

ASSURANCE SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Ann Arbor, Michigan

March 15-17, 2010

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission

A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Gilles Bousquet, Dean of International Studies and Director of the International Institute,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706

Mark E. Clasen, Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine, Wright State University,
Dayton, OH 45420

Celestino Fernández (Chair), University Distinguished Outreach Professor, University of
Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

Lori S. Franz, Professor of Management, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211

Donald L. Gilstrap, Associate Dean of Libraries, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019

Riall Nolan, Professor of Anthropology, Associate Provost and Dean of International Programs, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906

Douglas M. Priest, Senior Associate Vice President-Finance, Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN 47405

E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN 55455

R. Michael Tanner, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607

Susan B. Twombly, Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045

Dev Venugopalan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

Dieter Wanner, Associate Provost for Global Strategies and International Affairs, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210

Karen M. Whitney, Vice Chancellor for Student Life, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN 46202

Contents

I. Context and Nature of Visit	4
II. Commitment to Peer Review	8
III. Compliance with Federal Requirements	9
IV. Fulfillment of the Criteria.....	11
a. Criterion One	11
b. Criterion Two	14
c. Criterion Three	16
d. Criterion Four	21
e. Criterion Five.....	23
V. Affiliation Status.....	26
VI. Additional Comments and Explanations.....	27

I. CONTEXT AND NATURE OF VISIT

A. Purpose of Visit

A thirteen-member review team conducted a standard comprehensive evaluation of the University of Michigan (U-M) for continued institutional accreditation that included a Special Emphasis on internationalization. The visit did not include any Change Requests or other special reviews.

B. Organizational Context

Founded in Detroit in 1817, and located in Ann Arbor since 1837, as one of the first public universities in the nation, U-M has been continually accredited since 1913. Today, U-M is one of the most distinguished universities in the world. U-M is comprised of 19 schools and colleges (and 19 libraries) and its faculty members, that total about 6,000, have been exceptionally successful in attracting research funds. The University's research expenditures in FY09 exceeded \$1 billion (total University budget: about \$5 billion).

U-M enrolls over 41,000 students in numerous undergraduate, professional and graduate programs and employs about 6,000 faculty members. The University's students come from all 50 states and over 100 countries and about 96% of all first-year students and 36% of all undergraduates live in University housing.

As part of its Self Study, U-M focused (with HLC's approval) on internationalization. The final chapter of the Self Study Report provides ample evidence of the University's interest in, and commitment to global engagement, indeed, to being an international university. Additionally, this chapter provides recommendations for how U-M can continue to improve and expand its global reach through its exceptional programs and activities. The HLC visiting team addresses its comments and recommendations pertaining to internationalization in the Advancement section of this report.

In sum, during the past 10 years, since the last HLC comprehensive reaccreditation review, U-M has continued to grow its student body, faculty, staff and budget, improve its programs and expand its reach and influence, and all of this and more was accomplished even as the University experienced budget reductions in appropriations from the State of Michigan. Overall, the University continues on a most positive trajectory.

C. Unique Aspects of Visit

As per agreement between The Higher Learning Commission and the University of Michigan, the institution conducted a Special Emphasis Self-Study focusing on "internationalization." Thus, the university agreed to prepare (and HLC to accept) a succinct yet comprehensive document directly addressing the Criteria for Accreditation.

The team chair participated in a pre-visit on October 27-28, 2009 simply to get acquainted with the institution, some key administrators, and several individuals directly involved in leading the Self Study process, as well as to plan more effectively for the team visit.

D. Sites or Branch Campuses Visited

The U-M- Dearborn and U-M-Flint are regional campuses of the University of Michigan but they are accredited separately. Thus, the team did not visit these campuses.

E. Distance Education Reviewed

Although a small number of U-M programs offer web-based courses, the University does not offer any complete academic programs online or through web-based learning. Furthermore, institutional representatives indicated that the University was not planning to develop any online programs in the near future. Web-based courses are offered by the School of Nursing as part of the master's program, the Ross School of Business in the Executive Master's of Business Administration program, and the School of Public Health in its On Job/On Campus program.

F. Interactions with Constituencies

- Academic Affairs Advisory Committee (9)
- Accreditation Working Groups (six groups; 32 individuals)
- Admissions, Financial Aid and Registrar (6)
- Alumni Association (President and four others)
- Associate and Assistant Deans (5)
- Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer (and three others)
- Audits and Compliance Group (5)
- Athletic Director (and 5 other representatives of Intercollegiate Athletics)
- Board of Regents (3)
- Budget, Planning and Institutional Research Representatives (4)
- Business and Community Representatives (6)
- Chief Information Officer (and four others)
- China Task Force (4)
- Deans (15)
- Development Group (5)
- Directors, Institutes (4)
- Director, Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (and six other representatives of student involvement in research)
- Diversity Representatives (7)
- Educational and Government Outreach Representatives (6)
- Ethics and Conflict of Interest Representatives (4)
- Executive Director, Center for Learning and Teaching (and several others involved in teaching support)
- Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs (and two other Health Systems officers)
- Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer (and two other financial officers)
- Faculty: Open Meeting (4)
- Faculty Senate Assembly Leadership (5)
- General Education Group (5)
- Global Initiatives-Health (6)
- Government Representatives (3)

- Housing and Residential Life (4)
- Interdisciplinary Initiatives (7)
- International Programs Representatives (5)
- Internationalization Graduate Education Representatives (4)
- Learning Assessment Representatives (7)
- Learning Communities Representatives (5)
- Libraries (5)
- Michigan Society of Fellows (one Professor and 14 Assistant Professors)
- North Campus Research Complex Representatives (5)
- Ombuds and Dispute Resolution
- President
- Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs, current and incoming (and Vice Provosts)
- Public Goods Council (4)
- Research Administration and Technology Transfer Group (4)
- Service Learning Group (7)
- Staff: Open Meeting (9)
- Staff Group (5)
- Student Advising and Careers Group (7)
- Student Affairs Group (5)
- Student Leaders (7)
- Student Organizations Representatives (7)
- Students: Open Meeting (5)
- Study Abroad Group (6)
- Teaching Innovations Group (6)
- Teaching Support Group (6)
- Unit Assessment and Program Review (4)
- Vice President and General Counsel
- Vice President for Communications
- Vice President for Government Relations
- Vice President for Research
- Vice President for Student Affairs

G. Principal Documents, Materials, and Web Pages Reviewed

- Academic and Professional Integrity Policy
- Academic Units' Perspectives on Internationalization
- Accreditation Working Groups: Charges and Memberships
- Alumni Cohorts Survey: 2009
- Annual Environment Report
- Annual Report on Technology Transfer, Industry Research and Economic Development (2009)
- Assessment of Student Learning Report (2009)
- Association of Research Libraries Published Tables (most current tables)

- Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research
- Bylaws of the Board Of Regents
- China Task Force Report
- CRLT: 2008-09 Annual Report
- CRLT: List of U-M Assessment of Student Learning Projects
- CRLT: North Engineering Programs (brochure)
- CRLT: Promoting Excellence and Innovation in Teaching and Learning at U-M
- CRLT: Theatre Program Brochure
- Community Assistance Directory
- Diversity Blueprints Report
- Faculty Handbook
- Faculty Promotion Guidelines
- Financial Reports: 2008 and 2009
- Five Years Forward: An Address to the University Community
- Future Directions: Shaping the Michigan Difference
- George D. Kuh, Jillian Kinzie, John H. Schuh and Elizabeth J. Whitt (2005). *Success in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Graduating Senior Survey: 2008
- HLC Report of the 2000-01 Reaccreditation Visit
- Honor Codes at the University of Michigan
- Institutional Snapshots: 2007, 2008 and 2009
- International Center's 2008 Statistical Report
- Jack Kent County Community College Transfer Initiative Final Report
- Michigan Diversity Report
- Michigan Experience I: Perspectives from the Class of 2008
- Michigan Experience II: Perspectives from the Alumni
- Michigan Student Study Guidebook
- *Michigan Daily* (various issues)
- *Michigan Today* (various issues)
- Michigan's University Research Corridor: Annual Report 2009
- North Campus Master Plan
- Office of Budget and Planning website (and links to various reports)
- Organizational Charts
- Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment
- Policy Statement on Integrity in Scholarship
- Portal en Español
- Portrait of the University of Michigan
- Principles of Faculty involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan
- Self Study Report (including appendices and numerous webpage links): *The University of Michigan: An Institution of Global Learning, Knowledge and*

Engagement

- Staff Handbook
- Statement on Stewardship
- Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities
- Standard Practice Guide
- Student Handbook
- Test Validity Study Report
- Third Annual Economic Impact Report on Michigan's University Research Corridor (2009)
- Unit Assessment of the Role of Engagement and Service (2009)
- Unit Assessment of the Student Learning Environment (2009)
- Units on Internationalization (2009)
- University snapshots
- Websites:
 - <http://accreditation.umich.edu/>
 - Including, numerous (Self Study Report) web links to institutional, college and unit documents (including key learning assessment, engagement, and internationalization reports)

II. COMMITMENT TO PEER REVIEW**A. Comprehensiveness of the Self-Study Process**

The team notes that the self study process involved representatives of all pertinent constituents and much effort was made to conduct an open, transparent, and participatory process. Additionally, there was clear communication between the institution and the HLC liaison and the team chair. The team believes that the self study process and the Self Study Report have served the institution well as it reviewed its progress during the past ten years and as it thinks about, and plans its future, including in the area of internationalization.

B. Integrity of the Self-Study Report

The Self Study Report, both comprehensive and succinct, provided the review team credible and accurate information for its discussions with members of the University community and on which to assess the HLC criteria. The team found no discrepancies between the Self Study Report and the information acquired during the visit. On the contrary, the team believes that the printed Self Study Report, while representative, could not, by its nature, fully reflect the scope, depth and quality of the many initiatives and activities undertaken by the institution during the past ten years and in which it is currently engaged. Thus, the dozens of hotlinks in the electronic version to numerous websites, as well as the campus interviews, served to both fully inform the team and to provide a more complete picture of the University.

C. Adequacy of Progress in Addressing Previously Identified Challenges

The team considers the response of the organization to previously identified challenges

to be adequate.

D. Notification of Evaluation Visit and Solicitation of Third-Party Comment

Requirements were fulfilled.

U-M placed announcements in several area newspapers (*AnnArbor.com*, *Michigan Record*, and *The Michigan Daily*) on various days during the weeks of November 9th and 16th, 2009, inviting public comment, as well as in other publications, including the *Michigan Alumnus* (U-M's Alumni Association magazine).

The Higher Learning Commission received two (2) third-party comments, from the same individual, prior to the team's visit. Two (2) additional third-party comments, from two different individuals, were submitted (subsequent to the close of the third-party comment period) to HLC and transmitted to the team during the visit.

The team reviewed all of the third-party comments, which identified various issues, and followed-up during the visit by requesting information from the University and reviewing pertinent institutional policies and procedures.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

An Appendix in U-M's Self Study Report provided documentation on how the University is meeting the eight components of Federal Compliance, listed below, and the team reviewed this and additional information and documentation pertaining to Federal Compliance obtained during the visit.

1. Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.

Comments: U-M's credit hour assignments and degree program lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education; for example, the minimum number of credit hours for a four-year bachelor's degree varies between 120 and 128.

U-M's highly differentiated tuition and fee structure (based on student level, program, and residency) is rational and based on the costs of education.

2. Student Complaints

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.

Comments: U-M has various clear policies, processes and procedures for students to address complaints, both formally and informally, and the University systematically processes such complaints.

3. Transfer Policies

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.

Comments: Although specific to each of the University's schools and colleges, U-M's transfer admissions policies are clear and systematically communicated to incoming students.

4. Verification of Student Identity
The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.
Comments: U-M verifies students' identities through each student's use of a University "uniqname" and password, as well as a UMID number.
5. Title IV and Related Responsibilities
The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and recommends the ongoing approval of such contracts.
Comments: The University has provided the Higher Learning Commission with required information on the various components of Title IV. The team reviewed these materials and found no discrepancies or cause for concern.
6. Institutional Disclosures and Advertising and Recruitment Materials
The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.
Comments: The University's accreditation status, both institutional and program, is included in numerous documents and websites readily available to students and the general public.
7. Relationship with Other Accrediting Agencies and with State Regulatory Boards
The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.
Comments: Numerous U-M schools, colleges and programs are accredited by their professional organizations and such information is readily available to students and the general public in both print and electronic documents.
8. Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Third Party Comment
The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance.
Comments: See ID above.

IV. FULFILLMENT OF THE CRITERIA

CRITERION ONE: MISSION AND INTEGRITY. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- U-M has a well defined and widely known mission as a preeminent research university. The University's mission statement and ten-point vision statement are both clear and forceful and they are communicated effectively and supported by the institution's actions. The mission statement communicates the fact that U-M's mission is "to serve the people of Michigan and the world." The institution's mission is embodied in the mission statements of units throughout the University, including schools, colleges and departments, and is readily found in various

websites and printed materials. The University's missions are integrated with planning and budgeting processes at all levels, including the institution's "activity-based" budget system. Various initiatives in support of advancing the University's missions have been launched since the last HLC comprehensive review of 2000, including, for example, Multidisciplinary Learning and Team Teaching (2004), Residential Life Initiative (2004), Michigan Healthy Community Initiative (2005) and the Ethics in Public Life (2005).

