers and institutes that have not been reviewed on a periodic basis. All existing centers and institutes should be reviewed under this structure within five years of adoption of the revisions to the Policy.

6. Unit Heads should consider conducting annual discussions with center and institute Directors to broadly assess progress towards annual objectives, including challenges and opportunities that the center or institute faced that year and tangible outcomes, where appropriate.

7. Approval Authorities should consider the name of any existing center or institute that does not align with the naming conventions specified in the revised Policy at the time of the entity's next review, and may approve the continued use of the existing name as an exception to the naming conventions in the Policy. In these cases, the entity will be governed by the Policy specifications that are associated with the level at which they operate, rather than those associated with the name of the entity. New entities created under this Policy should be created with names that align with the level at which they operate, unless the name of the entity is dictated by an external funding agency or other external needs.

8. The University Senate should conduct a review of the Policy and the Guidelines and their implementation in 2026 to determine whether additional modifications are needed.

APPENDICES

IV-1.00(A)   **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC & RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991; Amended xxxx)

I.   Purpose

The University of Maryland encourages faculty, staff, students, and administrators to engage in areas of common academic and research interests. The creation of academic and/or research-based entities that help to organize and engage faculty, staff, and/or students from one or more disciplines around those interests can expand the research enterprise, foster collaboration, and support the University's educational mission. To this end, the establishment, review, oversight, and termination of these entities will be guided by the procedures established in this Policy, in order to protect the legitimate interests of faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

II.   Definitions

A. "Academic Director" means the head of a School within a College, who is equivalent to a Department Chair.

B. "Approval Authority" means the administrator or administrators with authority and oversight of the establishment, review, and termination of a Center or Institute. Depending on the level at which the entity operates, the Approval Authority may be a Department Chair, a Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.

C. "Center" means an academic and/or research-based entity, which engages faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within one Unit or across multiple Units. A Center may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

D. "College Level Center" means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single College and may involve engagement from multiple departments or areas of focus within the College.

E. "Department Chair" means the head of an academic department.

F. "Department Level Center" means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from a single department within a departmentalized College.

G. "Director" means the head of an academic and/or research-based Center or Institute.

H. "Group" means an informal collection of faculty members gathered to promote a common area of academic or research interest.

I. "Institute" means an academic and/or research-based entity with prominence and stature that is typically intended to have a level of permanence similar to that of an academic department. Institutes engage faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide. An Institute may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

J. "Intercollegiate Level Center" means a type of Center that is typically composed of faculty, staff, and/or students from two or more Colleges and involves engagement from multiple areas of focus across the University.

K. "Multi-Institutional Center or Institute" means an entity created collaboratively between the University of Maryland and another institution, in order to advance the missions of both institutions or of the University System of Maryland (USM).

L. "Unit" means an academic and/or research-based department, Institute, College or School, or Division.

M. "Unit Head" means the administrator or administrators responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to which the Director reports. A Unit Head may be an Institute Director, Academic Director, Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost.

III. Policy

A. The University recognizes Groups, Centers, and Institutes as organizational entities intended to facilitate research, foster collaboration, and enhance the academic experience.

B. Centers and Institutes must comply with applicable University and USM policies. Centers and Institutes that receive federal funds must ensure compliance with the federal regulations and guidelines that govern federal grants, contracts, and other funding agreements, including those regarding the responsible conduct of research.

C. The establishment of new Centers and Institutes should be aligned with the definitions of these entities in section II. of this Policy. Existing Centers and Institutes that do not meet the specifications of these entities in the definitions in section II. of this Policy are not required to be redefined or renamed solely for that reason. Renaming and reorganization may be a potential outcome of a periodic review process as defined in section VIII. of this Policy.

D. Centers and Institutes have a diverse range of financial models. Centers and Institutes should seek and maintain a level of support consistent with their mission and expectations, which could include funding from internal and external sources.

E. Centers and Institutes have varied missions, and with few exceptions do not award degrees. If applicable, Centers and Institutes should foster relationships with academic programs to support the University's educational mission.

F. Centers may not serve as a tenure home.

G. Institutes within the Division of Academic Affairs may serve as a tenure home with the approval of both the Senior Vice President and Provost and the President. All Institutes outside of the Division of Academic Affairs may not serve as a tenure home. Tenured/Tenure-Track (TTK) Faculty with a tenure home in an Institute may also hold a joint appointment in an academic department or non-departmentalized College/School.

H. Faculty contracts establishing joint appointments with Centers or Institutes must define the nature of the faculty member's responsibilities with the entity and any potential limitations to their appointment.

I. Centers and Institutes may be the primary appointment home for professional track (PTK) faculty and must establish and follow a plan of organization and policies, guidelines, and procedures for PTK faculty, in alignment with the University's policies and guidelines.

IV. Entities and Levels of Organization

A. Groups

1. Groups may be short-lived, or may persist as the interest of the faculty develops.

2. Groups typically consist of faculty within one Unit but may include faculty from multiple Units.

3. Groups may use naming conventions including "Group," "Research Group," "Research Laboratory," or other appropriate terminology, as long as the name does not improperly imply that the Group is a Center or Institute, as defined by this Policy.

4. Groups may evolve over time and establish themselves as Centers or Institutes by following the process defined in section V.B. of this Policy.

B. Centers

1. Centers may operate within one Unit or across multiple Units.

2. Centers should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.

3. Centers will be organized within the following levels:

   a. Centers within Institutes: The Unit Head for Centers within Institutes will be the Director of the Institute in which the Center resides. The Approval Authority is the administrator(s) to which the Institute Director reports, depending on the level at which the Institute resides.

   b. Department Level Center: The Unit Head for a Department Level Center will be the Department Chair of the Unit in which the Department Level Center resides. The Approval Authority for a Department Level Center is the Dean.

   c. College Level Center: The Unit Head for a College Level Center will be the Dean of the College in which the College Level Center resides. The Approval Authority for a College Level Center is the Senior Vice President and Provost. In the case of a College Level Center engaged in research activities, the Vice President for Research will be consulted when considering actions affecting the entity.

   d. Intercollegiate Level Center: The Unit Head for an Intercollegiate Level Center will be specified at the time of its establishment. Intercollegiate Level Centers may report to one Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost, as appropriate to the level, structure, needs, and focus of the Intercollegiate Level Center. The Approval Authority for an Intercollegiate Level Center is either the Senior Vice President and Provost or the President. In the case of an Intercollegiate Level Center engaged in research activities, the Vice President for Research will be consulted when considering actions affecting the entity.

C. Institutes

   1. Institutes may operate within one College, across multiple Colleges, University-wide, or across multiple institutions.

   2. Institutes should have a formal administrative structure and should be headed by a Director who will report to the Unit Head.

   3. The Unit Head for an Institute will be specified at the time of its establishment, as appropriate to the structure, needs, and focus of the Institute.

   4. The Approval Authority for an Institute may be a Dean(s), the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.

V.   Proposal and Establishment

A. Groups

   1. Groups may be established at any time with appropriate notice to the Unit Head(s) of the Department(s) or College(s) in which they reside.

   2. The name of a new Group must be approved by the Unit Head(s), in order to ensure that it is appropriate within the broader context of the Unit and does not overlap with terminology used for other named entities.

   3. The Unit(s) will be responsible for maintaining records of all Groups and providing information about the Group in departmental communications and on departmental websites.

B. Centers and Institutes

   1. The establishment of a new Center or Institute must be guided by a formal proposal.

   2. A proposal for the establishment of a new Center or Institute may be prepared by informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability, and feasibility of a Center or Institute, or any similar formal or informal group.

   3. Proposers are encouraged to consult with the Division of Research as a resource when determining the long-term feasibility of securing external funds in a specific research area.

   4. The specific elements that should be included in a formal proposal are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.

   5. In cases where a Center or Institute is being established as a result of an external funding opportunity, the proposal associated with that process may be substituted for the formal proposal.

   6. All proposals should be submitted to the proposed Unit Head, who will oversee the review of the proposal.

VI. Review Process for Proposals

A. Proposal review processes should be based on the level of the entity.

B. Proposals initiated in response to external funding opportunities should be routed through the pathway appropriate to the funding process.

C. The specific review processes for each type of entity are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.

D. Approval Process for Center & Institute Proposals

1. The Approval Authority will determine whether to approve the establishment of the proposed Center or Institute. The establishment of Centers and Institutes that are formed as a result of a successful external funding opportunity will be automatically approved by the University. The Approval Authority for entities at different levels of organization are specified in section IV. above.

2. The naming of all approved Centers and Institutes should be in alignment with the mission of the entity and avoid duplication with existing entities. Philanthropic and honorific namings of Centers and Institutes must be in accordance with the USM Policy on the Naming of Facilities & Programs (VI-4.00).

3. Proposals to establish Institutes will be reported to the University System of Maryland.

   a. The Chancellor will be notified of the establishment of all Institutes.

   b. The establishment of a Multi-Institutional Center or Institute will require the approvals of the Presidents of each institution and the Chancellor.

   c. The establishment of a Center or Institute that is administratively separate from the University of Maryland will require the approval of the President, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents.

VII. Periodic Review Processes

A. Review of Groups

1. Groups need not undergo a formal periodic review process.

B. Reviews of Centers & Institutes

1. All Reviews should be tracked by the Division of Research, which will notify Unit Heads of the need to initiate a review.

2. New Centers and Institutes must be reviewed within five (5) years of establishment.

3. The initial review of a new Center or Institute is a major milestone in assessing its future viability and subsequent reviews will assess continued sustainability.

4. Reviews of established Centers and Institutes will be conducted within seven (7) years of the completion of the last review.

5. The Approval Authority, in consultation with the Unit Head, may determine whether a Center or Institute should be reviewed independently or as part of the review of the academic Unit within which it resides.

6. Unit Heads will be responsible for ensuring that reviews occur on schedule, and will oversee the review process.

   a. All reviews should begin with a self-assessment conducted by the Director of the Center or Institute.

   b. Reviews for Institutes should include an external review. Reviews for Centers may include an external review, if deemed necessary by the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research.

   c. The Unit Head may appoint a representative review committee, which would be responsible for conducting the review and submitting its findings in a written report. In the absence of a review committee, the Unit Head shall conduct the review and develop the written report.

   d. Reviews should measure progress against the benchmarks and metrics for success identified during the establishment of the entity and/or refined in subsequent reviews.

   e. The specific elements of the review process are defined in the *University of Maryland Guidelines for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes*.

   f. Components of external funding agency reviews may be used to fulfill elements of a periodic review, when authorized by the Unit Head.

   g. The written report from the review committee and/or external review(s) should be sent to the Unit Head for consideration.

7. The Unit Head will make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.

8. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following a review as defined in section VIII. below.

9. Upon completion of all review processes, notification of the outcome should be forwarded to the Director, Unit Head, and the Division of Research.

C. Center and Institute Directors must undergo a formal comprehensive review in accordance with the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Directors of Academic and Research-Based Centers and Institutes (I-6.00[D]).

VIII. Outcomes Following Periodic Reviews of Centers & Institutes

A. The Center or Institute may be approved to continue normal operations with no modifications.

B. The University will abide by the rules and regulations of external funding agencies or state or federal funding requirements, if changes are warranted for Centers and Institutes primarily funded by those sources.

C. Reorganization or renaming procedures may be initiated.

1. If the Approval Authority determines that a reorganization is warranted following a review, the Unit Head may initiate procedures to transition the Center or Institute to a different type of entity.

    a. The Unit Head may consider a variety of options for reorganizing an existing Center or may consider other structural changes appropriate to the needs identified in the review.

    b. The Unit Head should consult with the faculty and administrators engaged in the entity's work, as well as with the relevant College(s)/School(s), the Dean(s), the Senior Vice President and Provost, and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, prior to approving a reorganization.

    c. If the proposed reorganization would result in the creation of a new Center, the new Center should be approved through the process for establishing a Center outlined in section V.B. of this Policy.

2. If the review indicates that the name of the entity should be changed, the Unit Head may initiate a process to rename the entity. Philanthropic and honorific namings must be in accordance with the USM Policy on the Naming of Facilities & Programs (VI-4.00).

    a. The Unit Head should consider any agreements with external funding agencies or affiliated laboratories regarding the name of the entity.

    b. The Unit Head should consult with faculty and administrators engaged in the work of the entity to develop a new name, and may consider engaging departmental or College-level committees, as appropriate.

    c. The Unit Head should determine whether a proposed new name would conflict with names used by existing Centers or Institutes at the University that focus on similar or related topics, and whether the proposed name is appropriate for the level at which the entity operates.

d. The Unit Head may approve a new name for the entity after consultation with key stakeholders and the Approval Authority, and should notify the Division of Research of the change.

D. The Center or Institute may be placed on probation.

1. The Unit Head, in consultation with the Director, will develop a plan of corrective actions that must be taken during the probationary period to address the factors that led to the negative review.

2. The Center or Institute will have up to two years from the point at which the plan is finalized to implement the corrective actions.

3. The Center or Institute will submit a self-assessment to the Unit Head detailing its progress in addressing the factors that led to the negative review within two years.

4. The Unit Head will review the self-assessment and make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.

5. The Approval Authority will make a final determination on actions following the implementation of the plan. The Approval Authority may:

   a. Remove probationary status and approve the continuation of normal operations;

   b. Determine whether additional corrective actions are needed;

   c. Determine whether additional time to address specific issues would be appropriate; or

   d. Initiate sunsetting procedures.

E. The Approval Authority may initiate sunsetting procedures when a period of time is needed in order to appropriately complete or phase out the activities of the entity.

1. The Unit Head will develop the sunsetting plan, in consultation with the Approval Authority, as appropriate. The Unit Head may engage the Director in the development of the sunsetting plan.

2. The sunsetting plan should address, among other things:

   a. The time frame of the phase-out period, which may range from a few months to up to two years;

   b. The reassignment or expiration of faculty/staff appointments;

c. Plans for ensuring the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity; and

d. Plans for how to address any remaining funding commitments and other financial matters.

3. The Unit Head will be responsible for taking any necessary steps to remove a Center or Institute from any public-facing websites or materials and notifying the Division of Research following sunsetting.

F. The Approval Authority may initiate termination procedures as specified in section IX. below.

IX. Termination

A. Groups, Centers, and Institutes may be terminated at any time by the Approval Authority, in consultation with the Unit Head, for violation(s) of USM or University policy, federal regulations, or state or federal law.

