




2110 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742-5241
301.405.9363 TEL 301.314.9896 FAX
www.ugst.umd.edu

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
AND DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

TO: Deans and Directors of Living-Learning and Other Special Programs

FROM: Donna B. Hamilton 
Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and
Dean for Undergraduate Studies

DATE: April 2, 2015

SUBJECT: Directors' Annual Reports

On behalf of the Provost's Committee on Living-Learning and Other Special Programs, I am forwarding the program criteria (Part One) and annual report guidelines (Part Two). Please stay strictly within the five-pages (excluding appendices) specified. Reports exceeding these limits will be considered as not having been completed. All reports are due June 30, 2015. **Please send the reports as an email attachment to Mark Kuhn (mskuhn@umd.edu, Director of Communications and Web Development in the Office of Undergraduate Studies.** Directors of Honors College programs should send their reports to William Dorland for forwarding to Mark by June 30. Directors of College Park Scholars programs should send their reports to Marilee Lindeman for forwarding to Mark by June 30. All others should send their reports directly to Mark. There will be every effort to respond to you by September 15, 2015.

The attached instructions indicate the data to be reported for each program. Some differences exist because of the varying systems used to admit students, different start/end periods for programs, and other issues. Notice that the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment will provide the data for Part Two, Appendix B—a great help to us all. You may expect to receive that data by May 1, 2015, earlier if possible.

As in previous years, the Provost's Committee on Living-Learning and Other Special Programs has asked that current program syllabi be posted on program websites. As indicated in their response last year, the Committee also expects all programs to report results of student satisfaction surveys.

Established in 2009, the Provost's Committee on Living-Learning and Other Special Programs is charged with providing "oversight and strategic direction" for Maryland's living-learning and other special programs. The guidelines for the living-learning directors' annual reports are keyed to the criteria and expectations set by this committee. The committee uses these criteria to assess programs annually and to review the portfolio of programs and their overall impact on and contribution to the campus. Committee members include: Elizabeth Beise, Cynthia Stevens, Thomas Cohen, Francis DuVinage, Barbara Gill, Mary Hummel, Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz, Philip Soergel, Wes Lawson, Madlen Simon, and the Dean for Undergraduate Studies as chair. Additional faculty members will be added to the committee later this spring. Thank you your extraordinary work on behalf of our students and the University. We look forward to receiving your reports.

Provost's Committee on Living-Learning and Other Special Programs

Program Criteria, Expectations, and Reporting Procedures

The Provost's Committee on Living-Learning and Other Special Programs, chaired by the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, is responsible for establishing criteria and expectations for living-learning programs at the University of Maryland and for assessing programs on an annual basis. Part One below states the expectations and criteria for the programs. Part Two outlines the report the Director will submit. Data reporting requirements differ from program to program.

PART ONE: Program expectations and criteria for assessment

1. Recruitment effectiveness. The program will generate enthusiastic interest from students. For programs that recruit freshmen, placement in those programs will be sought by students who are among those most competitive for admission to the University. For the themed programs in the Honors College and for College Park Scholars, recruitment effectiveness will mean that a very high percentage of students placed in the program will have identified it as their first or second choice. For other programs, placement will be sought by students with strong academic profiles and strong interests and accomplishments that align with program goals. Recruitment effectiveness will also be assessed in the context of program demographics, such as gender and race/ethnicity.
2. Retention/completion/graduation rate effectiveness. The program will have rates of retention to the University consistent with University goals for retention and graduation. The program will have rates of program retention and completion that demonstrate high student interest in and commitment to the program.
3. Quality of program concept and goals. The program concept and goals promise a challenging, intellectually stimulating, and meaningful educational experience.
4. Quality of curricular content, design, and integration. The curriculum supports the program goals and concept. The curriculum and program instruction are innovative and effective.
5. Program staffing in leadership and instruction. The program staff is optimal for high quality leadership, instruction, and implementation.
6. Quality of activities outside the formal curriculum that enhance the program. The activities outside the formal curriculum, including additional opportunities for faculty-student engagement, add great dimension to the program.
7. Quality of continuous improvement. The program undergoes continuous innovation and change in response to evaluations, student interest and abilities, or a changing program/university environment. Where possible and appropriate, connections exist between improvement initiatives and data available to or collected by the program.
8. Student satisfaction. To what extent do the students think highly of the program and its leadership? Do they see the program as coherent and meaningful? Do they believe that the faculty are available to and care about them? Do they feel the faculty are experts in their fields? Do they feel the faculty are excellent teachers? Does the program create a supportive environment for diverse students and does it make students feel welcome? (Information to be supplied from program student surveys and

program evaluation forms. Supervisors of the respective programs will also review the University's online course evaluations, but will not share individual results with this committee.)

PART TWO: Director's Living-Learning program annual report guidelines

The Director of each program will prepare a report that is no longer than five pages, exclusive of the tabulated data presented in the Appendix. Reports are due to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies annually on June 30th. Directors of individual Honors College and College Park Scholars Programs will send their reports to Professor Dorland and Lindemann, respectively, for forwarding to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Professors Dorland and Lindemann will each provide a brief (three pages each) overview of their programs, and will each submit all reports from their programs in one continuous document.

1) Fundamentals of the Program

- a) The program's goals. Describe the program's concept and goals. List the student learning outcomes and assessment results as available. Provide the URL for the program website.
- b) The Program's faculty and staff. List the program faculty and staff (identified by name, position they hold at the university, and position in the program), administrative responsibilities in the program, teaching responsibilities in the program (the latter by semester and course), co-curricular and other student interaction responsibilities in the program. Be concise.
- c) The program's curricular design. Describe the curricular design, including brief course descriptions and credit level. Provide a hyperlinked URL to the current syllabi on the program website. Provide evidence of high quality instruction.