- U-M is a long-standing national advocate for, and leader in issues pertaining to diversity in higher education. Section 14.06 of the Regents Bylaws clearly state the Board's commitment to nondiscrimination and equal opportunity for all people and lists numerous categories (several more than listed by most institutions of higher education). The University's commitment to the diversity of its student body was most recently demonstrated in the institution's forceful defense of two admissions lawsuits. Although in June 2003 the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Gratz v. Bollinger* that U-M modify its undergraduate admissions process, the use of race was not prohibited in admissions. Likewise, in *Grutter v. Bollinger et al.*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that diversity is a compelling interest in higher education and that race is one of a number of factors that can be considered in admissions. U-M's "Diversity Matters" website provides links to an extensive and impressive array of services and programs to support the University's ongoing diversity effort for faculty, students and staff as well as services beyond the campus. The Regents' policy of providing adequate financial aid for any admitted Michigan resident with need, thereby mitigating the impact of tuition increases, is supportive of U-M's diversity goals.
- U-M's extensive and deep commitment to diversity is found throughout its programs and activities, including recruitment, educational programs, training, outreach and advocacy. Some examples of this commitment include, the Office of Academic Multicultural Initiatives (assists in the recruitment of multicultural students), ADVANCE Program (supports women in science and engineering), curriculum (most students are required to enroll in a Race & Ethnicity course), Program on Intergroup Relations (courses and workshops on various diversity issues), Multicultural Teaching Services (for graduate students), Office of Institutional Equity (educational/training programs), Women of Color in the Academy Project (supports and promotes women of color), Services for Students with Disabilities (various services for such students), Portal en Español (Spanish-language website with information for students and parents), several councils that represents diverse groups and issues pertaining to diversity (Diversity Council, Commission on Women's Issues, Council for Disability Concerns), National Center for Institutional Diversity (various diversity outreach efforts), among many other examples. U-M recognizes the diversity efforts of its students, faculty and staff through various awards, including the Harold R. Johnson Diversity Award and the Distinguished Diversity Leadership Award.
- The University's participatory governance structure begins with the Board of Regents, an eight-member body whose members are elected statewide for eight-year terms. The Board meets monthly in public session and operates with two

standing committees: Finance, Audit and Investment; and Personnel, Compensation and Governance. The overall operation of the institution is delegated to the President who works with various senior level executive officers. The deans of the various schools and colleges work with elected bodies. Faculty governance permeates the University and faculty governance structures operate at all levels, including institutional (University Senate and Senate Assembly with its 10 standing committees), school/college and departmental. The President and the outgoing Provost have taken beneficial steps to make information about critical issues, such as the budget, available in a useful form to faculty members, strengthening a sense of shared governance.

- In terms of staff-related governance, U-M has nine bargaining agreements. Review of these agreements reveals that processes for responding to concerns of various categories of employees (e.g., staff, graduate students and lecturers) are clearly articulated and steps for recourse with problems are in written formats and clear. The visiting team heard from several staff members who commented that staff is regularly included in institutional initiatives and feel much a part of the University. The program of “Voices of the Staff” has provided a beneficial pathway for staff concerns to be brought to the attention of the campus leadership and to be cooperatively addressed.
- Students are actively engaged in shaping the University through a representative student government, contributions to a variety of faculty committees, and participation in over 1200 student organizations. Each school or college has a student government association which represents its constituency in meetings with administrators and which offers unique activities. Residence halls have separate governing structures and have a strong voice in the setting of residential fees. Graduate students have a separate Rackham governance organization specific to the needs of graduate students. In addition, the Michigan Student Association (MSA) with members from all schools and colleges seeks support to address major student issues, disperses student activity fee resources and participates in settings where student interests can be brought forward. Finally, a student member is included on many standing and ad hoc faculty committees to elicit student input to faculty recommendations.
- U-M’s commitment to operating with integrity is found in various policies and documents, including, for example, Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflicts of Commitment (revised at the institutional and unit level since the 2000 HLC reaccreditation review), Statement on Stewardship (for supervisory and administrative personnel), Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities, policies on academic integrity and honor codes, Integrity in Scholarship (for faculty), and Human Subjects Protection Program (for researchers). The University provides various resources and training opportunities to support its commitment to operating with integrity. U-M monitors its integrity through several means, including both internal (e.g., Office of Internal Controls) and external (e.g., audits) structures. The Audit Office and Health Sciences Compliance Office coordinate their activities, and training programs for pertinent college officers enhance the effectiveness of institutional compliance.

- The University's commitment to operating with integrity is also demonstrated through the avenues it provides its students and employees to address conflicts and grievances. In addition to formal procedures for pursuing faculty (found in each school and college), staff (Grievance Procedures and Dispute Resolution) and student (Office of Student Conflict Resolution) concerns, U-M also provides less formal (and highly effective) structures such as the Student Ombuds (provides students a confidential and informal environment to explore concerns and complaints), University Faculty Ombuds (created in 2003 to work with the faculty ombuds in schools and colleges to facilitate resolution of complaints) and Mediation Services (for faculty and staff). Also, a major review of the faculty grievance policy was underway during the time of the team's visit.
2. **Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention**
 - Although U-M has been a leader, with some nationally visible scholars and scholarship and its laudable defense of affirmative action in admissions before the U.S. Supreme Court, nevertheless the University faces challenges, as do most U.S. colleges and universities, in continuing to diversify its student body, faculty and administration. For example: U-M has 6% African American students in a state that has close to a 15% African American population; the number of traditionally underrepresented students of color has seen declines in some categories; and, the graduation rates of minority students still lag significantly behind those of majority students.
 3. **Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.**
 - None required.
 4. **Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)**
 - None required.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION TWO: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE. The organization's allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- A theme present throughout the Self Study Report and nearly all on-campus conversations was U-M's decentralized environment. It was acknowledged that although in some instances decentralization can result in inefficiencies, overall it was agreed that this model has worked exceptionally well for the University and

that any such inefficiencies are greatly offset by opportunities for creativity and effectiveness. Additionally, it was noted that significant direction on matters of policy and priorities originates with the President and Provost. Also, planning and priorities initiated at this level of administration generally involve issues of the common good and cut across academic and administrative boundaries. Use of a decentralized approach to financial control for academic schools and colleges, with built-in coordination by the Provost's office, combined with a centralized financial approach for supporting units is effective, and fits well the complexity of the University while preserving needed flexibility. The combination of centralized and decentralized planning and budgeting allows for both proactive and reactive responses to academic, economic and societal developments.