B. Groups, Centers, and Institutes may be terminated at any time by the Unit Head due to inactivity, lack of funding, or lack of interest by the faculty to sustain the entity's activities.

1. Groups may be terminated by the Unit Head if the faculty within the Group have left the University or are no longer interested in actively pursuing the focus area.

2. Termination may also be initiated by the faculty within the Group, Center, or Institute when faculty support for the entity no longer exists, if there is no interest among the faculty in participating in or leading the entity, or when the entity is no longer financially viable. Requests for termination may be submitted to the Unit Head for consideration.

C. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as a result of the periodic review process.

1. Termination of Centers and Institutes may be initiated by the Unit Head if at the time of review, they determine that a Center or Institute is inactive and has no existing faculty or staff dedicated to its work.

2. Centers and Institutes may be terminated as a result of a negative review or following a negative outcome from a probationary period, at the discretion of the Approval Authority.

D. The process of dissolving a Center or Institute must:

1. Take into consideration the contractual obligations and employment agreements with the faculty and staff associated with the entity, and determine how these will be fulfilled;

2. Abide by any contractual agreements with external agencies and/or affiliated laboratories;

3. Ensure the continued support of graduate students whose research is associated with the entity; and

4. Provide for the appropriate closure of any active research space, including but not limited to the disposal of hazards, data, and supplies and equipment, in compliance with Environmental Safety, Sustainability, and Risk (ESSR) and other applicable oversight entities.

X. Implementation

A. The requirement for regular reviews of academic and/or research-based Centers and Institutes applies to all such entities defined in this Policy, established prior to July 2021, as well as to any new entities created under this Policy.

B. Existing Centers and Institutes should transition to the new review processes established in this Policy at the time of their next review.

C. Centers and Institutes that have not been reviewed within the past five years or that do not have a defined review cycle should be reviewed as soon as is practical but no later than five years from the approval of this Policy, using the processes outlined in this Policy.

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND GUIDELINES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC AND RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES

I. **Introduction**

The University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Academic & Research-Based Centers and Institutes (IV-1.00[A]) ("the Policy") defines and provides for the development of entities meant to facilitate research, foster collaboration, and enhance the academic experience. These Guidelines were created to support the implementation of the Policy, in the interest of enhancing consistency while recognizing that these entities vary widely across the University.

II. **Proposal and Review Process for New Centers & Institutes**

A. New Centers and Institutes are established through a formal proposal process, as indicated in the Policy.

1. Proposals should typically include the following elements:

   a. A description of the purpose and mission of the proposed entity;

   b. A description of whether and how the proposed entity addresses the teaching, research, and service missions of the University of Maryland;

   c. A description of the value the proposed entity provides to the University;

   d. A description of whether and how the proposed entity intends to incorporate graduate students and undergraduate students;

   e. An explanation of how the proposed entity differs from existing Centers, Institutes, or departments at the University that focus on similar or related topics;

   f. An overview of expected interdisciplinary connections and collaborations, if appropriate;

   g. Details regarding the proposed administrative and organizational structure, as well as any planned advisory or governance structures;

   h. A description of new and/or specialized space, infrastructural, technological, and information assets or services needed for the entity;

   i. An overview of the financial model of the proposed entity;

   j. Benchmarks and metrics to be used in measuring the proposed entity's progress and success; and

    k. A research and/or budget plan for the first five years of operations.

   2. Proposals should include additional information specific to the entity being proposed, including any information relevant to external funding agencies, if applicable.

   3. Centers and Institutes that are initiated in response to an external funding opportunity may substitute the proposal associated with that process for the formal proposal.

B. Proposals for Centers and Institutes should be routed through the appropriate Unit Head, Approval Authority, and the Office of Research Administration, if the proposal involves external funding.

C. The proposal review process for establishing new Centers and Institutes should be overseen by the proposed Unit Head and conducted in alignment with the Policy.

   1. Proposal review processes should be based on the level of the entity.

     a. Reviews of proposals to establish new Centers within an Institute should include consideration at the level of the Institute.

       i. The Institute Director should review the proposal, and may submit it to the appropriate faculty advisory committee for review.

       ii. The Institute Director should consider the recommendation from any faculty advisory committee, if appropriate, and the merits of the proposal, and should make a recommendation to the Approval Authority.

     b. Reviews of proposals to establish new Department Level Centers should include consideration at the level of the department.

       i. The Unit Head should review the proposal, and may submit it to the appropriate departmental faculty advisory committee for review.

       ii. The Unit Head should consider the recommendation from any faculty advisory committee, if appropriate, and the merits of the proposal, and should make a recommendation to the Dean.

     c. Review of proposals for College Level Centers, Intercollegiate Level Centers, and Institutes may need consideration at the level of the College or the University.

       i. The Unit Head(s) may submit the proposal to the relevant College faculty advisory committee(s) for review.

       ii. In reviewing the proposal, the Unit Head(s) should consider the merits of the proposal and the feasibility of the request(s) for space and funding necessary to create and maintain the Center.

(1) Funding sources may include, but are not limited to College funds, short-term commitments from the University, and/or external funds.

(2) The Unit Head(s) should work in consultation with the Approval Authority on assessing the space and funding aspects of the proposal.

    (a) The Senior Vice President and Provost may request that proposals that capitalize on special funding opportunities where the College cannot supply all necessary resources, or those that involve large or long-term commitments from University funds, be reviewed by the University's Academic Planning Advisory Committee (APAC).

    (b) The Senior Vice President and Provost may ask APAC to review other proposals for College Level Centers, Intercollegiate Level Centers, and Institutes, as appropriate.

2. Proposals initiated in response to external funding opportunities should be routed through the pathway appropriate to the funding process.

III. Governance Structure & Policies

A. Centers and Institutes should establish a Plan of Organization that aligns with the principles of shared governance within the Unit(s) to which it reports.

1. The Plan should identify the entity's administrative and governance structures and define titles recognized within the entity.

2. The Plan must be approved by the Unit(s) to which the entity reports.

B. Centers and Institutes should establish policies, guidelines, and procedures for professional track (PTK) faculty in alignment with similar University policies and procedures (e.g., Appointment, Evaluation, Promotion (AEP) policies and merit pay policies, title series, and promotion ladders relevant to the PTK faculty within the specific entity) that must be approved by the appropriate Approval Authority or approval body.

IV. Periodic Reviews of Centers & Institutes

A. All existing and new Centers and Institutes are subject to periodic reviews as specified in the Policy.

B. Periodic reviews of Centers and Institutes should include consideration of the following elements:

1. Continued alignment with the goals, mission, and purpose of the University and the Unit(s) affiliated with the entity;

2. An assessment of activities and trend data since the establishment of the entity or since the last review;

3. An evaluation of challenges and opportunities since the last review;

4. An assessment of financial viability;

5. An assessment of the efficacy of organizational and administrative structures;

6. Quality of any related instruction, advising, mentorship, or professional development activities;

7. Research activities including peer-reviewed publications, scholarship, and creative activities performed by the Center or Institute since the last review;

8. Information on whether the entity has had an impact on recruiting and retaining outstanding faculty;

9. Information on how the entity plays a positive role in community engagement, community service, and outreach activities;

10. Stakeholder feedback;

11. A reevaluation of the benchmarks and metrics for success; and

12. An assessment of whether changes are needed to enable future success.

C. As indicated in the Policy, reviews for Department Level Centers, College Level Centers, and Intercollegiate Level Centers may include an external review.

1. The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, should determine whether an external review should be conducted.

   a. For Department Level Centers, the Approval Authority in consultation with the Unit Head should make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, on whether an external review should be conducted for a specific Center. For College Level Centers and Intercollegiate Level Centers, the Unit Head should make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, on whether an external review should be conducted for a specific Center.

   b. If an external review is not recommended by the Unit Head and/or the Approval Authority, the Director of a Center may make a request for an external review to the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research, if appropriate, if they feel it is warranted.

V.   Implementation of the Policy

A. The Division of Research should maintain a centralized database and public-facing information on all Centers and Institutes at the University.

B. The Division of Research should be notified at the conclusion of the proposal and periodic review processes and in other instances when modifications are implemented, so that the public-facing information and internal tracking mechanisms can be updated as appropriate. At a minimum, the Division of Research should be notified of:

1. Approved proposals for new Centers and Institutes;

2. Approved name changes or reorganizations of existing entities;

3. Any outcomes following periodic review processes, including probation and sunsetting plans; and

4. Termination of Centers and Institutes.

VI.   Review & Revision of the Guidelines

A. The Guidelines should be updated periodically to provide additional guidance associated with the Policy, as needed.

B. The Guidelines are subject to a comprehensive review and revision at times when the Policy is reviewed and revised.

I-6.00 (D)   **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE REVIEW OF DIRECTORS OF ACADEMIC OR RESEARCH-BASED CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**
Approved by the President April X, 2021

I.   Purpose

The administrative performance of Directors of academic or research-based Centers or Institutes shall be subject to recurrent, formal, and comprehensive review. The purpose of the review is to evaluate how well the Director is fulfilling their administrative responsibilities and whether they have been ensuring the long-term success of the Center or Institute. The review process seeks to provide constructive recommendations for improving the Director's performance and supporting their continued professional development.

II.   Definitions

A. "Academic Director" means the head of a School within a College, who is equivalent to a Department Chair.

B. "Approval Authority" means the administrator or administrators with authority and oversight of the review of academic or research-based Center or Institute Directors. Depending on the level at which the entity operates, the Approval Authority may be a Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, the Senior Vice President and Provost, or the President.

C. "Center" means an academic and/or research-based entity, which engages faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within one Unit or across multiple Units. A Center may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

D. "Department Chair" means the head of an academic department.

E. "Director" means the head of an academic and/or research-based Center or Institute.

F. "Institute" means an academic and/or research-based entity with prominence and stature that is typically intended to have a level of permanence similar to that of an academic department. Institutes engage faculty, staff, and/or students in areas of specialized focus within a College, across multiple Colleges, or University-wide. An Institute may be affiliated with an external agency and/or laboratory.

G. "Unit" means an academic and/or research-based Center, Institute, Department, College or School, or Division.

H. "Unit Head" means the administrator or administrators responsible for a Unit and the individual(s) to whom the Director reports. A Unit Head may be an Institute Director, Academic Director, Department Chair, Dean, multiple Deans, the Vice President for Research, or the Senior Vice President and Provost.

III. Policy

A. This Policy applies to the review of Directors of academic and/or research-based Centers or Institutes. The review of Department Chairs and Academic Directors is covered by the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Department Chairs and Directors of Academic Units (I-6.00[C]).

B. A Director whose appointment is expected to be considered for continuation shall undergo a periodic and comprehensive review.

C. A Director may request a review even if they are not contemplating a continuation of their appointment.

D. The review should normally occur at the beginning of the last year of the Director's current appointment, or every five (5) years in cases where the term of the appointment is indefinite.

   1. A Unit Head may initiate a review earlier, if deemed appropriate.

IV. Review Process

A. The Unit Head will establish the timeline for the review and the review process should generally be completed within six (6) months.

B. The Unit Head will appoint a representative review committee including faculty, staff, and students that reflects the diversity goals of the University. The Unit Head should consult appropriately before appointing members to the review committee.

C. The Unit Head will charge the review committee with developing evaluative criteria appropriate to the mission of the Unit, conducting the review, and submitting its findings in a written report.

D. Reviews must include an assessment of the following major components:

   1. How well the Director is fulfilling their administrative responsibilities based on those articulated at the time of appointment;

2. Consideration of the Director's role in the long-term viability of the Center or Institute;

3. How the Director's leadership has impacted the Center or Institute's progress in meeting its benchmarks and metrics for success;

4. Input from faculty, staff, and students associated with the Center or Institute;

5. Input from the Director being reviewed;

6. Input from external stakeholders, as appropriate; and

7. Constructive recommendations for continued success.

E. The Unit Head may specify additional components and/or additional steps in the review process, as appropriate to the size and structure of the entity that the Director leads.

F. Components of external funding agency reviews of Directors may be used to fulfill elements of the University review process, when authorized by the Unit Head.

V. Assessment Following the Review Process

A. A decision about whether the appointment will be continued will be formally considered upon the completion of the review process.

B. The Unit Head will begin by considering the review committee's report and providing a copy of the report to the Director under review.

C. The Unit Head will give the Director an opportunity to respond to the report in writing. If the Director chooses to respond, that response will be attached to the review committee's report as a permanent appendix.

D. The Unit Head will develop an evaluative report, giving consideration to the review committee's report and the Director's response.

1. The evaluative report should indicate the Director's present strengths and weaknesses and shall endorse specific recommendations regarding professional development, continuation of the appointment, or other relevant matters pertaining to the Director for the Approval Authority's consideration.

2. Financial implications and an agenda for implementation may also be a part of the recommendations in the evaluative report.

E. The Unit Head shall then convene a meeting with the Director under review to discuss the evaluative report and the appropriateness of continuing the Director's appointment for another term.

VI. Final Outcome

A. The Unit Head will assess whether the Director should be reappointed and will make a request for reappointment to the Approval Authority, if appropriate.

  1. If reappointment is recommended, the Unit Head shall submit a copy of the review committee's report and the evaluative report to the Approval Authority.

  2. If reappointment is not recommended by the Unit Head, the Director should be informed of the Unit Head's decision and the review committee's report should be forwarded to the Approval Authority and the Office of Faculty Affairs, where it will be kept on file.

  3. The external funding agency or affiliated laboratory associated with the entity should be notified of the Unit Head's decision regarding the Director's appointment.

B. The Approval Authority will make a final determination regarding actions following the review process.

C. The Approval Authority will consider the Unit Head's evaluative report and the review committee's report when making a final determination on the request for reappointment.

D. The Approval Authority's decision on the request for reappointment will be transmitted to the Unit Head.

  1. Upon notification of the Approval Authority's decision to approve the request for reappointment, the Unit Head will inform the Director of the decision and will distribute a summary of the review committee's report to the members of the Unit. A copy of the Unit Head's letter to the Approval Authority, the review committee's report, and the Approval Authority's reply will be kept on file in the Office of Faculty Affairs.

  2. If reappointment is not recommended by the Approval Authority, the Director should be informed of the decision and the review committee's report should be forwarded to the Unit Head and the Office of Faculty Affairs, where it will be kept on file.

3. The external funding agency or affiliated laboratory associated with the entity should be notified of the Approval Authority's decision regarding the Director's appointment.