2) Data Analysis (See section 4. Honors and Scholars program directors should not separately include data with their annual reports as data will be submitted collectively for each set of programs by Professor Dorland and Lindemann. Other programs will include their data as report appendices.)

- a) Recruitment effectiveness. Each program director will evaluate program recruitment data, addressing the most salient details of those data.
- b) Distinguishing features of incoming class (accomplishments, special interests). This category may be especially relevant to programs other than Honors and Scholars.
- c) Program retention/completion rate effectiveness. Each program director will evaluate program retention/completion data, addressing the most salient details of those data.
- d) Student satisfaction. Each program director will provide a concise summary of the survey questions asked, response rate, and average ratings of the items.

3) Analysis of this Academic Year

- a) Continuous improvement.

Each program director will describe any changes or improvements implemented in the past year. Explain the basis for those changes and provide observations on the impact of their implementation.

- b) Outside the formal curriculum.
Each program director will list by category any activities outside the formal curriculum that enhanced the program. In light of the program's goals, describe two-to-five of these activities and the ways in which they added value to the program.
- c) Curriculum.
Each program director will describe any (proposed) changes to the curriculum that enhance the academic experience.
- d) Survey of student satisfaction results
Each program director will comment on what they learn from the survey and how these results will affect future decisions and actions.

4) Appendix A: Data provided by each program director

For Honors College and College Park Scholars, Professors Dorland and Lindemann will submit the following in their overviews of these programs:

- a) Retention rate to each program; completion rate to each program (AY 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14)
- b) Number of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th choices, and number of students admitted to the program after May 1.

Honors program directors (except University Honors) will individually list in each of their reports:

- c) Special course activities and numbers of students participating (speakers, site visits, performances)
- d) Internships: specific experience and name of student (NASA: Alice Smith)
- e) Research activities (on or off campus): experience and name (Biogenesis: Joseph Smith)
- f) Study abroad: place and name (Spain: J. T. Smith)
- g) Other relevant experiences related to program participation

The University Honors director will individually list in the program report:

- h) Special course and non-course activities and numbers of students participating (speakers, site visits, performances)
- i) Course- and non-course-related internships: specific experience and name of student (NASA: Alice Smith)
- j) Course- and non-course-related research activities (on or off campus): experience and name (Biogenesis: Joseph Smith)
- k) Course- and non-course-related study abroad: place and name (Spain: J. T. Smith)
- l) Other course and non-course experiences related to program participation

Scholars program directors will individually list in each of their reports:

- m) Special course activities and numbers of students participating (speakers, site visits, performances)
- n) Internships: specific experience and name of student (NASA: Alice Smith)
- o) Research activities (on or off campus): experience and name (Biogenesis: Joseph Smith)
- p) Study abroad: place and name (Spain: J. T. Smith)
- q) Other relevant experiences related to program participation

All other program directors will individually list:

- r) Retention rate to the program; completion rate to the program (at least three successive years of each)
- s) Special course activities and numbers of students participating (speakers, site visits, performances)
- t) Internships: specific experience and name of student (NASA: Alice Smith)
- u) Research activities (on or off campus): experience and name (Biogenesis: Joseph Smith)
- v) Study abroad: place and name (Spain: J. T. Smith)
- w) Other relevant experiences related to program participation

5) Appendix B: Data provided by IRPA

The Office of Institutional Research Planning and Assessment will provide the data indicated below—covering three years—to both the Dean for Undergraduate Studies and program directors. Professors Dorland and Lindemann will submit all data for their programs with their comprehensive reports; other directors will individually attach the data.

Honors College (all programs):

Overall yield rate

Demographics overall and by program: race, gender, first generation

SAT: 25/75% overall and by program (no midpoint)

H.S. GPA: overall and by program

Retention to the university

Graduation rate

College Park Scholars (all programs):

Overall yield rate and yield rate by program

Demographics overall and by program: race, gender, first generation

SAT: 25/75% overall and by program (no midpoint)

H.S.GPA: overall and by program

Retention to the university

Graduation rate

Beyond the Classroom:

Demographics: race, gender

University GPA at admission to program

Degree credits at admission to program.

Civicus:

Yield rate

Demographics: race, gender, first generation

SAT: 25/75% (no midpoint)

H.S. GPA

Retention to the university

Graduation rate

FLEXUS:

Demographics; race, gender, first generation
 SAT: 25/75% (no midpoint)
 H.S. GPA
 Retention to the university
 Graduation rate

Global Communities: beginning with Fall 2011 admits

Yield rate
 Demographics: race, gender, first generation and geographic origin
 SAT: 25/75% (no midpoint)
 H.S. GPA
 Retention to the university

Hillman Entrepreneurs

Overall yield rate and yield rate by program from each community college
 Demographics overall and by program: race, gender, first generation
 Community college GPA
 Majors enrolled
 First year transfer retention to the university
 Graduation rate

Hinman CEOs:

Demographics: race, gender
 University GPA at admission to program
 Degree credits at admission to program

Language House:

Demographics: race, gender
 University GPA at admission to program
 Degree credits at admission to program

VIRTUS: beginning with Fall 2011 admits

Demographics; race, gender, first generation
 SAT: 25/75% (no midpoint)
 H.S. GPA
 Retention to the university

Writers' House:

For freshmen admits:
 Yield rate
 Demographics: race, gender, first generation
 For other admits:
 Demographics: race, gender
 University GPA at admission to program
 Degree credits at admission to program