- Though complex and highly decentralized, U-M currently benefits from strong, effective central leadership (in fact, U-M has been fortunate to have such leadership throughout the years) that has been successful in leveraging mechanisms from the center to achieve overarching institutional goals and priorities. This combination of, and synergism between centralization and decentralization allows the University to be both nimble in terms of creative academic and administrative initiatives yet focused in regards to overall campus goals and priorities.
- Overall, the University successfully engages in ongoing financial planning and manages its finances exceptionally well. For example, undergraduate enrollment and tuition strategies are consistent with the University's mission and finances. Additionally, U-M anticipates as much as an additional \$100M in budget cuts during the next few years and it is already mapping revenue and expenditure strategies to deal with this possibility. Also, mechanisms used to allocate resources from endowment to operating budgets are both conservative and appropriate to the environment. IT is targeted as a source of major cost savings as U-M merges administrative and academic computing functions and should result in even greater cross-campus collaboration.
- Planning and financial decisions integrate well with the budgeting process and faculty governance. Faculty and others with whom we met during the visit appreciate the Provost's establishment of the Budget Advisory Committee and her openness and attention to transparency and to communicating with the campus regarding financial planning.
- Academic units, including centers, have a 10-year review process that is in the early stages of implementation. Those units that have participated in this process have found it to be both forward-looking and helpful. Also, some schools and colleges have their own five-year academic review processes in addition to the recently established 10-year cycle.
- Although the University has lost revenue from state appropriations during the past eight years, the institution has engaged in a series of strategic cost reduction and revenue enhancement initiatives that have successfully ensured financial strength, particularly in relation to many of its peers. For example, in 2008 U-M completed a highly successful \$3.2B fundraising campaign and preparations are under way for the next such campaign.
- Since 2002, U-M has implemented approximately \$150M in budget reductions in reaction to and in anticipation of State budget reductions. At the same time, the

university has accumulated resources for strategic investments such as the hiring of 100 additional faculty members during a five-year period currently underway and in support of its strategic interdisciplinary initiatives. Another example of the University's successful resource management in times of declining State support is its ability to purchase a 2,000,000 square-foot, multi-disciplinary research complex (NCRC) as well as to support its staffing and operations. This major purchase was a joint venture between the University and the Medical School.

- In terms of personnel, given the University's international stature, it is able to attract highly qualified and productive faculty members as well as professionals and other support staff. U-M has exceptional administrative leadership, both centrally and in the schools and colleges. Assuming the University's continued prestige and competitive salaries and benefits, it should be able to continue to recruit well-prepared individuals at all levels and for all positions.
- The University has undertaken a review of space utilization resulting in more efficient use of facilities and a reduction to build new facilities. Additionally, U-M has invested heavily in upgrading and renovation of existing facilities creating many high-quality work environments (and living spaces in the residence halls).

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention

- Not required.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

- Not required.

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)

- Not required.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION THREE: STUDENT LEARNING AND EFFECTIVE TEACHING. The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- The nature and amount of assessment and support for teaching and learning that exists on campus goes far beyond what is reported in the U-M's self-study report; however, the diverse range of approaches is represented in supporting learning assessment documents. In keeping with the decentralized nature of the University, there is no unified, centralized student outcomes assessment

program. Assessment is tied directly to questions that matter to faculty and is understood, valued, and practiced University-wide in academic as well as in academic support areas in ways that capitalize on the expertise of comprehensive research universities. Assessment occurs at multiple levels and is widely supported and promoted by deans and central administrators.

- As described in several Accreditation reports on assessment, many academic and support units have stated outcomes and articulated ways of collecting data to ensure students are achieving unit intended outcomes. This is most obvious in the professional schools that are subject to some form of external accreditation, such as Engineering and Education, where well-developed assessment programs exist. Many other units are working with the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) to identify outcomes and to assess learning, and several projects address specific learning outcomes of interest to faculty. Examples include assessment of: the undergraduate study abroad requirement in the School of Art and Design; student learning in the M-STEM program in the College of Engineering; and student learning in international programs. The College of Literature, Science, and Arts (LSA) is in the process of developing a long-term project to assess college-wide general education outcomes.
- Various schools and colleges are investigating the efficacy of curricular requirements. For example, the School of Education is engaged in a research-based effort to develop and test performance-based measures of teaching ability. There are literally dozens of examples of classroom and program-based action research being conducted at U-M, many of which are being done with the assistance of CRLT. Examples include a study of effectiveness of curricular revisions in Dental Hygiene, evaluation of the Chemical Engineering 342/343 course sequence, and impact of curricular modules on intercultural competence in Spanish. Significant work is taking place in the Sweetland Writing Center to assess and track student entrance to, and progress through the undergraduate writing requirements.
- CRLT works with numerous units on campus to evaluate many other programs, including projects to investigate the effectiveness of various versions of classroom clickers and Lecture Tools.
- Academic Reporting Tools is a U-M academic data warehouse that is used by faculty and administrators to gather substantial data about student course-taking patterns and grades. Although the system is not yet available for use by all faculty members, it soon will be. Its use makes a wide variety of assessment possible.
- The Rackham Graduate School conducts periodic, rigorous reviews of doctoral programs that focus on variables such as attrition, time to degree, completion rates, placement, and student assessment of their own experiences at critical transitions. These data are disaggregated by race/ethnicity and gender, and the results of these reviews are used to

inform decision-making and funding from deans.

- U-M regularly engages in centralized data collection on student goals, learning, engagement, and self-reported outcomes: the University participates in NSSE and CIRP, and in 2008 it conducted a Graduating Senior Survey and an Alumni Survey. Both of these latter surveys asked respondents to engage in self-assessment of learning related to general learning outcomes. NSSE data are reported to faculty and administrators in student affairs to use as a basis for considering improvements to the learning environment. U-M also participates in the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education. The University is not a participating member in the Voluntary Student Assessment project, but recently conducted a validity study to investigate the usefulness of several commercially available assessment instruments. This study led the University to the conclusion that the Collegiate Learning Assessment and similar instruments are not effective tools for capturing the learning that occurs at U-M. In an effort to be transparent about student success, the University prominently displays a link to its version of the College Portrait on its homepage.
- U-M creates successful learning environments. It has strong, well-established learning communities, including the Residential College. In fall 2009, University Housing reported that approximately 39% of U-M students who live in residence halls live in the Residential College, a Living Learning Community, or in one of many theme living options (out of a total 9,200 beds). Students living in the residential learning communities participate annually in the National Survey on Living Learning Programs, which is used to compare U-M student outcomes with those of peer institutions. In addition, Housing administers an annual satisfaction survey, the results of which are used to inform decision-making.
- The Schools of Medicine and Dentistry and the College of Engineering are leaders in efforts to improve teaching and learning. Medicine and Dentistry, in particular, are making effective use of M-Portfolio as a way of capturing student work and promoting student reflection.
- U-M has the necessary orientation, advising and other academic support programs (Newnan Academic Advising Center, New Student Orientation, and Sweetland Writing Center) and it offers a number of distinctive academic programs such as the Honors Program, service learning courses, study abroad, the First-Year Seminar Program, and the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program. There are numerous and successful non-residentially based learning communities. The University Libraries continue to play a leadership role in the University's academic life, providing several facilities for students and faculty to engage in learning and scholarship in both physical and virtual environments. Particular libraries within the system are open 24 hours a day, seven days a week to support student learning and effective teaching. The University Libraries rank 7th overall among Association of Research Libraries institutions and rank 8th overall in the number of volumes held at 9.2M; however, they rank 94th in

electronic materials as a percent of total library materials. Access to technology is sufficient across campus with computer labs, a broad wireless footprint, and the incorporation of CTools and ePortfolio (locally called MPortfolio) for courseware and student learning engagement. A number of units (e.g., Dentistry, Medicine, and Social Work) are actively using MPortfolio in their teaching and learning.