E. In cases where the Director is not reappointed to their role, the Approval Authority should work with the Unit Head to:

1. Appoint an interim Director and follow any external entity guidelines to initiate a search to identify a permanent replacement to serve as Director of the entity; and

2. Guide externally-funded entities through the transition to a new Director and any potential shifts in funding or any other terms of the externally-funded entity.

Proposed Revisions to the University of Maryland Policy on the Review of Academic Units
from the Research Council
New Text in Blue/Bold (**example**), Removed Text in Red/Strikeout (~~example~~), Moved Text in
Green/Bold (**example**/~~example~~)

I-6.00(A)   UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY ON THE REVIEW OF ACADEMIC UNITS
(Approved by the President November 10, 2001; Amended xxxx)

I.   Overview of the Unit Review Process

Periodic review of an academic unit's pursuit of excellence can contribute significantly to the enhancement of the unit's progress and respond to the University's responsibility for efficient use of resources. Each academic unit on campus shall undergo a review at no more than seven-year intervals. ~~Centers contained within a unit shall be reviewed along with the unit.~~ The primary goal of this review will be to improve the unit's effectiveness and quality--by providing the unit and the administration with a clear assessment of the unit's strengths and weaknesses and by providing the unit with the opportunity for periodic self-examination. Each dean is responsible for preparing and circulating a schedule of reviews for his or her units, for initiating the reviews, and for reporting to the **Senior Vice President and** Provost on the results of the reviews.

The review process shall have several components: an internal self-study including the accumulation of relevant data, external review of the unit, and proper utilization of the results of the review. An internal **review** committee will be selected and charged with the self-study and the accumulation of data. An external **review** committee will be selected and charged with the external review. In order to ensure proper utilization of the results of the review, the internal self-study and the external review reports should be made available to the unit, the Dean, and the **Senior Vice President and** Provost in a timely manner. The entire length of time required for the review from the beginning of the self-study to the completion of the external review should be no more than one-year, and ideally no more than six months. The arrangements for the external review and the conduct of the self-study should be done concurrently, so that the external review can occur immediately after the completion of the self-study.

The campus has an unusually wide variety of units that include performing arts departments and professional schools that undergo accreditation reviews or have other external constraints. Thus, the review procedures must allow flexibility--in the time period between reviews, in the composition of the committees, and in the data gathered. For example, units requiring accreditation may wish to adjust the timing of their academic reviews to coincide with the accreditation reviews so as to maximize the value of the review process, or they may, with the approval of the **Senior Vice President and** Provost, have the accreditation review serve as all or a portion of the unit review. To the extent possible, however, all reviews should address common criteria.

II.   Selection of Review Committees

The Dean of the unit under review shall have primary responsibility for the selection of the external review committee, according to procedures outlined in the College Plan of

Organization or bylaws, and for ensuring the completion of an appropriate self-study. It is the Dean's responsibility to ensure that the composition of the committees is in concert with the goals of the review. Where the College or School is not departmentalized or where the unit reports directly to the **Senior Vice President and** Provost, the **Senior Vice President and** Provost shall have responsibility for selecting the committees. If an accreditation review is approved to serve as the external review, then the accreditation review committee serves the function of the external review committee.

The internal self-study committee shall (where appropriate) include faculty, students (undergraduate and graduate where appropriate), and staff members and shall (where appropriate) include faculty from outside the unit.

The external **review** committee will usually consist of three to five off-campus scholars or professionals of significant accomplishment who can be relied upon to provide an objective and authoritative assessment of the unit. In making these appointments, the Dean shall solicit nominees from the Chair of the unit under review. For units that undergo accreditation or other externally organized reviews, the information supplied by the accreditation or other review team should be fully utilized; this may eliminate the need for an external review committee or make it possible to use a smaller, more focused, external **review** committee. The scope of the required additional review will be at the discretion of the Dean, in consultation with the **Senior Vice President and** Provost. The external **review** committee members should be provided with a copy of the internal self-study a few weeks in advance of their visit to campus.

III. **Charge to Committees**

In addition to accumulating factual data and soliciting and reporting the views of unit members and other interested parties, the internal self-study committee should develop a coherent picture of what the unit does and how it operates. The committee should provide its assessment of how successful the unit is in fulfilling its mission, and how well it functions as an organization. The unit's success in fostering diversity and providing a supportive climate for all its members should be discussed. The committee report should include the unit's strategic vision of its future directions and a realistic assessment of the actions necessary to move it to a higher level of achievement.

A particular responsibility of the external **review** committee is to assess how the unit and its programs compare with disciplinary norms. This includes scholarly success and stature, the choice of areas of study, the structure of academic programs, and the quality of graduates and their placement. The external **review** committee should also provide its view of the appropriate future directions of the unit, and of the actions needed to move it to a higher level of achievement.

The quality of the review will depend critically on the nature of the charge given to the review committees. At a minimum, the committees will receive copies of this policy on Review of Academic Units. Detailed charges, specific and appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the unit at the time of the review, should also be given by the Dean. The

following points define the issues to be addressed, but should be construed merely as illustrative of these issues.

A. Charge Concerning Quality of Undergraduate Instruction

The self-study and external review committees should attempt to evaluate the nature of the undergraduate experience by addressing the quality of the intellectual environment, the teaching, and the curriculum. As appropriate to the discipline, this might involve issues such as the following:

1. How well does the curriculum fit the philosophy and purpose of the undergraduate program? Does it reflect both adequate generalization and specialization? Does it reflect up-to-date thinking in the field?
2. How well is information fluency assured for all undergraduate majors? How well is information technology incorporated in instruction? Are graduates of the program prepared to use information resources and technology at a level appropriate to the discipline?
3. Do the courses offer sufficient breadth and depth? Are proper sequences established among courses? Is there a well-established departmental honors program and are there opportunities for honors and independent study projects? Is there a capstone course or other senior experience designated to integrate the undergraduate work and to provide a transition to graduate school or career?
4. Are there sufficient numbers of courses and seats offered to meet the needs for majors, other programs for which the unit provides service, and general education? Are the courses offered with adequate frequency?
5. Do all programs (for majors, for general education, service courses for other programs, and electives for personal enrichment) motivate students and foster learning, follow the catalog descriptions, and use up-to-date materials that reflect current thinking in the field? Where possible, courses should be visited.
6. For laboratory courses: Is the apparatus adequately maintained? Are all lab manuals easily updateable and maintainable using modern software? Are all lab manuals accurate and up-to-date? Do students have adequate workspace, or are they overcrowded?
7. What has been the outcome of the teaching assessment process, which was described in the information package?
8. How does the unit collect information on student learning outcomes and use this assessment in curriculum revisions?
9. Is there recognition for superior academic performance?
10. What is the availability of financial assistance, honors programs, experiential learning programs, and assistance in developing potential? Is there an environment that fosters collaboration, learning, and community morale?
11. What is the availability of lectures, readings, performances, informal group meetings, off-campus experts in the field, and undergraduate organizations? What communication is there about current action and concerns, as well as research, scholarship, and creative activity in the field?
12. What is the nature of the contact with faculty, especially mentoring, other than in the

classroom and during formal office and advising hours? What kind of in-and out-of-class contact with other students is there, particularly those from diverse racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds?

13. Does the academic unit support and enforce University policy on academic integrity? Are faculty aware of undergraduate referral procedures?

B. Charge Concerning Quality of Graduate Instruction

The committees should attempt to evaluate the nature of the intellectual environment of the unit. This would involve, among other considerations, the following:

1. The quality of the graduate courses. Where possible, some courses should be visited.
2. How well is information fluency assured for all graduate students? How well is information technology incorporated in instruction? Are graduates of the program prepared to use information resources and technology at a level appropriate to the discipline?
3. The combinations of courses that define particular programs. Are they the right combinations? Are certain courses missing? Is there appropriate balance?
4. The content and substance of the different graduate programs within the unit and their relationship to what is important in the discipline.
5. The general intellectual environment of the department, independent of the formal graduate program (e.g., active speaking series, collaboration of faculty, team research, scholarship, and creative activity, people who appear to be excited by the newness of ideas in the unit, and the like).
6. The funding of graduate students as fellows and teaching and research assistants. Where assistantships are involved, what is the appropriateness of the assignments to the students' development as instructors, scholars, and/or artists?
7. Does the academic unit support and enforce University policy on academic integrity? Are faculty aware of graduate referral procedures?
8. What is the nature of the contact with faculty, especially mentoring, other than in the classroom and during formal office and advising hours? What kind of in- and out-of-class contact with other students is there, particularly those from diverse racial, economic, and cultural backgrounds?

C. Charge Concerning Advising

The committees should attempt to evaluate the quality of the advising systems for undergraduate and graduate students.

1. Is there a sufficient level of advising to support student needs and wishes appropriately? Does it encourage students to make acceptable progress toward their degrees? Does it make appropriate referrals to other services outside the unit?
2. Do students receive adequate and current information about courses and programs in the unit? To what extent do students have access to current information about requirements, deadlines, and important opportunities within the unit, such as special events, student groups, opportunities for research, scholarship, and creative activity,

and the like? Do majors receive adequate and current information about graduate programs, financial aid and scholarship opportunities, career interests, and experiential learning programs?

3. Do students receive adequate and current information about programs, courses, services and opportunities outside the unit, including adequate advising about the general education program?

4. What is the reputation of the advising staff with students, faculty, alumni, parents, and others?

D. Charge Concerning Service Activities

It is important that service contributions of the unit be evaluated carefully, particularly in those units where service can be a major component of activity, such as in education and agriculture. A survey of service clients may be essential in order to respond fully to this charge. Issues to be addressed include the following:

1. What is the nature and extent of service offered by the unit and what audiences are the recipients of this service? Is the extent of the service offered commensurate with the objectives and capacity of the unit?

2. What has been the reaction towards the service from the recipients of it? What is the reputation of the unit among the recipients of the service? Are there objective measures of the quality of the service (e.g., manuals, curricula, and the like)?

E. Charge Concerning Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

The external review committee should be asked to address the following questions in their review.

1. What is the committee's assessment of the dissertations recently produced with regard to quality, area of inquiry, importance, innovation, and the like?

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the department in research, scholarship, and creative activity?

3. What are the major foci of unit research, scholarship, and creative activity and how do these relate to the field in terms of importance and innovation? Does the unit lack foci, are its efforts in research, scholarship, and creative activity scattered?

4. Who are the leading faculty in research, scholarship, and creative activity? How might other faculty be assisted in improving their productivity?

5. Are the resources that are presently available being used in the best possible ways? What might be some alternative uses of the same resources that might be more productive?

6. How can a minimal amount of resources, such as one line or a small amount of money be effectively used to increase the capacity of the unit for research, scholarship, and creative activity?

F. Charge Concerning Recommendations

Many recommendations that would improve a given unit might not be feasible because of

the expense involved and the requirements of other units within the University. Therefore, the committees are encouraged to focus their recommendations upon what can and should be done within existing resources, unless the Dean expressly indicates otherwise. Where a committee feels that additional resources must be added in order for the unit to be able to   function (e.g., facility improvements because of unsafe laboratory conditions), the committee should recommend the minimum addition that will satisfy the unit's requirements. Since there will always be competition for scarce resources that involves units not being reviewed by these committees, recommendations that many positions or large amounts of funds be added to the unit are not likely to be useful and turn attention away from what realistically can be done.

IV. Unit Reports

1. The internal self-study and external **review** committee reports should be factual and explicit.
2. The Chair of the unit under review will distribute the self-study report to the faculty and will deliver a copy to the Dean who will transmit it to the members of the external review committee in advance of their visit to campus. The external review committee should be asked to submit their final report within thirty days of their campus visit, and upon receipt, the Dean shall transmit a copy of the report to the Chair of the unit under review. The Chair of the unit under review shall distribute the external review **committee** report to the faculty immediately upon receipt and, with the advice of the faculty, may respond to the report within thirty calendar days of the Chair's receipt of that report. Should the Chair of the unit under review respond to the report, the response shall be attached to that report as a permanent appendix.
3. The Dean shall prepare an evaluative report of the unit under review, giving due consideration to (a) internal self-study and (b) the report of the external review **committee** and any response by the Chair, and after consultation with the Chair shall transmit it promptly to the **Senior Vice President and** Provost along with copies of the internal self-study and the external review.
4. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost shall promptly convene a meeting with the Dean and the Chair of the unit under review to discuss the documents received.
5. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost shall prepare a summary report on the unit review, giving due consideration to (a) the internal self-study, (b) the report of the external review committee and any response by the Chair, and (c) the Dean's evaluative report. The summary report shall endorse various recommendations and, as appropriate, discuss their financial implications and agenda for implementation. The **Senior Vice President and** Provost's summary report shall be transmitted to the Dean, the Chair, and the faculty of the unit within thirty calendar days of the meeting with the Dean and Chair. It will also serve as the required Institutional report to the Board of Regents.

Appendix A: Information to be Provided to the Committee

The internal self-study shall include and be informed by information regularly collected and published by the Office of Institutional Research, ~~and~~ Planning, **and Assessment (IRPA),** additional information provided by the Dean's office, an assessment of information resources provided by the University ~~l~~Libraries, and information derived from unit files including information generated from internal and external accreditation reviews. The resulting information package should be appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the unit. For academic departments and Colleges or Schools that are not departmentalized, the items in the package should include the following (depending on the specific degrees offered):

1. Five-year numbers of undergraduate and graduate students (full-time and part-time), degrees awarded, mean length of time to complete bachelors degree(s), numbers of faculty and staff (full-time, part-time, and budgeted FTE), graduate assistants, credit hours taught to majors and non-majors, SAT/ACT scores of majors, GRE scores and undergraduate GPA of graduate students, contracts and grants received, faculty salary comparisons, and expenditures of non-restricted funds.
2. Information on the number of applications for admission to the graduate program, the quality of schools that are represented, the number of acceptances, identification of specializations and number of students in each, and other similar material concerning the appeal of the program to prospective graduate students.
3. Positions accepted by recent professional Master's and Ph.D. graduates, awards and honors received by recent graduates, entry level salary of graduates, and frequency distribution of years required to complete professional masters and doctoral programs.
4. The abstract pages from all Ph.D. dissertations since the last review.
5. Summaries of recent achievements in research, scholarship, and creative activity of the faculty and of recent graduate students. These should include an indication of the quality of the journals and presses involved, and citation counts of publications, or other evidence of the importance of the faculty's achievements; the curriculum vitae of each faculty should also be made available.
6. Courses offered, categorized by audience (graduate students, undergraduate majors, general education, service to other units, electives).
7. Undergraduate curriculum and any requirements for admission to major.
8. Advisors, number and FTE (separately for faculty and staff), for undergraduates and graduates, and for theses and dissertations.
9. Description of the advising system for undergraduates and graduates, including the procedures for selection, training, coordination, and monitoring of the advising staff.
10. Description of the process used to assess teaching, and of the procedures used for the selection, training, coordination, and monitoring of the teaching staff, including teaching assistants.
11. Results of student questionnaires on advising and teaching.
12. Plan of Organization of the unit, including committees and memberships.
13. Appropriate statistics computed from the above data.
14. Information on departmental resources both physical and financial

UNIVERSITY SENATE	CHARGE

Charged: June 3, 2019 | Deadline: March 30, 2020

Review of the University of Maryland Policy and Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes
(Senate Document #17-18-12)
Research Council | Chair: George Hurtt

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Lanford request that the Research Council review the University of Maryland Policy & Procedures for the Establishment and Review of Centers & Institutes (IV-1.00[A]).

Specifically, it asks that you:

1. Review the report and recommendations provided by the Research Institute Advisory Committee.

2. Review similar policies on the establishment and review of centers & institutes at Big 10 and other peer institutions by reviewing existing information and doing additional research, as needed.

3. Review data on the number, size, structure, and administration of existing centers & institutes at the University, including those established for retention purposes, and consider their variations and missions.

4. Review best practice models in those colleges that have developed new guidelines for their institutes.

5. Review the definitions of the types of centers & institutes in the current policy and suggest whether they should be revised.

6. Consult with a representative of the Office of the Provost.

7. Consult with faculty and graduate students actively engaged in interdisciplinary research within centers and institutes.

8. Consult with the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee.

9. Consider whether the current policy is aligned with our educational and research missions.

10. Consider the role of graduate students in centers and institutes and the impact of potential organizational changes on their research, especially for those in interdisciplinary programs, dual doctorates, or masters/PhD programs.

11. Consider whether the establishment of centers and institutes should include sunset provisions.

12. Review the current and proposed procedures for the periodic review of centers & institutes and consider whether the policy should be revised.

13. Consider the proposal to initiate new centers and institutes with a probationary status before attaining permanent status and recommend whether it is appropriate for the University.

14. Provide a preliminary update on findings to the University Senate.

15. Consult with a representative of the Office of General Counsel on any proposed changes to the University's policy.

16. If appropriate, recommend whether University policy should be revised and submit recommendations for Senate consideration.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 30, 2020**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office, extension 5-5804.

IV-1.00(A) **UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT AND REVIEW OF CENTERS AND INSTITUTES**
(Approved by the President August 1, 1991)

A. Policy

Although faculty may from time to time establish informal relationships for the purposes of conducting research, or of fostering improvement of teaching or curricula, or of enhancing service to the State in a particular area, they must follow certain procedures, as described below, for inclusion in official administrative lists and for periodic review.

Institutes, Bureaus, Centers, Laboratories, Research Teams, and other similar groups and organizations form useful devices for organizing groups of faculty and staff from different disciplines to focus teaching, research and/or service in an area of common interest and concern. Centers, Bureaus, and Institutes should be justified on the basis of their contributions and relationships to academic programs, but with a very few exceptions, these entities shall not offer courses or oversee degree programs. To provide an orderly method for the establishment of Centers, Institutes, and interdisciplinary units known by other names, it is appropriate to devise guidelines or procedures that provide for appropriate faculty and administrative review. These units are expected to be supported largely by external funding and not exert significant claims on State or university resources. Yet the legitimate interests of faculty proponents and of administrators in whose jurisdictions the units may be located must be protected. These procedures are intended to protect those interests but are not so complex as to render the establishment of the units such a lengthy and time-consuming task that few will venture to propose them; they comply with the University System Policy for the Establishment and Review of Centers and Institutes in the University of Maryland System, approved by the Board of Regents on January 11, 1990. (IV-1.00)

B. Group

The first, and simplest type of unit compares to an established specialization area within a department, such as organic chemistry, counseling psychology, or nuclear physics. Characteristically, it is an ad hoc collection of faculty members gathered together as a "Group" to promote an area of common interest. "Groups" and projects in this category might be shortlived. Such a group shall be titled "Research Group for _____" or "Laboratory for _____" etc. No formal procedure for its establishment is involved other than written approval of the Dean for the unit in which the faculty are housed.

C. Center

The second level of organization compares to an academic program without departmental status. Typical of this type of organization is a "Center." It has more permanency than the "group" referred to above. It may involve external and/or State funding and may appear as an organized unit in the working budget. Usually, it will have a formal administrative structure, headed by a Director. The Director and a secretary may be, at least partially, supported by general funds. Procedures for establishment of a "Center for ___" are as follows:

1. A formal proposal for the establishment of a new Center shall be prepared by its proponents, who may be informal groups of interested faculty and administrators, a committee appointed for the purpose of determining the need, desirability and feasibility of a Center, or any similar formal or informal group.

2. The proposal shall include a statement of the purpose of the Center; the rationale for its establishment; details of its membership, governance, and administration; initial and prospective funding; space needs, and other requirements.

3. The proposal shall be submitted by the organizing proponents to the Dean(s) of the College(s) to whom the Center Director will report. In those circumstances in which a Center will reside within a Department, the proposal will first be submitted to the Department Chair. The Dean(s) will submit the proposal to the Programs, Courses, and Curriculum Committee(s) of the College(s) in which the Center is to reside, for advice and recommendation.

4. After review by the College(s)

   a. The Dean(s) of the College(s) in which the Center will reside will be responsible for identifying the source of resources (if any) necessary to create and maintain the Center. These may be extramural funds, department funds, College funds, and/or small, short-term commitments from Graduate School DRIF monies. A proposal requiring, in the view of the Graduate Dean, large or long-term commitments from Graduate School DRIF will fall under provisions 4.b. below. If the proposed center requires space, the Dean(s) will be responsible for identifying the source of additional space as well. The proposal, including commitment of funds, space, etc. will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval. The Vice President has the option of consulting The Academic Planning Advisory Committee, but is likely to do so only if a major redirection of resources appears to be involved.

   b. In unusual circumstances, a special funding opportunity may require a commitment of more resources than the College(s) involved can afford. (e.g., NSF Science and Technology Centers). In these cases, the Dean(s) of the College(s) involved shall be responsible for identifying the resources the College(s) can commit and enumerating those which would need to be met by the campus. At the campus level, the full review process would be required in these cases, including review by APAC and final approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. APAC shall develop guidelines for its review.

5. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.

D. Institute or Bureau

The third level of organization compares with an academic department. Typical of this type of organization is an "Institute" or "Bureau." It is expected to continue indefinitely and, thus, have greater permanency than a Center.

It may have both external and general funding, but it should be included in the working budget and have a formal administrative and governance structure. Just as a Program may propose conversion to an Institute. Procedures for establishment of an Institute are similar to those used for the establishment of new academic departments, and are as follows:

1. Same as 1) above

2. Same as 2) above

3. Same as 3) above

4. Same as 4) above, except that the Vice President recommends approval to the President.

5. Upon approval by the Vice President, the proposal is forwarded to the President. After review and approval by the President, the proposal is forwarded to the Chancellor for information. It is understood that in the review process, alterations may be recommended and made in the proposal by any of the reviewing administrators.

E. The Periodic Review of Centers, Institutes, Etc.

1. Institutes and Bureaus

   Institutes and Bureaus shall be subject to the same review procedures as academic departments.

2. Centers

   It is expected that Centers will be established with the provision that their functions, productivity, fiscal condition, and continuance will be periodically reviewed. The procedure for review is as follows:

   a. Every five years, each Center shall submit a review of its activities to the Dean(s) to which it reports. This review shall include the following types of information: date Center established, purpose, major activities over previous five years, funding and major categories of expenses, number of personnel associated with the Center and source of support for each, relationship to institution, benefits to institution.

Upon receiving the review, the Dean(s) shall choose one of the following administrative actions: maintain the Center in its current state; institute a broader scale review; change the definition, operators and/or director of the Center; terminate the Center.

Each Dean shall submit to the Vice President for Academic Affairs a report of these reviews and the administrative actions.

b. A Center which is established with (other than one-time) funding from outside its College(s), i.e., one established according to 4.b. above, will follow the same procedure with one additional step. The review will be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs who, in consultation with APAC, shall choose whether to continue to terminate the campus' portion of the Center's funding.

c. Those Centers which reside entirely within one Department and report to the Department Chair shall be reviewed as part of the Department review.

3. For those Centers existing as of July, 1988, Deans shall establish a staggered schedule of reviews beginning in five years.

Report of the Research Institute Advisory Committee

June 4, 2018

The Senior Vice President and Provost and the Vice President for Research asked us to review policies, procedures, and practices for the establishment, operation, and review of research institutes at the University of Maryland; to compare our policies, procedures, and practices to those of peer institutions; and to provide recommendations on best practices for how existing and new institutes can operate more efficiently and effectively at executing their mission on behalf of the University. The charge to the committee is at Appendix A; the committee membership is at Appendix B. The committee met five times during the spring semester.

Recognizing that the largest research centers are larger than many institutes, the Provost and the Committee agreed to expand the scope to include major research centers. For the purposes of this review, the Committee considered research centers with annual expenditures of more than $2 million per year. To investigate a range of practices of current institutes and major centers at the University of Maryland, we examined the following units: UMIACS, START, ESSIC, IREAP, NFLC, CRESST, CASL, MPRC, CEST, SYSYNC, IPST, IBBR, CAPER, ISR, LSC, IGSR, NCSGRE, MIAEH,[1] and MC2; a summary is given in Appendix C. We also investigated policies and practices at peer institutions, including Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio State, Illinois, Northwestern, and the University of California San Diego; a summary is given in Appendix D.

It was apparent from this review that no single set of policies and procedures for the establishment, operation, and review of institutes and centers will be sufficient. Indeed, our investigations revealed that peer institutions often do not adhere to what appear to be their own detailed and well-defined policies and procedures for research centers. We recognize that there will arise special and unanticipated circumstances that will require flexibility and exceptions. We offer the following recommendations as a starting point for any new institute or major research center.

- **Creation of new institutes and centers**. The creation of new institutes and centers should be considered when needed to pursue interdisciplinary research involving faculty from more than one department, school, or college; or when the creation of an institute or center is required to compete for a major funding opportunity. The creation of institutes and centers within a single department should be discouraged unless there is a compelling rationale.

  In addition, creation of a center with significant subject-matter overlap with an existing center should be strongly discouraged. Overlap creates internal competition and seeds confusion to government and private sponsors about which entity does what. The creation

---

[1]The Maryland Institute for Applied Environmental Health (MIAEH) is not a research institute; It is an academic unit similar to a department. Policies for research institutes are not appropriate for an academic unit such as MIAEH, and so we have omitted MIAEH from the list of institutes in appendix C. Consideration should be given to rationalizing the University's use of the term "institute" by converting MIAEH into a department.

of an overlapping center with a new director and administrative support also creates inefficiency. There will be exceptions, of course, but efforts should be made to unify research efforts in a particular domain. Advocates for the new center should explore how the mission or capacity of the existing center could be expanded to satisfy their needs and aspirations. At this time, there is overlap in a number of centers or initiatives, to include cybersecurity; brain and performance; environment and sustainability; and language science.

Although research institutes and centers are created primarily to pursue research with the potential for substantial external funding, in rare cases it may be desirable to do so for the purpose of education, training, or service, or to develop and enhance capability in an area for which there is no immediate prospect of significant external funding.

- **Probationary Status**. Most new institutes and centers should be established on a temporary basis. After a probationary period of three to five years, a decision should be made on whether the institute or center has met its initial goals and should be given permanent status. A key component of evaluating permanent status is securing a significant external contract or grant and the likelihood that future funding will continue. In the case of an institute, soft money might be provided for the probationary period, which will be converted to base budget when the institute is made permanent. (This would not apply to institutes or centers that are established by legislation or provided core State or Federal funding.)

- **Approvals**. Proponents of a new institute or center should prepare a detailed proposal containing a mission statement, a governance plan, and a business/operating plan with staffing, proposed expenditures and sources of revenue to cover those expenditures, space needs, and other requirements. The proposal must contain goals to be met within the probationary period, to inform a decision on whether to grant permanent status. The proposal should be first submitted to the relevant unit heads for their advice and recommendation; then to the relevant dean(s) for their advice and recommendation; and then to the Provost and Vice President for Research for approval.

- **Governance**. Institutes and centers should have a director that is responsible for all aspects of their operation. For institutes and centers that reside primarily within a single college and draw faculty from multiple departments, the director should report to the dean. For institutes and centers with activities within multiple colleges, a lead college and dean with primary administrative responsibility should be designated. The director should report to the lead dean, who should consult with the other deans on a regular basis. For institutes and centers with substantial activities in three or more colleges, consideration should be given to having the director report to an executive committee comprised of the relevant deans and chaired by the Vice President for Research.

- **Tenured/tenure-track faculty appointments**. In our review of UMD institutes and centers we discovered several different models for appointments of tenured/tenure-track faculty in

institutes and centers. In some cases, the appointment and salary were split on a permanent or indefinite basis with a tenure-home department, with the institute or center paying its share of the salary (typically half) from hard or soft funds. This makes it difficult for the center to respond to changes in funding patterns by changing faculty membership, and also makes it difficult for the department to absorb the full salary if the faculty member leaves the center, loses funding, or if the center ceases to exist. In one case (ISR), base funds are transferred from the department to the institute to support the institute's share of the faculty member's time. This drains the department of faculty capacity without providing compensation for the lost teaching and service time. We recommend that these types of appointments be phased out as faculty retire, and that no new faculty appointments of these types be made.

We recommend that all tenured/tenure-track appointments permanently reside entirely within academic departments. In other words, departments should ultimately be responsible for 100% of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member's salary. For a specified and limited period of time, some portion of the faculty member's FTE and salary may reside in an institute or center, by mutual agreement of the department chair and the institute or center director. The fraction of the salary need not match the FTE. Alternatively, an institute or center can buy out a portion of a faculty member's time, in the same way and at the same rate as the faculty member could use a grant or contract to buy out time in the absence of the institute or center. In both cases, the institute or center (or the faculty PI) would compensate the department for the reduction in teaching and service commitment to the department. Such agreements may have a term of one to three years but should not be indefinite or permanent.