- U-M has created effective learning environments. Kuh et al (*Student Success in College*, 2005) singled out U-M as being one of two research universities that effectively engages its students in learning-related activities while maintaining high academic expectations. U-M has very high first to second year retention rates (95%) and four-year graduation rates (73%). The University's International Center data indicate that the number of U-M students studying abroad has almost doubled since 2004. Results from the Graduating Senior Survey and Alumni Survey indicate that both groups are overwhelmingly satisfied with their educational experiences. Likewise, both groups assess their learning as high on a variety of intellectual skills, and both groups overwhelmingly reported that the benefit of a U-M education was worth the cost. About 45% of graduating seniors reported having had a research experience, 70% studied a foreign language, and 83% reported doing community service. U-M graduates have pass rates of over 90% on professional licensure exams.
- U-M has impressive structures in place to support effective teaching and assessment of student learning. The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), with 12 PhD-holding staff members and 20 part-time doctoral student employees, actively supports teaching and learning University-wide in multiple ways. Through CRLT, the University provides grants to improve assessment, offers faculty seminars, coordinates the Provost's Seminars on Teaching, provides support for multicultural teaching and learning, and runs the CRLT Players Theatre Program. Since 2008, CRLT has awarded 20 Investigating Student Learning Grants and 12 faculty innovation grants. In 2008-09, the Center served 14,013 participants (7,704 in campus-wide programs, 4,403 in discipline specific programs, 1,538 individual consultations, and 368 midterm student feedback sessions). These University-wide efforts are complemented by school and college programs. For example, the LSA Teaching Academy, which is required of all new faculty in LSA (first offered in fall 2009), involved 48 new faculty members. CRLT-North supports effective teaching in Engineering. In addition the IDEA Institute supports effective teaching in STEM disciplines. U-M also offers training and support for graduate teaching assistants through the Rackham Graduate School, CRLT, and academic units. Finally, the University recognizes outstanding teaching through several teaching awards for both faculty and graduate student instructors.
- CRLT provides midterm student feedback sessions to new faculty that are required as part of the participation in the LSA Teaching Academy and to other faculty on demand. In 2008-09, CRLT provided 368 such sessions. LSA deans report that participation in their Teaching Academy and midterm student feedback greatly benefitted the 48 new faculty participants, resulting in higher

than normal teaching evaluations.

- 2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention**
 - Not Required.
- 3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.**
 - Not required.
- 4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)**
 - Not required.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION FOUR: ACQUISITION, DISCOVERY, AND APPLICATION OF KNOWLEDGE.

The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

- 1. Evidence that Core Components are met**
 - The University's national and global prominence in research, scholarship, and the creative arts demonstrates a devotion to learning and extension of knowledge at the highest level. The University's faculty members share the intellectual stimulation and challenge of creating and applying new knowledge and are extremely successful in attracting external funding to support their efforts. Faculty and staff describe and value a knowledge environment that is characterized by the touchstone of inquiry and creative activity and that fosters active and meaningful collaborations across organizational and disciplinary boundaries.
 - Students are drawn to U-M by its reputation as a leader in research and scholarship and by the intellectual engagement for which it is known. High quality graduate programs produce about 750 PhD graduates (2008) each year, as well as a similar number of first professional degrees. The University provides numerous opportunities for undergraduate students to engage in the exercise of intellectual inquiry and lifelong learning including internships, research experiences, UROP, and honors theses. Such programs successfully integrate undergraduate learning with the research mission.
 - The institution has carefully articulated policies which elaborate the rights and responsibilities of all members of the University community. That information is made available through publications and web materials. The Board of Regents, the Provost, and the Vice President for Research have enacted policies which

reinforce personal obligations and rights as a faculty member and researcher, in many cases working with the Senate Assembly. Research integrity is supported by policies and well-run organizational structures (e.g. HRPP) which assist researchers in complying with appropriate protocols.

- The special emphasis on internationalization for the reaccreditation self study reflects the University's desire to build on the strengths of its already prolific and productive international activities to create a greater global presence and impact on the institution. The University is positioned to improve course offerings, language learning, support infrastructure, international partnerships, and student opportunities outside the U.S. and on campus to achieve its goals.
- U-M values interdisciplinary study which prepares graduates for the complexity of the future and which fosters new ideas and approaches for acquiring, discovering and applying knowledge. Policies and procedures have been developed to remove barriers and encourage interdisciplinary research. The hiring of interdisciplinary scholars and the development of the Life Sciences Institute and the Multidisciplinary Learning and Team Teaching Initiative are evidence of a demonstrable commitment to promoting new paradigms for learning and creating knowledge. Acquisition of breadth of knowledge and skills by undergraduate students is assured through a combination of program requirements, collaborative programs, student engagement in research, and interdisciplinary activities.
- The University seeks information and feedback to assure that its curricula and programs appropriately prepare students for life and work in a global and technically challenging society. Undergraduates and alumni are invited to participate in a number of nationally benchmarked surveys. PhD student surveys, focus groups with alumni, parents and donors, and faculty surveys and input from numerous advisory groups all help inform the University about opportunities to improve student learning and engagement.
- U-M offers a broad range of awards for faculty, staff and graduate students which recognize research, service, teaching and/or creativity. Training and development opportunities exist for staff members, leadership programs for administrators, and numerous teaching-related programs offer enrichment for faculty and graduate students. Students have a wide variety of academic recognitions, learning centers and activities which motivate them to expand their efforts and horizons.
- The University has in place a very large support system for faculty to pursue external sponsorship of both basic and applied research. In addition to external funding, U-M offers internal grants and awards programs which support a variety of projects that are either in disciplines or situations where external funding is unavailable, including seed funding for innovative ideas and support for the creative arts.
- The University facilitates the application of intellectual property resulting from the creative and innovative activities of faculty, staff and students. U-M takes

measures to inform faculty of the processes for taking ideas to licensing and commercialization. The productive and close relationship with Ann Arbor SPARK provides opportunities for researchers including students to develop commercial applications of their discoveries. Entities such as the Center for Entrepreneurship in the College of Engineering and the Zell-Lurie Institute for Entrepreneurial Studies in the Ross School of Business provide a conducive environment for students to develop the skills needed to develop such applications.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention

- None required.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

- None required.