Special arrangements may be needed in some cases. For example, a tenured faculty member might be recruited to direct an institute on a full-time basis, with the salary paid entirely by the institute. Although a department might be willing to grant tenure to facilitate such an appointment, the department may be reluctant or unable to absorb the full salary when the faculty member steps down as institute director. In such cases, special arrangements may be necessary to provide the department with additional base budget for the appointment.

- **Start-up funding**. In some cases, institutes and centers are founded with an external grant or contract that provides core administrative funding, or base budget is provided by the legislature or the University. In other cases, internal start-up funding is needed to provide for the first several years of operation, before grants, contracts, and DRIF return can provide full funding.

  We recommend that a special fund be created to provide start-up funding and/or shared services for new institutes and centers, to supplement funding from colleges, the Provost, and VPR. Because the primary purpose of new institutes and centers is to secure significant additional external funding, which would generate additional F&A, we believe it is appropriate to create and sustain this fund with a small percentage of the F&A that is

collected on all grants and contracts. This would represent an investment by the entire University to grow the research enterprise and, with it, the F&A recovery and DRIF distribution that benefit the entire campus. An allocation of 1 percent of F&A (off the top) would provide about $800,000 per year for this purpose. We recommend that the Provost and Vice President for Research jointly control the allocation of these funds. These funds may be allocated to directly support a new institute or center (e.g., to match funds provided by colleges) or to hire central staff that would support one or more nascent centers.

- **Consider revising F&A/DRIF distribution**. Currently, DRIF distribution between a department and an institute or center is determined on a case-by-case basis, depending on which unit administers the grant or contract and how faculty time is divided between the department and the institute or center. Departments often view this as a zero-sum game, because the institute or center receives DRIF only at the expense of the department. Of course, it is not a zero-sum game if faculty are able to secure more funding than would have been possible without the existence of the interdisciplinary institute or center—which, as noted above, is the primary rationale for the creation of research institutes and centers. Even so, departments often view institutes and centers as a drain on their human, financial, and space resources, not as an instrument for expanding those resources. But institutes and centers—particularly those that do not have significant State or other core funding—need DRIF return to fund overhead activities and expenses that cannot be direct-charged to grants and contracts.

One solution would be to provide the necessary DRIF return to institutes and major centers from a different or higher level—for example, off the top of the F&A that is collected. A significant portion (about half) of the F&A that is collected on an institute or center grant or contract is for administration of the grant or contract, which includes essential functions performed by institute or center personnel. Currently, a small number of institutes (e.g., ESSIC, NFLC, UMCERSI) receive a rebate of a fraction of the F&A collected on their grants and contracts to pay for institute administrative functions. This has been done on an ad-hoc, case-by-case basis, to conform to the particular financial situations of these centers. It would be preferable if a standard and transparent process were adopted to decide when an F&A rebate was appropriate for an institute or center, and what amount or percentage should be rebated.

It is beyond the charge to this committee to recommend a revision of F&A or DRIF distribution. Any revision would have far-reaching impacts and would require careful analysis. We simply note that DRIF is vital to the operation of institutes and centers, but distributing DRIF to institutes and centers at the expense of departments is a significant disincentive to the growth of research institutes and centers. In addition, the two-year delay between F&A collection and DRIF distribution presents a significant challenge for institutes and centers that are starting up, growing rapidly, or have large fluctuations in expenditures.

One idea that has been proposed previously is to rebate to institutes and centers one-quarter of the F&A that is collected on institute/center grants and contracts. Institutes or centers with University or other core funding could have this funding subtracted from the rebate. Consider, for example, an institute with $15.45 million in grants and contracts (of which $10 million is direct cost and $5.45 million is indirect) and $1 million in University funding. In this proposal, the F&A rebate would be one quarter of the F&A ($5.45/4 = $1.362 million) minus the University funding ($1 million), or $362,000. In this case, University funding (including the rebate) would be about 12% of the institute budget. If the maximum rebate was 20% of the F&A collected, University funding would be 10% of the institute budget.

We recommend that a group be convened to consider the financial impacts of an F&A rebate along these lines.

- **Flexibility in HR policies**. Many State and University human resources policies are based on the assumption that employees are State-funded. Serious problems are created when these policies are applied to institute and center employees that are funded entirely by grants and contracts. For example, a center employee who accumulates unused annual leave while working on a contact generates an unfunded liability when he or she takes the leave after the end of the contract period or leaves the center. This could be mitigated by limiting the accumulation or pay-out of annual leave, or by creating a fringe benefit pool to pay these expenses. As another example, soft-funded researchers are subject to the same limits on merit salary increases as State-funded faculty, even though they may be responsible for raising their own funding. Similarly, soft-funded researchers are required to take furloughs in the interest of fairness, even though this can result in an underspend and the return of funds to the sponsor. Neither of the last two financially benefits the university (and actually decreases indirect cost recovery), and both can lead to the departure of center staff.   Efforts to provide flexibility in applying these policies to such positions would improve the operation of centers.

- **Review**. Currently, some colleges periodically (about once every five years) review centers; for centers or institutes secured by an external award, the sponsor reviews on a regular basis (as often as every three years); internally funded efforts, particularly those supported by the Tier 3 mechanism, are regularly evaluated by the VPR's office. The committee recommends a more structured and formal review process be developed– particularly when there are multiple, internal funding sources that are supporting the start of a new research center. The reviews should examine in some detail the amount of external funding pursued and secured, programs developed and related efforts. When funding from the Provost and VPR is provided to such efforts, both offices should designate a representative to take part in the review (as well as a faculty member external to the center under review). The review should be a significant factor in helping to determine if a center continues to receive internal funding, and for what duration.

Other institutions, such as UC San Diego, have a robust review process, where major research centers are reviewed on a recurring five-year cycle. There are a number of criteria by which the centers are reviewed, and a report is submitted to the Vice Chancellor for Research, Provost, and Deans of colleges involved in the center.

- **Sunsetting**. Sunsetting a center or institute can be required due to any number of factors. For example, the center director may retire or move to a different university and no other faculty member wishes to lead the effort; it becomes difficult to secure external funding; or internal university funding is redirected. The formal review process highlighted above should provide a recommendation to the Provost, VPR, and the deans most closely associated with the research center about whether it should continue in its current capacity, return to a probationary status, or be sunsetted. If there is a recommendation to sunset, the recommendation should be endorsed by the Provost and VPR and the deans responsible for the center.

- **Reform of existing institutes and centers.** The above recommendations apply to new institutes and centers. If these recommendations are adopted, it would be beneficial to gradually reform existing institutes and centers, as appropriate. As noted above, permanent or indefinite faculty appointments in existing institutes and centers could be phased out as the faculty in these appointments retire, and all new appointments be made in the manner we recommend. One might also consider moving existing institutes and centers to the governance model recommended above. For example, IBBR could report to one or more deans instead of the Provost; and the Center for Smart Growth, the Language Science Center, and the Brain and Behavior Institute might report to a committee of deans chaired by the VPR.

  Finally, we note the existence of duplication and overlap in the mission of existing institutes and centers. For example, there are three efforts focused on language (CASL, LSC, and NFLC), two in cybersecurity (MC2 and MaGIC); two in brain and behavior (BBI and CSMHHP); and multiple efforts in environmental and sustainability research. In such cases, the Provost and VPR could appoint a small task force to investigate the benefits and impacts of a more unified approach.

Appendix A: Charge to Research Institute Advisory Committee

1. Assess the current situation with respect to operating procedures and use of funds in our existing research institutes. This includes but is not limited to models associated with (a) joint appointments; (b) course relief; (c) use of shared laboratory and equipment. Determine how research institutes and centers are established and managed at our peer institutions—i.e., identify best practices if possible.

2. Develop a set of operating principles and procedures that reflect best practice and that best support the mission/purpose of research institutes that we should adopt for any new institutes formed in the future.

3. Outline the criteria and approvals that should determine whether or not a new institute is formed.

4. In order to do 2 & 3 it is probably also necessary to:

    a. Define the general mission of research institutes

    b. Outline how funding for an institute should be provided and criteria that should determine funding levels and distribution

    c. Outline how funding should be used to support the research mission

    d. Suggest how indirect cost return from institute activities should be distributed and used

5. Outline best practices for review of research centers and institutes.

6. Identify existing problems, anomalies, etc that need to be addressed and suggest remedies if possible, noting any obvious practices to avoid going forward.

7. Resolution of reporting and space issues, how to deal with closing or bridging funding when grant support is lost.

Appendix B: Committee Membership

Steve Fetter, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs (co-chair)
Eric Chapman, Assistant Vice President for Research Development (co-chair)
Linda Aldoory, Professor, Communication; Associate Dean for Research and Programming, College of Arts and Humanities
Michael Ball, Professor and Senior Associate Dean for Faculty, School of Business; Institute for Systems Research
William Bentley, Professor, Bioengineering; Director, Institute for Biomedical Devices
Ann Holmes, Assistant Dean for Finance and Administration, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Gary LaFree, Professor, Criminology; Director, National Center for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism (START)
Donald Milton, Professor, Public Health; Director, Maryland Institute of Applied Environmental Health
Maureen Meyer, Assistant Dean for Finance, School of Engineering
Fernando Miralles-Wilhelm, Professor and Interim Director, Earth System Sciences Interdisciplinary Center
Mihai Pop, Professor, Computer Science; Director, Institute for Advanced Computer Studies (UMIACS)

Staff
Hana Kabashi, Project Manager, Division of Research

Appendix C: Selected Research Institutes and Centers at UMD

Institutes

Institute for Bioscience and Biotechnology Research
- IBBR was created out of two previous Centers: Center for Biosystems Research (CBR) and Center for Advanced Research in Biotechnology (CARB). IBBR was created by adding the Center for Biomolecular Therapeutics from UMB. The IBBR headquarters is at Shady Grove.
- Approval Process – IBBR was created by the Chancellor, the Regents, and University Presidents owing to the need for distribution of UMBI assets. It is an Institute joint between UMB, UMCP, and NIST.
- IBBR's Director reports to the Provost of UMD.   The IBBR Director has an advisory executive committee.
- IBBR has over 120 researcher appointments from three different institutions: NIST, UMB, and UMD. Owing to the lack of uniformity for appointments, IBBR created "IBBR Fellows," consisting of Federal employees from NIST and tenured/tenure-track faculty and non-tenure-track faculty from UMCP and UMB.
- For non-tenure track faculty, 3-year contract renewable, then 5-year contract once tenured, renewable (following campus policy).
- IBBR funds 100% for the line (to-date) and transitioning to 50:50 split. Note that UMBI paid the entire salary for its faculty (with the exception of 2 joint appointees). The tenured or tenure-track positions were in UMBI. Thus, when UMBI was ended, all tenured UMBI faculty were transitioned to departments within USM campuses. IBBR faculty were transitioned to positions within UMB and UMCP. Their salaries remain with IBBR.
- Faculty receive a reduction in course load.
- Budget is a mix of hard, soft, and F&A return (from the Provost Office).
- Annual reporting.

Institute for Governmental Service and Research
- Established in 1948, IGSR is the second oldest public service unit on campus after Maryland Cooperative Extension. In 1958, the UM Board of Regents voted to include the Institute in UMD's budget.
- The director of the Institute reports to the Vice President of Research through the Associate Vice President and Chief of Staff.
- There are 8 PTK faculty and 6 hourly faculty appointees. There are no tenured/tenure-track faculty, nor any joint appointments.
- There is one full-time, non-exempt administrative assistant, two part-time, contingent I exempt staff working on projects, one full-time exempt IT staff, and three full-time, exempt staff performing various administrative functions, including HR, budget/finance, communication, research development and administration.
- FY17 Expenses: $1.3 million; FY17 State Budget: $478,233; FY17 DRIF: $35,311
- Periodic project/program reviews (2-3x/year) and annual performance reviews.

Institute for Physical Science and Technology

- IPST was established in 1976 as a merger of the Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics (IFDAM) and the Institute for Molecular Physics (IMP). Both Institutes were established shortly after World War II in response to interest by the US Navy in supporting research in fluid dynamics and applied mathematics (IFDAM) and high-pressure physics and engineering (IMP). The Institute addresses this mission by supporting research in areas at the intersection of traditional disciplines; initiating and promoting recruitment of faculty with joint IPST-departmental appointments; and sponsoring interdisciplinary PhD programs. The Institute oversees the Chemical Physics (CHPH) and Biophysics (BIPH) programs, and supports (together with MATH and CSCAMM) the Applied Mathematics and Statistics and Scientific Computation (AMSC) program.
- The Director is the chief administrative officer and has those responsibilities and powers assigned by the College (CMNS) and the University and is appointed by the University.
- The Assembly is the deliberative body of the Institute. It may consider any matter affecting the Institute or its members. It is responsible for its own organization, meetings, and elections.
- Faculty hold joint appointments with departments, e.g. IPST/Physics, with tenure in the department (with one exception).
  - 36 permanent members, 9 research appointments
  - IPST faculty appointments are permanent, and IPST provides a portion of the faculty member's salary, typically reflecting the fractional appointment in IPST.
  - Course relief is handled differently with various departments.
- An internal administrative staff comprised of: Director of Administrative Services; Assistant Director, Program specialists, Coordinators, Assistants, and Engineering technicians
- FY17 Numbers
  - Total State Budget: ~\$3M; State Budget Expended: <\$2.5M; Annual Sponsored Research Awards: ~\$3M; DRIF funds received: \$180-200K
- The Institute is undergoing an External Review during the current (Spring 2018) semester, with the visit of the review committee scheduled for April 23-24. A Self-Study has been prepared and made available to the committee. The previous external review occurred during the 2009-10 academic year.
- The lack of a uniform CMNS-wide policy on DRIF splits for faculty with joint appointments means that these splits are often negotiated and re-negotiated case by case. This is time-consuming and occasionally leads to tension between units.
- The IPST model of permanent rather than renewable appointments is somewhat unusual, but has resulted in a core of faculty with a long-term commitment to the well-being of the Institute.

Institute for Research in Electronics & Applied Physics

- Established in 1978 as the Laboratory for Plasma and Fusion Energy Studies, the name changed in 1988 to the Laboratory for Plasma Research, and then in 2001 to IREAP.
- Director reports to two Deans (CMNS and Engineering), but is administered in CMNS

- IREAP has an Executive Committee that includes membership from tenured/tenure track faculty, professional track faculty, and staff on rotating basis. Terms are usually 1 or 2 years. Ex officio members include directors of administrative services and technical operations. IREAP holds 2-4 Executive Committee meetings a year to review cost share and commitment proposals, DRIF distributions and other IREAP business. Each February/March there is a State of the Institute Assembly where the director presents the previous year's data.
- Faculty is a mix of various types of appointments:
  - 20 Tenure/Tenure track; 10 Professional Track
  - 11 joint appointments; 9 affiliate appointments
  - Joint appointments receive a portion of their salary from IREAP's State faculty lines.
  - Teaching expectations for faculty with joint appointments are handled by the academic departments, and vary by department.
  - IREAP makes no distinction between joint and affiliate appointments; all have voting privileges and are represented on IREAP committees.
- FY17 Expenditures: $19,267,276; FY17 State Budget: $995,216 (increased to $1,209,466 in FY 18); DRIF distributions: $405,163.
  - Given its research portfolio, IREAP has a relatively lean state budget, relying heavily on DRIF to fund not only operating expenses but a significant portion of salaries.
  - Faculty rely on DRIF primarily for expenses that cannot be charged to awards and contracts: travel unrelated to awards, computer purchases, job advertising and publicity expenses, hosting visitors, etc. The DRIF return is comparable to their peers in ECE and MSE, but higher than Physics.
- Reviewed per campus policy for Centers and Institutes. Last review was March 2017.
- IREAP has not conducted a faculty search in many years. The lack of faculty hiring authority and the unwillingness to allocate faculty lines to the Institute is a major detriment to their strategic planning.

Institute for Systems Research
- ISR was founded in 1985 as the Systems Research Center (SRC), one of the first cohorts of Engineering Research Centers funded by the National Science Foundation. Original NSF funding ~$2M per year; received permanent state funding (~$3M per year) in 1989; renamed ISR in 1992. Maintained center status and NSF funding until 1998.
- Director reports to Dean of Engineering and has status of department chair.
- Executive and administrative committees are all elected.
- Institute is comprised of joint appointments, affiliate faculty from across campus. There are a small number of permanent appointments that but be renewed every three years. ISR originally paid 50% of salary of joint appointments and teaching load was cut in half (12 to 6); today the load is reduced from 9 to 6. A new joint appoint from outside ENGR is funded using soft money at less than 50%.
- Staff units: finance, administration, external relations, public relations and information management, computing and the MSSE program.

- State Budget: 2003: ~$3.2M; 2015: ~$3.2M; in between it has fluctuated up and down. FY15 Operational Costs: ~$3.2M
- External Funding: 2010: $12.9M; 2011: $15.3M; 2012: $16.6M; 2013: $16.9M; 2014 $14.5M. Other sources of income include: soft money support (Provost, Dean, VPR, etc.); sabbaticals; foundations; budget cuts; DRIF, ENPM
- The ISR has had a number of reviews (probably not strictly periodic); In 2015, it had a very comprehensive external review. Originally, it had very frequent NSF reviews and recently had a review and celebration on the occasion of its 25th anniversary.
- Issues/Concerns:
  - Because of the way joint appointments are funded, other engineering department chairs no longer see strong advantages to ISR joint appointments.
  - Because of the lack of central/flexible funding, it can be challenging to rally ISR faculty around new research areas.
  - The MSSE program has never reached its perceived potential; one challenge is that faculty do not have teaching responsibilities as part of their joint appointments.
  - While there have been many successful industry projects and relationships, the industry partner program has had its ups and downs.

University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies
- UMIACS was created at the initiative of President Toll to advance the development of hardware architecture components, algorithms, software systems, and computational mathematics needed for advanced computer systems of the future, including supercomputers. The Institute was also expected to facilitate collaboration between the University, industry, and federal government.
- The director of the Institute reports to the CMNS Dean. An elected steering committee advises the director. Major changes in the organization of the Institute require a vote of the Assembly.
- 72 faculty and 8 research scientists, the majority working in 16 centers and labs in UMIACS. Two thirds are from computer science and electrical and computer engineering. Faculty appointments are rotating (3-year term for asst. and assoc. and 5 years for full). Six permanent faculty; no new permanent faculty will be appointed. Appointees are paid part of the salary.
- Director of Business Operations manages all the financial and human resources and a staff of four responsible for pre/post-award grant management, payroll, human resources, purchasing, etc. Director of Communications and a half-time assistant manage communications and website content. Director of IT manages a staff of 5 FTE as well as hourly student workers.
  - The IT group establishes and manages advanced computing infrastructures for sponsored projects and also provides basic IT services to all faculty, staff, and students in the Institute.
  - The Institute and each Center also have a coordinator responsible for managing events, travel reimbursements, and grants related to the Centers.

- UMIACS: $3.7M base, Center for Bioinformatics and Computational Biology: $750K base, Maryland Cybersecurity Center: $350K base. External funding: ~$20M annually.
- The Institute is reviewed every 10 years according to the founding documents. The last external review occurred in 2015. The review process also considers the Centers organized within the Institute.
- The funding model, wherein faculty receive a significant amount of salary support from the Institute, makes is difficult to evolve the composition of the Institute and adapt to the changing research landscape. Fund reversals to CMNS whenever CS faculty leave the Institute has resulted in a declining base budget, further limiting our ability to serve the broad campus community.

Centers

Center for Addictions, Personality and Emotion Research
- The Center for Addictions, Personality, and Emotion Research (CAPER) was created informally at the department level as the name for a particular faculty member's research group. It was never officially constituted as a center at the campus level, never received hard budget support from the campus, and is being phased out now that the faculty PI has moved to another university.
- CAPER started in approximately 2005. There was no formal approval process as this center was one of many laboratories or groups within the psychology department. The current chair is not sure how it came to be that it acquired the word "center;" it may have been used to create a name that was memorable. Around 2011 a subunit was created in the financial system under PSYC to allow for ease of management of CAPER-related accounts.
- No formal governance structure. The director met individually with the dean and may have attended the chairs and directors meeting.
- No formal faculty appointments. Affiliated faculty were those who conducted collaborative projects with Carl Lejuez. Currently there are 4 PTK faculty assigned administratively in the payroll system to this subunit. These faculty work on last grants associated with CAPER.
- FY17 expenditures: $565,657; no state budget in FY17. Psychology PIs receive one-third of the DRIF return received by the department from their grant. All PIs portions related to CAPER grants were returned to a general CAPER DRIF account, rather than to individual faculty. Based on data since FY14, CAPER received around 10% of the total DRIF return received by department.

Center for Advanced Study of Language
- CASL was established in 2003 as a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) sponsored by the NSA to improve the USG language capabilities.
- CASL executive director reports to the Vice President for Research. The sponsor appoints a USG official (contracting officer representative) to approve all work performed under the UARC contract.

- CASL currently has 4 admin staff for finance, contracts, and HR; 6 IT staff; and 5 security staff. The large IT and security staff are to meet the unique needs of a SCIF. There currently are 29 research staff (research scientists and faculty specialists).
- Joint TTK faculty were appointed to SLLC and HESP (and perhaps other units in the past). CASL provided partial funding with no defined work expectation or course release. An MOU required CASL had to give two years notice of intent to terminate the joint appointments (and maintain an escrow with two years of salary). All other faculty appointments were PTK; most were 100% CASL.
- FY18-19 expenditures are expected to be $7-10 million per year.
- Dedicated 130,000 SF building (RPB1), most of which is a sensitive compartmented information facility (SCIF).
- Reviewed every five years as part of the contract renewal.
- Sponsorship transferred from NSA to the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence on 1 Oct 2017; NSA funding ended 1 April 2018. No hard budget; DRIF return is unable to pay for large fixed costs associated with operating a SCIF.

Center for Research and Exploration in Space Sciences & Technology II
- CRESST II is a cooperative agreement between NASA Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) and UMD, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Catholic University, Howard University, and Southeastern Universities Research Association. CRESST II was established in April 1, 2017 with the award of the CRESST II cooperative agreement to UMD. The proposal for CRESST II was written with the knowledge of the CMNS Dean and the Vice President for Research and with their assistance in discussions with senior administrators at the partner institutions. The approval process was the support to write the proposal and the selection by the GSFC review committee and GSFC senior management.
- CRESST II is not a center or institute in the UMD structure; it is more like a grant.
- CRESST II has a board that consists of the relevant dean and the Vice President for Research at UMD and UMBC, the Vice Provost at Howard, the President of SURA, and Associate Provost for Research at Catholic. Because it is a grant, it is administrated through Office of Sponsored Research.
- The scientists in CRESST II that are assigned to UMD are given PTK faculty or faculty specialist appointments through the astronomy department. There are no joint appointments with other departments. CRESST II scientists are paid 100% from grant money.
- CRESST II has 2 UMD administrative staff (a program manager and a business manager) who are paid entirely by the cooperative agreement. One is.
- FY17 Expenditures: $16.5 million. DRIF distribution is normal, with astronomy as the only department. CRESST II gets university assistance to pay for payroll, travel, appointment, and benefits administration. These are all items that are explicitly included in the stated off-campus overhead rate and hence must be paid by the university.
- 5-year grant period with optional second 5-year renewal at the choice of GSFC.

Language Science Center
- Started in summer 2013 and involved Tier 3 DRI as well as an investment in faculty positions and space commitment from Provost. It was built on a 10-year grassroots effort, plus a 2-year process initiated by the VPR along with a cluster hire.
- On soft money: director (25%) and three assistant directors
- On hard money: associate directors (2 w/approx. 50% salary that flows via LSC)
- Management committee, executive committee and various initiatives. Most faculty have unpaid appointments.
- Oversight by Provost and VPR, with involvement of at least 5 colleges. Deans of ARHU and BSOS oversee.
- Mix of state and external funding with small amounts of DRIF. Initial Tier 3 provided $300k/yr, mostly covering soft-funded positions. Two $3M external awards (1 NSF training grant; 1 IES Goal 3 project) plus smaller external awards.
- 4500 sf dedicated space in HJ Patterson Hall; moved in 1 year ago. Research community uses labs and equipment across campus.
- No formal review yet.

Maryland Cybersecurity Center
- MC2 was created in 2010 as a result of a call for proposals from the Provost's office. MOU between CMNS and Engineering was signed in July 2011.
- The center reports to the UMIACS director, and indirectly to the deans of CMNS and Engineering.
- There was an advisory board in the past, but not currently. (The board was disbanded when MaGIC was formed.)
- All faculty in MC2 are rotating and are subject to renewal by the UMIACS APT committee.
    - Original MOU specified funding for 9 positions, 4 each in CS and ECE, and one position for the director.
    - Appointments are made by agreement by the CS and ECE chairs and UMIACS director. The director is appointed with the blessing of the Deans of CMNS and Engineering.
    - Currently 5 faculty formally supported in MC2.
    - No reduction in course load.
- FY17 Expenditures: $619,962; FY17 State Budget: $366,970; almost no DRIF.
- No reviews have taken place since its inception.

National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism
- START was established in January 2005 as a U.S. Department of Homeland Security Center of Excellence, with an initial $12 million grant.
- Awarded DHS renewal grants in 2008 and 2012.
- Has Director and Executive Director with branches for Research and Transition.
- 101 total UMD employees with a START affiliation: 52 full-time faculty, 32 hourly workers, 8 researchers with appointments in other departments paid in part through START awards, 7 exempt staff, 2 non-exempt staff. Has interns spread all throughout the center, working alongside project advisors, researchers and faculty.

- FY17 Expenditures: $12,714,406; FY17 State Funding: $213,901; FY17 External Funding: $21,666,139. START HQ submitted 61 proposals in FY17. $4.1M in revenue from education programs since 2005.
- Has experienced both on and off campus rates and spaces; new space opened April 2018.

National Foreign Language Center
- Originally established as a 501-3(c) think tank in Washington, DC, in 1986. It was affiliated with Johns Hopkins through the 1990s but joined UMD in March 2000 through an MOU with then-ARHU Dean Jim Harris and then-NFLC Director Dick Brecht (who was a UMD faculty member at the time). Its focus shifted from a foundation-supported think tank to a DOD-supported federal contractor after 9/11, when the country realized it lacked the practical foreign language skills it needed to secure the nation and remain economically competitive.
- Executive Director, Executive Committee, several subcommittees and a senior leadership committee of about 20 individuals.
- About 100 total employees; no tenured faculty and no traditional faculty assistants.
- Budget varies between $10-15M per year, with only about $190K in state funding per year.
- No space on campus or any campus facilities; space is rented off campus.
- USM-sponsored internal audit that we just completed in 2018.

Appendix D: Policies at Selected Peer Institutions

Northwestern University
- A very flexible approach with no formal policy. Administration is supportive of new centers and generally try to make things work. There is some effort to standardize practices.
- The approval/establishment process is very variable.
- In evaluating centers and deciding whether to fund a center, Northwestern is not as focused on external funding as is UMD.
- Faculty generally are not supported through institutes and centers.
- Some centers have hard budget. Hard money is provided for start-up and can be removed after a period of time.
- The colleges (Deans) and the VPR receive the bulk of F&A return; very little is returned departments, centers, or faculty, so this is less of an issue than is UMD. There is little fighting over DRIF. Departments receive significant tuition revenue from MS programs—a much larger source of funding for engineering than at UMD.
- Reviews are supposed to be every 5 years but this is not strictly enforced. The structure of reviews is not standardized.

Ohio State University
- Two levels of center: university-level (two or more colleges) and college level
- University-level centers
  - A highly structured and detailed approval process that requires completing a template and seeking approval from the Council on Academic Affairs the University Senate—a 6-month process.
  - Start-up funding is a combination of initial grants and contracts, college contributions, and central hard and soft funding
  - Progress report required after two years, full review after 4 years.
  - Of the 80 university-level centers, eight report to VPR; the remainder report to the relevant deans, with a lead dean appointed on a rotating basis.
  - A structured process for periodic reviews is being implemented. Only one university-level has been sunset, at the request of the lead dean.
  - The approval and review process run by the Provost's Office.
- College-level centers are approved by and report to the dean.
- Faculty tenure is held only by academic departments, not university- or college-level centers, but appointment may be split between a department and a center.

University of California, San Diego
- The associate vice provost for research is a former UMD faculty member.
- If a center spans more than one one school or college, the center is managed centrally by the vice chancellor for research.
- There is an established and thorough review process that happens once every five years. They have extensive material that we could draw on to structure reviews.