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)

- None required.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

CRITERION FIVE: ENGAGEMENT AND SERVICE. As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

1. Evidence that Core Components are met

- U-M has demonstrated strong institutional commitment to serve its various constituencies as evidenced by a highly focused, criteria-based approach toward engagement which is primarily defined as connections and service beyond the University, into the community, state, nation and world, with mutually beneficial outcomes.
- The University has organized itself in a variety of effective ways in order to fulfill its outreach and engagement mission and in order to accomplish its strategic engagement interests through strategic thinking and programs that are organic at the campus-wide level and more formalized at the college and unit levels.
- U-M clearly demonstrates its commitment to stimulate economic growth and development as a significant economic contributor to the State of Michigan and beyond. Direct contributions to the economy include funds that the University attracts as well as funds that flow from the University into the community, state and region. For example, U-M employs over 40,000 individuals with an annual payroll of over \$3.5B. Student retail spending alone accounts for \$450M to the

local economy.

- Notably, the President and many other University representatives expressed a strong commitment to leveraging institutional resources to benefit the economic development of the local and state economies. Two major examples of U-M's commitment to advancing the State's economy are: 1) University Research Corridor (URC), an alliance which brings together the expertise and resources of the University of Michigan, Michigan State University and Wayne State University to accelerate economic development through various initiatives, including supporting innovation and encouraging the transfer of technology to the private sector; and 2) the University's many centers and initiatives, including the Office of Technology Transfer, the Business Engagement Center, the Institute for Research on Labor, Employment and the Economy, and the Division of Research Development and Administration.
- Other examples of the University demonstrating its commitment to its civic mission are found in the Health System and the Alumni Association. The Health System, which includes the Medical School, three hospitals, and more than 120 health centers and outpatient clinics, serves 1.7 million patient visits each year. The Alumni Association is an independent organization, which, working on behalf of the University, provides a variety of programs and services designed to nurture and support current and future U-M alumni. Notable efforts include a system of national and international alumni clubs, career services, networking opportunities, and publications. The University currently has over 488,000 living alumni.
- Civic leaders with whom the team met reported that the University leverages its outreach resources in a variety of highly effective ways, primarily through the schools and colleges, including students working in the community as volunteers and interns. U-M advances economic development through many initiatives, including the SPARK program which is an example of a campus-community collaboration working together to strengthen the community as a best place to do business. Civic leaders acknowledged that a critical mass of knowledge workers that the University employs and generates through its graduates are key to the local businesses and enduring quality of life which has recruited and kept people in the region. Another program mentioned by several groups as an authentic way the University engages the state is through the Michigan Roads Scholar Program.
- The University has organized itself to ensure that volunteerism, community outreach, and service learning occur within a highly decentralized structure. Institutional support for such engagement includes training, advice, and establishing connections to the community. University units committed to these efforts include, for example, the Ginsberg Center, the Office of the Vice President for Government Relations (e.g., the Community Assistance Directory), and the Center for Educational Outreach.
- Although U-M does not have an institutional course requirement for service learning, in almost every school and college, courses are offered through which

students can engage in service. The proliferation of such courses is substantiated, for example, by the 2008 survey of graduating seniors where it was noted that there were at least 180 course sections per year involving service learning in which approximately 3,500 students enroll. The Self Study Report notes and it was confirmed through campus interviews that service learning is an increasingly valued approach to teaching at U-M. The Ginsberg Center, established in 1996, as a comprehensive service learning support center, currently works with approximately 2,000 students facilitating direct student involvement in the community.

- One important way the University demonstrates its responsiveness to both campus and greater communities' need for information, community and engagement is through its commitment to public broadcasting known as Michigan Public Media, which includes radio stations in Ann Arbor, Grand Rapids and Flint and well as TV and Cable stations.
- Other examples of community building and engagement which benefit constituents include the broad and extensive offerings of intercollegiate sports and cultural experiences which benefit both the campus community of students, faculty and staff as well as alumni and the greater community. Some examples of the collection of museums and natural settings that are open to the public include the: Detroit Observatory, Exhibit Museum of Natural History, Kelsey Museum of Archeology, Museum of Art, Sindecuse Museum of Dentistry, Stearns Collection of Musical Instruments, Matthaei Botanical Gardens and the Nichols Arboretum.

2. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components need organizational attention

- Not Required.

3. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components require Commission follow-up.

- Not required.

4. Evidence that one or more specified Core Components are not met and require Commission follow-up. (Sanction or adverse action may be warranted.)

- Not required.

Recommendation of the Team

Criterion is met; no Commission follow-up recommended.

V. STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS

A. Affiliation Status

No change.

Rationale for recommendation: The institution did not request any changes nor did the team find any reason for recommending changes.

B. Nature of Organization

1. Legal status

No change.

2. Degrees awarded

No change.

C. Conditions of Affiliation

1. Stipulation on affiliation status

No change.

Rationale: The institution did not request nor did the team find any evidence to recommend any changes.

2. Approval of degree sites

No change.

Rationale: The institution did not request nor did the team find any evidence to recommend any changes.

3. Approval of distance education degree

No change.

Rationale: The institution did not request nor did the team find any evidence to recommend any changes.

4. Reports required

None

5. Other visits scheduled

None

6. Organization change request

No change.

Rationale: The institution did not request any changes.

D. Commission Sanction or Adverse Action

None

E. Summary of Commission Review

Timing for next comprehensive visit: academic year - 2019-2020.

Rationale for recommendation: The University of Michigan continues to meet the criteria for accreditation as established by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. Furthermore, the evidence reviewed by the team leads us to believe that the institution will continue to do so.

The University of Michigan is one of America's premier research universities. Its academic programs are known world-wide for their quality.

VI. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND EXPLANATIONS

None

ADVANCEMENT SECTION

REPORT OF A COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION VISIT

TO

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Ann Arbor, Michigan

March 15-17, 2010

FOR

The Higher Learning Commission

A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools

EVALUATION TEAM

Gilles Bousquet, Dean of International Studies and Director of the International Institute,
University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706

Mark E. Clasen, Professor and Chair, Department of Family Medicine, Wright State University,
Dayton, OH 45420

Celestino Fernández (Chair), University Distinguished Outreach Professor, University of
Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721

Lori S. Franz, Professor of Management, University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, MO 65211

Donald L. Gilstrap, Associate Dean of Libraries, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019

Riall Nolan, Professor of Anthropology, Associate Provost and Dean of International Programs,

Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47906

Douglas M. Priest, Senior Associate Vice President-Finance, Indiana University Bloomington, Bloomington, IN 47405

E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, Minneapolis, MN 55455

R. Michael Tanner, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL 60607

Susan B. Twombly, Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045

Dev Venugopalan, Associate Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, WI 53201

Dieter Wanner, Associate Provost for Global Strategies and International Affairs, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210

Karen M. Whitney, Vice Chancellor for Student Life, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN 46202