- A shared administrative core of five to seven people in the VPR office manage and serve the various centers that report to the VPR.
- There are no faculty appointments in centers or institutes.

University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana
- Creating centers is part of the strategic plan of the university. The number of centers created yearly is high (11 new centers this year).
- Centers are reviewed every 5 years.
- Faculty appointments are tied to departments and supported through center grants and departmental contributions.
- A number of centers receive special considerations and receive an additional percentage the of the F&A return, but the process for this is unclear.
- New centers can be given temporary or permanent status. The approval process for temporary centers is abbreviated and designed to allow the unit time to formalize the intended mission, aspects of unit organization, faculty engagement and long-term funding strategies over a 3-5 year period. Most new units pursue temporary status. If the proposed unit has secured stable long-term funding and the vision of the unit has been determined, a new unit may pursue permanent status.
- Centers v. Institutes
  - Centers are typically units of research or public service situated within a college, school or department.
  - Institutes are typically units of research or public service situated at the campus-level or span multiple colleges or schools and involve faculty and staff from a range of academic disciplines. Institutes may house smaller or temporarily approved centers.
- They provide an online template for center/institute proposals

University of Michigan
- Has a best practices documents outlining detailed processes for establishing, operating, reviewing, and sunsetting centers and institutes, but our point of contact noted that the best practices document is ignored and irrelevant.
- Similar to UMD – institutes and centers are formed using ad-hoc criteria and practices.
- Sunsetting is a serious problem. They are moving more towards a "try before you buy" approach and have approved temporary units on a trial basis.

MAIN THEMES IN FEEDBACK FROM KEY STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

The Research Council met with key stakeholder groups in Fall 2019 to better understand the scope of the problems and concerns with the existing policy and its implementation across the University. The following summarizes the main themes raised through feedback process:

- There is no central repository of information related to centers and institutes at the University.

- There are no clear, stated definitions or levels at the University of what constitutes a center versus an institute; different types of centers (departmental, collegiate, intercollegiate, university-wide, etc.); or the differences in bureaus, laboratories, research teams, and other entities.

- There should be a better understanding of how scale, size, purpose, and funding model(s) align with the different types of centers, institutes or other entities.

- There should be more clarity about what aspect of the University mission a center or institute supports. There is an articulated desire to ensure that it is made clear when the mission extends beyond research to include education and service. Graduate students, in particular, were vocal about a center or institute's role in attracting students and providing training and employment opportunities.

- There is no formal establishment or approval process for centers and institutes at the University. Other institutions detail information that is required when proposing a center or institute and a number of peers have comprehensive proposal forms.

- Inclusion of graduate students should be considered from the outset of the proposal; inclusion of graduate students should not be a requirement but would be optimal.

- There are no consistent guidelines on the administrative structure or operations of centers or institutes at the University. At other institutions, examples of these details in policies include provisions indicating that the director is named immediately; an advisory committee is established; the director may only be a tenured faculty member unless the chancellor makes an exception; or there are formal governance structures.

- There should be clarification on institutional support and DRIF return rates. There does not seem to be a lot of information publicly available about DRIF return percentages at other institutions. At our University, the dean is responsible for identifying funding sources, and long-term support and/or higher DRIF return rates are negotiated at a higher level.

- There is no standard internal and/or external review process for centers or institutes at the University. Most institutions use a five-year review cycle, though there is some

deviation. Most institutions have lists of review criteria, and most of the metrics by which an entity will be judged are created when the proposal for creating the entity is approved. There are formal processes and review committee composition requirements. Existing templates and forms could be adjusted for our University's purposes.

- There are no existing sunset provisions and no sense of what criteria should be used in determining when and how to close, revise, or repurpose a center or institute. Other institutions have criteria and a clear process by which all of these scenarios may play out.

- One key component of transitioning or sunsetting centers or institutes is ensuring that attention is paid to establishing a thoughtful plan for the orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel.

- There are no probationary periods at the University, either those created when a new center or institute is being created or those enacted after a less than wholly positive review.

- There should be procedures on how to transition existing centers and institutes to a new structure, process, or system, particularly in the area of reviews.

Centers & Institutes Peer Best Practices

I. Levels - range 3 to 6 levels

    A. 4 levels: departmental, College/School, Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Graduate Education, multi-College (Wisconsin)

    B. 3 levels: Collegiate, Intercollegiate, University-Wide (Minnesota)

    C. 3 levels: School, campus, and university-wide (Indiana)

    D. 5 levels: Departmental, Decanal, Chancellor/Exec VP (require Senate input for creation & termination), Presidential (require Senate input for creation & termination), Board of Governors; (Rutgers)

    E. 6 levels: Agency Center - affiliated with; Admin Center - admin focused; Sponsored Research Center - soft funded; faculty member center - recruitment/retention; School/College center - within a single unit; University designation - across multiple units; (Michigan)

    F. 6 levels: Organized Research Unit (ORUs)= Institute vs. Center vs. Laboratory (multi-disciplinary) vs. Museum or Field Station vs. Station vs. Multicampus research units/programs/initiatives. (UC Berkeley)

    G. 4 Levels: Research Institutes (larger scale) vs. Research Consortia (collective and extensive) vs. Research Center vs. "Industry Membership Program. (Penn St.)

    H. **3 levels: Group (Research Group or Laboratory, collection of faculty members), Center (akin to academic program), Institute or Bureau (akin to academic department). (UMD)**

II. Center Establishment

    A. Proposal

        1. a detailed description of the multi-departmental center function, justification, relevance to the University's strategic plans, participating departments and faculty, administration, funding, formal name; evidence that the multi-departmental center will more effectively achieve stated academic objectives than traditional departmental, school, or college structures. (Nebraska)

        2. Name, Director, Mission & Purpose, Opportunity/Justification, current activities, organizational structure & governance;

public/private partnerships; Financial Support; Program Description; Admin of Grants; Staffing; Membership Policies, Membership Participation; Space; Data & Equipment; Endorsements; Evaluation; Impacts; Timeframe; Life Cycle; (Rutgers)

3. Executive summary, Business plan (strategic vision, initiatives/programs, peer assessment, administration & key faculty, milestones & timeline, resources required, financial planning, metrics of sustainability & success (Michigan)

4. Name of proposed director; names of advisory committee; research plan and budget plan for 2 years of operations and projections for the three following years; names and signatures of faculty who have agreed to participate; business development plan; competitor analysis; and "a date after which central campus financial support is no longer required must be agreed to. There is an expectation that ORUs will become self-supporting within this specified time-frame." Financial and start-up agreements should be secured. (UC Berkeley)

5. Societal impact, eminence, and assessment of similar units nationally and internationally included in proposals (Northwestern)

6. No formal proposal but research centers must meet these criteria: have an identifiable focus; have on-going funding; have funding including multiple grants and contracts; not a single grant; engage multiple faculty (more than 2) and **graduate students (optimal but not a requirement)**; have some clearly identified rationale for being established; (Penn St.)

7. **A statement of the purpose of the Center; the rationale for its establishment; details of its membership, governance, and administration; initial and prospective funding; space needs, and other requirements (UMD)**

B. Administrative Structure

1. Each ORU is headed by a director and will have an advisory committee/council that assists the director in setting the unit's goals and may assist by critically evaluating its effectiveness on a continuing basis. (Texas)

2. Directors are tenured faculty unless the chancellor makes an exception. All directors report to the VC for research who is the chancellor's designee. Candidates are recommended to the VCR by a search advisory committee. Directors serve for 3-5 year appointments. Director stands up faculty advisory committee to review activities and plans, provide written advice to director, feed the unit's annual report. (UC Berkeley)

3. Centers usually have a formal administrative structure with a Director and perhaps a secretary; Institutes or Bureaus should have a formal administrative and governance structure. (UMD)

C. DRIF Return

1. 45% of indirect cost recoveries (ICR) related to facilities and administration (F&A) will be distributed to the college/department/principal investigator. The division of these funds within each college will be based on the college's policy for distribution. (Illinois)

2. **Dean responsible for identifying source of funds for Centers, including short-term DRIF commitments needed. Long-term or large DRIF contributions will require further review at the campus level (UMD).**

III. Center Review

A. Most institutions use a 5 year term

B. Has it met its mandate? Is it relevant to the mission? good financial steward of its resources? Should it stay the same or change, if so how? How is the leadership performing? (Michigan)

C. mission and purpose; center activities and trend data; evaluation of center activities in view of the mission/purpose; an evaluation of challenges and opportunities; proposed changes (Wisconsin)

D. preparation of a self-study by the director of the university-wide center, an independent review team is appointed, consisting of distinguished external scholars in the center's primary areas of expertise; internal members may be added to the team as needed. The review team's findings are forwarded to the Executive Vice President for review and action. Actions may include renewal of the center's university-wide designation,

termination, or transition to departmental, collegiate center, or intercollegiate status. (Minnesota)

E. Charts/self-review template/committee site visit template/review committee questions/final committee report template/etc. (UCLA)

F. **Institutes & Bureaus follow procedures for academic department review. Centers which reside entirely within one Department and report to the Department Chair shall be reviewed as part of the Department review. Other Centers - will submit a review that includes date Center established, purpose, major activities over previous five years, funding and major categories of expenses, number of personnel associated with the Center and source of support for each, relationship to institution, benefits to institution. (UMD)**

IV.   Center Termination - Sunset Provisions

A. Sunset provisions must be included in the original proposal; When faculty support for a center no longer exists, if there is no interest among the faculty in participating in or leading the center, or when a center is no longer financially viable, the center should be formally discontinued. Requests for discontinuation may be initiated by the center faculty and submitted to the school/college APC. If, at the time of the five-year review, the dean cannot verify that a center is viable, the dean may recommend discontinuation to the school/college APC. Approved requests will be forwarded to the provost for approval by the UAPC, typically as part of an automatic consent agenda. (Wisconsin)

B. Termination can be a result of review process (Minnesota, Rutgers)

C. Provisions for sunsetting: The center cannot sustain itself financially, either by external or internal funds; The scholarly quality of work performed by the center falls below U-M norms; The original interdisciplinary nature of the center has disappeared;The center is unable to attract new faculty, students, or dedicated leadership. suspension/dissolution of a CI requires a plan to reorganize human resources, institutional and external funding, and infrastructure issues within the organizational framework of the University. (Michigan)

D. A phase-out period lasting from a few months to up to two years may be provided to permit **orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel**, grants, financial accounts, and programs. (UC Berkeley)

E. URICs that are judged to no longer meet the URIC criteria and institutional strategic value may lose their Office for Research status including any associated financial support. At that point they may be sunset or, in agreement with a school, transition into a school-based center. (Northwestern)

F. **Sunset only discussed through provision that after a review of a Center, the Dean may choose to terminate the Center. (UMD)**

V. Probationary Status

A. Phase 1 (temporary status) - abbreviated process, granted for 3-5 years; Phase 2 (permanent) (Illinois)

B. Reviewed 2 years after initial creation and then at 4 year intervals after. Actions will be recommended to CAA after each review: continuation, conditional continuation with a follow-up in less than four years, and termination. (Ohio St.)

C. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VI. Database of Centers

A. Center directors are responsible for updating information in University's database annually (Minnesota)

B. Extensive [ORU DATABASE](#). Link to URL for each, named director, affiliated schools and departments. Searchable. Also a [MAPPING](#) page that shows how ORUs link to departments and schools. (UCLA)

C. There is an Excel sheet that contains a listing of all 250+ entities (name/type/school or college/approval date/college count/URL/etc.). (Wisconsin)

D. Listing - A current listing of Centers and Institutes shall be maintained by the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, together with a record of any such unit which has been suspended or dissolved by action consistent with this policy. (Rutgers)

E. Name, Director, Mission, URL (Northwestern)

F. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VII. Reorganization, Restructuring, and Renaming

A. Provisions for Renaming, Reorganization, and Restructuring with approval process (Rutgers, Wisconsin)

B. **Not discussed in UMD Policy**

VIII. Application of Policy to Existing Centers & institutes

A. The necessity for regular review of research centers and institutes applies to those units founded before the adoption of this policy. Such centers and institutes should work with the appropriate office (Dean, Campus research official, VPR) to develop a plan for review within one year of the date this policy is adopted, following the recommendations herein. (Indiana)

B. All existing academic centers established outside of this rule shall be reviewed under the requirements of this rule. Those not in compliance with the rule shall be allowed one additional year to make appropriate adjustments to allow for their continuation. (Ohio St.)

C. **For those Centers existing as of July, 1988, Deans shall establish a staggered schedule of reviews beginning in five years (UMD).**

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

Institution	URL	Key features
University of Michigan	http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/	"…we have identified best practices, attributes, and structures within our centers, helping them to continue to be vibrant, productive, successful, and efficient." *University of Michigan uses best practices rather than "policy" to guide the creation, review and closing of centers. It is flexible and adaptable and could serve as a solid model for UMD.* ● Best practices: http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/bpci.pdf, sections of which include: - "Suggested Process on the Formation of Centers or Institutes" with list of criteria; - "Effective Management of Unit and Annual Reports" with list of suggested criteria, documentation, and extensive list of possible metrics; - "Tracking Centers/Institutes/Initiatives" which includes different types categorized and defined (center vs. institute vs. school/college center vs. faculty member center vs. sponsored research center vs. agency center); - "Comprehensive Reviews" (a formal periodic review that generally takes place every five years) with five major objectives; - "Sunsetting, Closing, Discontinuance of a Center" which includes general standards for consideration, "manifestations" that might stem from closure, and tips for correctly transitioning. ● Templates: Business plan template and Bylaws template - *The business plan template (link on site) is incredibly comprehensive and is used to frame a center at its inception. It could be adjusted and touches on many of the points raised in the C&I discussion sessions at UMD.*

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		● List of centers: http://provost.umich.edu/programs/bpci/bpci_list.html - Organized by cross-campus entities/college and unit/etc. Links to websites provided.
University of Wisconsin	https://kb.wisc.edu/30659	Page organized in the following way: I. Introduction II. Defining Centers, Institutes and Center-like Units III. Establishing New Centers IV. Evaluating Centers V. Changes to Existing Centers Center-like units are defined. They must be officially approved at various levels (up through the BoR) in a work-flow controlled system. There is an Excel sheet that contains a listing of all 250+ entities (name/type/school or college/approval date/college count/URL/etc.). Sunset provisions must be included in the original proposal (which is not to exceed 10 pages and must address a set of points including purpose/mission/governance/funding/etc. at a minimum. Review involves a periodic report that should include, at a minimum: - mission and purpose - center activities and trend data - evaluation of center activities in view of the mission/purpose - an evaluation of challenges and opportunities - proposed changes "Every five years, the provost will initiate a request to deans for a summary report on center activity since the prior review." Provision V is unique in that it is more nuanced than just addressing sunsetting. It includes guidance on renaming centers, reorganizing or restructuring centers, and discontinuing centers. *UMD might consider*

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		looking at this portion of UW's policy, specifically, as it is more comprehensive.
University of North Carolina System	https://www.northcarolina.edu/Research-and-Discovery/Centers-and-Institutes	Organized at a system level by 400.5[R] policy: Regulations on Planning, Establishing, and Reviewing Centers and Institutes in the University of North Carolina 260+ centers. Purpose to "provide a framework upon which campuses should build detailed policies and protocols to guide the planning, establishment, management, and discontinuation of institutional centers and institutes."
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/policies/establishing-a-new-unit-of-research-or-public-service-including-centers-and-institutes/	New Centers/Institutes have 2 options: phase 1 (temporary) or phase 2 (permanent); Phase 1 is an abbreviated process but most then go to phase 2; ● Phase 1 granted for 3-5 years ● Phase 2 permanently establishes New centers need to be reviewed by the Senate Educational Policy Committee; ● Proposal Template Definitions: ● Centers - units of research or public service situated within a college, school or department ● Institutes - units of research or public service are situated at the campus-level or span across colleges or schools and involve faculty and staff from a range of academic disciplines. Institutes may house smaller or temporarily approved centers.
University of Minnesota	● Creating and Evaluating Interdisciplinary Centers ● University-wide Centers: Establishing, Operating and Evaluating	3 Types of Centers: collegiate, intercollegiate, university-wide; *Center directors are responsible for updating information in University's database annually University-Wide Center status requirements: ● A profile of the center including focus, brief history, organizational structure and governance, participants, research productivity, and evidence of excellence.

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	● [Collegiate and Intercollegiate Centers: Establishing, Operating and Evaluating](#)	● A strategic plan for the center. ● An explanation of the relationship between the center's goals and the University's strategic objectives. ● Rationale for designation as a University-wide Center. ● Budget information including a concise budget history, a current budget, and budget projections. Potential external review: ● Degree of strategic importance to the University ● Extent and complexity of the effort including number entities involved ● Need for central resources ● Prospect for leveraging central resources to secure external funding Must be approved by Provost & President Operating Guidelines: ● facilitate continuous progress toward the academic objectives cited in its authorization request ● demonstrate its ability to offer competitive or educational advantages ● document how it measurably contributes to the University's strategic goals Review Process ● preparation of a self-study by the director of the university-wide center, ● an independent review team is appointed, consisting of distinguished external scholars in the center's primary areas of expertise; ● internal members may be added to the team as needed. ● The review team's findings, are forwarded to the Executive Vice President for review and action.

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		● Actions may include renewal of the center's university-wide designation, termination, or transition to departmental, collegiate center, or intercollegiate status.
Penn State University	https://policy.psu.edu/policies/rag05	Definitions provided. All involve research entities, to which this policy speaks, specifically. Research Institutes (larger scale) vs. Research Consortia (collective and extensive) vs. Research Center vs. "Industry Membership Program." The latter involves industry-supported basic research. Unique in this specific labelling of industry supported work. There is a whole process at Penn for establishing these kinds of units. Research CENTERS should: 1. have an identifiable focus 2. have on-going funding 3. have funding including multiple grants and contracts; not a single grant 4. engage multiple faculty (more than 2) and graduate students (optimal but not a requirement) 5. have some clearly identified rationale for being established Faculty appointments, in particular, and a minimum number. "All newly formed Research Institutes, Consortia, and Centers should be established with the approval of the Senior Vice President for Research. Approvals will be forwarded from the Senior Vice President for Research to the Executive Vice President and Provost."
Michigan State University	https://research.msu.edu/institutes-centers-and-labs-by-college/	Pretty thin. There is a listing and a form for establishing a center linked to the site, but very little in the way of framework.
University of Iowa	https://www.iowaregents.edu/plans-and-policies/board-policy-manual/37-	The policy is controlled at the Board of Regents level. It was just revised. "Proposals to create new centers or institutes at the

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	approval-and-closing-of-new-centers-and-institutes	universities shall be submitted to the Board Office. Following review by the Board Office and the Council of Provosts, the Board Office shall place the request on the agenda for the next appropriate meeting of the Board of Regents' Academic Affairs Committee. The Committee shall review the proposal and recommend action by the Board of Regents or take other action as it deems appropriate." FORM to create center. Does include a table that describes funding sources for 7 years. Site to include an evaluation plan. All Iowa institutions should report up to the Board on Centers and Institutes on a SEVEN (7) year cycle. Each unit must have completed an annual review FORM. The Board will periodically pick and audit centers/institutes from submitted reports. Lots of guidance about NAMING entities after individuals. There is a form to complete. "Requests to close a center or institute shall be reported to the Board Office on **Form H (PDF)**. After reviewing the request, the Board Office shall place the proposal on the agenda of the Academic Affairs Committee." The listing links to webpages. The list itself is controlled by an individual who edits the list. https://research.uiowa.edu/directory-centers-and-institutes
Northwestern University	https://www.research.northwestern.edu/institutes-and-centers/ (list)	Found a list at university and at unit level. University Research Institutes and Centers (URICs) LIFE CYCLE documentation. "Requests are typically made to University leadership, specifically the Provost, Vice-President for Research (VPR), or a Dean.

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

	https://urica.northwestern.edu/center-support/new-institutes-or-centers/	The requests may initiate the establishment of a task force, followed by a series of discussions, including programmatic and administrative planning, assessment of the program alignment with a URIC or a school-based center, short-term and long-term resources that are required, and sustainability. The prospective director is required to submit a proposal including: • The Center's mission and vision • Societal impact • Demonstrated need; evidence that the new initiative could not be undertaken in the absence of the proposed URIC • Impact on Northwestern eminence • Assessment of similar units nationally and internationally • Current and planned interdisciplinary research collaborations that provide a foundation for the URIC's activities • Proposed research and educational activities • Proposed team and a strategy for membership growth • A business plan – current and future external funding (federal and non-federal), as well as internal support • Budget • Sustainability plan • Metrics to assess success" Underlined items that seem to deviate from others. Really rigorous planning, a market analysis, etc. Once a new URIC is approved, the VPR appoints the director for a 3-year term, agreed upon by the director and the appropriate research deans. Rigorous ANNUAL reviews by Office for Research senior leadership. "URICs that are judged to no longer meet the URIC criteria and institutional strategic value may lose their Office for Research status including any associated financial support. At that point they may be

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		sunset or, in agreement with a school, transition into a school-based center."
Ohio State University	https://oaa.osu.edu/centers-and-institutes 3335-3-36 Centers and institutes.	Controlled largely by the council on academic affairs (CAA). For university centers, if a proposed entity is approved by the CAA it will go to the university senate for final approval. It will then be communicated to the board of trustees. For college centers, deans may establish and the CAA is notified. The office of academic affairs keeps records and a list. "With the approval of the council on academic affairs, the faculty of a school or college may delegate to an academic center the authority to offer courses or degree programs established under the auspices of that school or college…University faculty and staff may affiliate with the academic center under procedures approved by its oversight committee. Academic centers shall not serve as tenure initiating units." Each university and college center must have an oversight committee. University centers: Reviewed 2 years after initial creation and then at 4 year intervals after. Actions will be recommended to CAA after each review: "continuation, conditional continuation with a follow-up in less than four years, and termination." College centers monitored by deans through annual reports. Notification of decision to academic affairs through CAA. ** [Per "grandfathering"]** Provisions for previously established centers: "All existing academic centers established outside of this rule shall be reviewed under the requirements of this rule. Those not in compliance with the rule shall

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		be allowed one additional year to make appropriate adjustments to allow for their continuation."
		Start-up centers are given more flexibility. Expedited review of request from VP or dean, then approval by CAA, then one year until another review. If funding secured, then it will go through the regular process. If not, an extension may be granted through CAA.
Purdue University	https://www.purdue.edu/research/centers-institutes-cores/list.php	There is an application form that is useful but not much more detail offered.
Indiana University	https://policies.iu.edu/policies/rp-11-002-establishment-centers-institutes/index.html	Defines 3 levels of centers & institutes: school, campus, and university-wide; Policy Organization: Scope, Policy Statement (types, what they should include, evaluated and held accountable for benchmarks), A. Types of Research centers & institutes - school, campus, university-wide; B. Naming; C. Exceptions; D. Application of Policy to Existing Centers & institutes; Reason for Policy; Procedure; A. Establishing School & Campus; B. Establishing University-Wide (apps will include & reviewed under the following criteria); Reviewing School & Campus; Reviewing University Wide; Administration of Research Centers & Institutes;
University of Nebraska	https://nebraska.edu/-/media/unca/docs/offices-and-policies/policies/board-governing-documents/board-of-regents-bylaws.pdf?la=en (section 2.11 - page 19)	Pretty limited information in policy. Creation - A proposal for approval should include: ● a detailed description of the multi-departmental center function, ● justification, ● relevance to the University's strategic plans, ● participating departments and faculty, administration, funding, formal name

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		● evidence that the multi-departmental center will more effectively achieve stated academic objectives than traditional departmental, school, or college structures.
Rutgers University	https://policies.rutgers.edu/1015-currentpdf	Revised in 2017; Levels: classified according to their level of approval and reporting relationship - Departmental, Decanal, Chancellor/Exec VP (require Senate input for creation & termination), Presidential (require Senate input for creation & termination), Board of Governors; basic requirement that it is not unreasonably duplicative, Proposal Guidelines for establishing a center; Review Guidelines: ● New & Renewal process: 5yr term ● 6mo prior director submits self-assessment (how met initial expectations & criteria for renewal; ● Supervisor has 3 options: suspend, terminate, or renew without additional review but can also seek an internal review or request an external review; ● after additional information, final decision is made and notification provided; ● Renewals should include justification from reviews, changes in funding/space/staffing, time of renewal, and criteria for evaluation in subsequent renewals; ● suspension/dissolution of a CI requires a plan to reorganize human resources, institutional and external funding, and infrastructure issues within the organizational framework of the University. ● For existing entities: a date set that takes into consideration the length of time the CI has already been in existence, but no more than five years in the future. Includes info on Listing of Centers & Institutes; Tenure resides in department so hires must be joint between center & department; Restructuring & Reorganization requires same approval process as creating

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

University of Texas System	https://www.utsystem.edu/sites/default/files/offices/board-of-regents/rules-regulations/40602.pdf	Rule 40602 on Organized Research Units (ORU). Designation of ORUs: Institute ("major" and "broad based") vs. Laboratory (non-departmental and maintains facilities for research in several departments) vs. Center ("anticipated <u>annual budgets of at least $3,000,000</u>") vs. Non-ORU Center (less than $3M). "Procedure for Establishment of ORUs. An ORU is established upon submittal and approval of a proposal by the president and the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs. The proposal should describe the purpose and benefits of the ORU to the institution, the faculty members and other participants, research and other activity plans, space requirements, and budget needs. If institutional space or funds are committed, confirmation of such commitments from the appropriate institutional representative should be included in the proposal." Naming regulations included: Rule 80307 "Advisory Committee or Council. Each ORU is headed by a director and <u>will have an advisory committee/council</u> that assists the director in setting the unit's goals and may assist by critically evaluating its effectiveness on a continuing basis." Each ORU <u>must be reviewed at least every SIX (6) years</u> by an ad hoc committee. "The committee's report will be forwarded to the president, who, in consultation with others, will determine whether the ORU should continue, be phased out, or be discontinued. The president shall forward the recommendation and ad hoc committee's report to the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs or the Executive Vice Chancellor for Health Affairs."

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

University of California- Berkeley	https://vcresearch.berkeley.edu/research-policies/oru-policy-procedure	ORU policy conforms to larger UCal policy. Established by Chancellor or designee. May be subject to review every FIVE (5) YEARS. ORUs= Institute vs. Center vs. Laboratory (multi-disciplinary) vs. Museum or Field Station vs. Station vs. Multicampus research units/programs/iniatives. Directors are tenured faculty unless the chancellor makes an exception. Speaks to stipends. All directors report to the VC for research who is the chancellor's designee. Candidates are recommended to the VCR by a search advisory committee. Directors serve for 3-5 year appointments. Director stands up faculty advisory committee to review activities and plans, provide written advice to director, feed the unit's annual report. Affiliated faculty, researchers, and students encouraged. ORU budgets usually mixed (private/philanthropic/grants/income incurred/etc. "Additional funds may be provided by the VCRO. Typically, appointments funded solely by ORU resources will be time limited to the life of a project or an ORU, after which neither the ORU nor VCRO will be responsible for salary commitments for such appointments. When budgets permit it, the VCR may agree to also provide temporary funds to an ORU in support of other ORU-related activities. The use and term of such temporary funds shall be determined and agreed upon between the VCR and the Director." The VCR is at liberty to review and adjust ORU budgets annually. The VCR establishes ORUs. Guidelines included for ORU creation. Should include name of proposed director; names of advisory committee; research plan and budget plan for 2 years of operations and projections for the three following years; names and signatures of faculty who have agreed to participate; business development plan;

Peer Institutions: Review of Documentation Regarding Centers and Institutes

		competitor analysis; and "a date after which central campus financial support is no longer required must be agreed to. There is an expectation that ORUs will becomes self-supporting within this specified time-frame." Financial and start-up agreements should be secured. Annual reports will be submitted prior to disbursement of the next year of funding for the ORU. At least every TEN (10) years there will be a rigorous, in-depth peer review of every existing ORU that will involve non-UC,B researchers, tours, etc. The VCR or review committees may recommend continuance or closure of ORUs. "A phase-out period lasting from a few months to up to two years may be provided to permit orderly transfer or termination of non-faculty personnel, grants, financial accounts, and programs."
University of California- Los Angeles	http://www.ucla.edu/about/centers-and-institutes	Extensive ORU DATABASE. Link to URL, named director, affiliated schools and departments. Searchable. Also a MAPPING page that shows how ORUs link to departments and schools. States that they are governed by UC-wide policy (see above). Extensive guidance on the review process, which takes place every FIVE (5) years. Charts/self-review template/committee site visit template/review committee questions/final committee report template/etc. https://www.icca.ucla.edu/review-information