Contents

I. Overall Observations about the Organization.....	4
II. Consultations of the Team	4
A. Assessment.....	4
B. Diversity.....	5
C. Internationalization.....	5
1. High-Level Support and Guidance.....	6
2. Diversity in Internationalization.....	6
3. Policy Support.....	7
4. Coordination, Communication and Connection to the Curriculum.....	7
5. Institutionalizing Success.....	8
D. General Comments.....	8
III. Recognition of Significant Accomplishments, Progress, and/or Practices.....	9

I. OVERALL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE ORGANIZATION

The University of Michigan (U-M) made significant progress in many areas since the last comprehensive re-accreditation review. The visiting team was impressed with and commends the University for the clear direction it established and implemented during the past ten-year period, particularly in the context of the several budget reductions from State revenues that the University experienced. Although many programs and activities could be cited as examples here, three stand out: 1) the establishment of 100 new faculty positions to help advance the University's interdisciplinary initiatives; 2) the purchase of the research park to help further U-M's academic mission; and 3) the establishment of the University Research Corridor to promote innovation and support economic development in the State of Michigan and the region. The enthusiasm for U-M was widespread among those meeting with the visiting accreditation team. Given U-M's tradition of decentralization and budgetary models that create college and unit resource management discipline, the sense of cooperation among groups across administrative boundaries was impressive.

The visiting team congratulates U-M for its many accomplishments during the past ten years as well as for the overall morale of faculty, staff, and students found at the University, all of which earned the President and Provost accolades throughout the campus (and the extended community).

II. CONSULTATIONS OF THE TEAM

Although we comment briefly on assessment in this report and have a general note at the end, most of our comments and recommendations pertain to internationalization, U-M's theme for the Special Emphasis self study. The visiting team congratulates U-M for selecting internationalization, a most critical issue in the future of all of our colleges and universities, as its primary focus for the self study. We hope that our comments below will assist the University in furthering its commitment to, and initiatives in internationalization.

A. Assessment

- An incredible amount of valuable faculty and staff-driven outcomes assessment is occurring at U-M. The individual academic units serve as distributed hubs of assessment work, supported by staff in several units across campus. Still, much remains to be done. In the words of one dean, the challenge is how to institutionalize continuous curricular improvement. The visiting team recommends that U-M continue to support its assessment programs and projects.
- The visiting team valued the questions that the Self Study Report poses for the future of teaching and learning at U-M. However, although Rackham Graduate School gathers valuable information through its review of graduate programs, the same level of attention to learning outcomes does not seem to have been devoted to master's and doctoral level programs as has been given to undergraduate programs. Thus, the visiting team recommends that more attention be given to graduate outcomes assessment and to documenting use of

assessment results at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

- There are numerous surveys of graduating students and alumni—at the college, school, department and university levels. The information gleaned from these surveys can be very valuable but the visiting team worries about overuse of such surveys that may lead to diminished response rates. Thus, we recommend that some coordination among units issuing graduating and alumni surveys may benefit the entire community.

B. Diversity

- U-M should continue and build on its efforts to recruit a diverse community of students, faculty and staff, particularly faculty and senior-level administrators. The University should also continue to invest in financial aid to enable a diverse group of students to enroll.

C. Internationalization

The University of Michigan's choice of internationalization for the Special Emphasis self study highlights the institution's commitment to addressing an urgent issue in higher education world-wide. The Broad perspective provided in Chapter 7 of the Self Study Report demonstrates extensive faculty and administrative involvement in the preparation of this institutional snapshot. It represents a thoughtful and thorough reflection on opportunities and challenges before U-M as an institution with a rich palette of international activities.

Internationalization is an emerging area, and there is no overall blueprint for success. At most institutions, internationalization is very much a work in progress with respect to each of these key areas. Each university will internationalize in its own unique way, but all successful internationalization efforts will share some broad and essential characteristics.

- There will be significant university investment in the enterprise, coupled with support from the top administration as well as from faculty.
- Internationalizing universities will construct a web of significant overseas linkages, enabling them to offer a range of international experiences to both students and faculty.
- These overseas experiences will be matched by significant on-campus programs for both domestic and international students, as well as by programs to enhance faculty capabilities for international activity.
- Policies will be in place to both support international activity and to minimize obstacles; in addition, there exist administrative structures to promote and coordinate efforts.
- Activities, however diverse, will unroll within an overall framework or plan which maximizes their importance and impact on campus. Finally, activities will be measured and assessed against institutional standards, goals or benchmarks.

In our discussions with a very wide range of individuals at U-M, we looked at how these various aspects of internationalization manifest themselves. Overall, it should be said that international activity at Michigan is impressive in terms of quality, spread, and significance. This is all the more remarkable when one considers that such activity takes place within a highly decentralized, distributed system. It was clear to the visiting team

that international aspects permeate all units of U-M to varying degrees, permitting the disciplinary academic values to drive the quest for global engagement.

The points which follow are in no sense criticisms, but rather observations, which we recommend the University consider as it moves forward. U-M faces the double challenge of establishing an institutional character or concept for internationalization and of coordinating it across rather loosely federated units for the most effective use of finite resources. In that spirit, we offer the following thoughts.

High-Level Support and Guidance

- The President and the Provost have played a crucial role in elevating internationalization to the current level of relevance at U-M. Their continued championship of these endeavors is essential for substantive success of the initiative.
- The President's and the Provost's compelling articulation of the strong connection between internationalization and Michigan's economic future legitimizes internationalization as a significant focus for U-M as a premier public University.
- At the same time, outside the University and the state of Michigan, changes are occurring in international education which will have a profound effect on what happens here in the future. It will be important, therefore, to position the Vice-Provost for International Affairs to be both an effective institutional representative outside the University, at the national and global level, and also a key resource person for institutional leadership (President, Provost and Deans), providing them with context, guidance and advice as they develop their international initiatives.

Diversity in Internationalization

- The internationalization of the institution's profile of students, faculty, and staff is a major contribution to the global representativeness and relevance of the U-M's mission and operation. It is clear from the Self-Study Report and from the interviews conducted on campus that internationalization is pursued by the leadership and the University's members as a complement to the diversity which characterizes a premier U.S. research institution (i.e., diversity based on American ethnic and racial groups), rather than an easier substitute for such diversity.
- U-M has an impressive number of international students, but it is also worth considering who is not present on the campus, and why. The University may wish to become more intentional in its recruitment efforts (for both students and faculty), to build a more robust and diverse campus population.
- It is also important to provide opportunities for international exposure for those students who, for a variety of reasons, will never go overseas. Building on U-M's existing "Global Classroom" experiences can provide this important opportunity, while at the same time enhancing all other international programs in various ways.

Policy Support

- The Self Study Report and the on campus interviews highlighted the need to considerably lower those factors or conditions which impede faculty work and

prevent students from taking full advantage of existing and potential opportunities. With respect to study abroad, for example, it may be time for a systematic evaluation of the benefits of somewhat more cohesive policies and services such as risk management, operation of study abroad programs, orientation of students and faculty/staff resident directors, pre-departure determination of credit transfer, and the financing and pricing of programs.

- Can a compelling case be made for giving an overarching institutional mandate to the International Institute, increasing its resources and enhancing the position of the vice provost? The Self Study Report mentions the idea of a Center for Global Engagement with such functions. We recommend the University explore further the feasibility, role and function of such a center.
- While leaving the academic content of education abroad in the hands of faculty and their respective units, coordinated institutional policies can assure a more equitable access to education abroad experiences by all students. U-M may also wish to build on the recently launched Global Michigan webportal for international affairs to support both faculty and students across the institution (see e.g. the University of Washington model, found at <http://www.washington.edu/globalaffairs/>).

Coordination, Communication and Connection to the Curriculum

- Since all academic units pursue their own internationalization activities, the playing field is somewhat uneven, particularly for units with more limited resources and less budgetary flexibility. This creates the potential for duplication of effort, increase of cost and less than adequate institutional coordination for best results (focus, sustainability, risks, even treatment of all students and faculty). The leadership's assessment of the balance between coordinated efficiencies and decentralized creativity should permit the institution and its units to follow their preferred mode of operation and succeed in the quest for meaningful internationalization.
- It's not entirely clear how international activity at the different levels is connected to the curriculum, both within one department and across disciplines. A focus on integrating the international dimension into the overall student learning experience, especially at the undergraduate level, could enhance the institutional brand with a signature dimension, the "Michigan Model."
- Beyond its informational impact, the new global web portal will become an essential planning tool once it encompasses a comprehensive inventory of U-M's extensive international activities.
- Given the University's special emphasis on internationalization, there is a real opportunity to broaden and deepen engagement and service through sustained collaboration with the institution's stated aspirations to greater global engagement. Natural bridges exist – for instance, in service learning, in service to the communities of foreigners and immigrants in the State of Michigan, or even in some of the clinical work professional schools carry out in communities. Conversely, this alliance would provide best practices and opportunities for faculty and student involvement while they study or research abroad. The proposed Center for Global Engagement – recommended in Section 7 of the report – could be the vehicle to carry out such collaborations, and just as importantly continued dialogue and joint projects between faculty, staff, and students involved in service and those involved in international education and research. Securing pre-eminence in a global context requires such

thinking and action. The University is encouraged to develop new forms of global-local engagement which can bring the message home as to the importance of educating the next generation of graduates who can enrich their local communities because of their own international expertise and global outlook. A number of themes and areas lend themselves naturally to this synergy, for example, social justice is a structural dimension of the Ginsburg Center activities. Such a theme is eminently global as well as local. Economic development is another area where – as the civic leaders we interviewed put it – the ability of the University to leverage its global assets can make a unique and long-term contribution to the well-being of Michigan.

Institutionalizing Success

- U-M is faced with a well-known knowledge management problem affecting international activities: there's much going on, a lot of things are being taught, researched, studied, and pursued, but how is learning taking place across the campus and across disciplines? How are the ensuing insights integrated into the educational process? Learning how to learn and build on this output to achieve impact on the student experience will be important at the University level.
- As U-M develops a broader presence internationally, it will become important to think about a "partnership culture." How can the institution distinguish key or strategic, long-term, multi-faceted partners from other more opportunistic ventures? How can additional focus, effort and resources be directed to these chosen partnerships? What is a good balance between supporting growth in number and size of programs and centering on consolidation and synthesis of select ventures?
- The true impact of internationalization will be achieved through its institutionalization. Appropriate attention needs to be paid to succession and sustainability of promising and productive initiatives. Assuring success for the institution's most interesting efforts implies the adoption of strategic directions and aspirational goals and outcomes.
- An annual campus-wide international symposium could provide a featured forum for sharing international experiences and learning across the campus, and with overseas partners.

D. General Comments

Consideration of new opportunities should include possible tradeoffs which may be required of existing programs. Additional investments in stable programs with known results may sometimes be preferable to new opportunities with higher resource requirements and less certain benefits (example: additional UROP funding may have benefits that go beyond some alternative expensive student international activities). With the emphasis on nurturing of entrepreneurial programs and new activities, care may need to be taken to protect and encourage the creative arts areas and like programs in their support of core missions.

III. RECOGNITION OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOMPLISHMENTS, PROGRESS, AND/OR PRACTICES

Through outstanding leadership and excellent fiscal management and planning, U-M has done exceptionally well, even in the context of diminishing state funds over several years, to improve the quality of its programs and to maintain its international reputation and standing. Given the institution's current initiatives, such as the funding of 100 new positions in interdisciplinary programs, and future vision for internationalization, U-M is likely to remain one of the nation's, indeed one of the world's best universities.

*Team Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

INSTITUTION and STATE: : University of Michigan, MI

TYPE OF REVIEW (from ESS): Continued Accreditation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW (from ESS): As a part of the Comprehensive Visit, the University has committed itself to conduct a Special Emphasis Study on the role of Internationalization in its academic and organizational operations.

DATES OF REVIEW: 3/15/10 - 3/17/10

Nature of Organization

LEGAL STATUS: Public

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

DEGREES AWARDED: B, M, S, D

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS: Offerings outside of the state are limited to courses.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF NEW DEGREE SITES: Prior Commission approval required.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES: Prior Commission approval required for distance education programs other than the Executive MBA, Master of Engineering-Automotive Engineering, and Master of Engineering-Manufacturing.

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

REPORTS REQUIRED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

OTHER VISITS REQUIRED: None

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 1999 - 2000

YEAR OF NEXT COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION: 2009 - 2010

TEAM RECOMMENDATION: 2019-2020

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE

INSTITUTION and STATE: University of Michigan, MI

TYPE OF REVIEW (from ESS):) : Continued Accreditation
__X_ No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

		Program Distribution	Recommended Change (+ or -)
Programs leading to Undergraduate	Associate	0	
	Bachelors	249	
Programs leading to Graduate	Masters	236	
	Specialist	5	
	First Professional	University of Michigan, MI	
	Doctoral	135	

Off-Campus Activities

In-State:	Present Activity:	Recommended Change: (+ or -)
Campuses: Sites: Course Locations:	None University of Michigan, MI 2	

Out-of-State:	Present Wording:	Recommended Change: (+ or -)
Campuses: Sites: Course Locations:	None University of Michigan, MI Jackson, WY (Camp Davis)	

Out-of-USA:	Present Wording:	Recommended Change: (+ or -)
Campuses: Sites: Course Locations:	None University of Michigan, MI , Japan (Global MBA East Asia)	

Distance Education Certificate and Degree Offerings:

Present Offerings:

University of Michigan, MI

**Recommended Change:
(+ or -)**