

# HISTORY OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE AT UMUC <sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

The purpose of this appendix is to provide a retrospective of UMUC that focuses on four fundamental points:

- The relationship of the curricula across its divisions
- The importance of adjunct faculty
- The model for providing academic oversight
- The role of faculty in governance

The documentary bases for this Appendix are principally the self-studies prepared for each of the decennial visits from 1966 through 2006 and the corresponding available MSCHE team visit reports (1986, 1996, and 2006). Other documents, such as the 1981 Periodic Review Report, were also consulted.

The chief findings that emerge from this review are the following:

1. The curricula across the three divisions (Europe, Asia, and Stateside) developed in divergent directions until this trend was decisively reversed by the curricular centralization at UMUC after 2000. It was the acceleration of online education, the emergence of the stateside division as growth engine of the University, and the common syllabus project that produced a centrally approved catalogue, common course numbers, and a common approach to teaching the same courses.
2. The value of practitioners teaching as adjunct faculty has been recognized by UMUC at least since the 1960s, well before the explosion in the use adjuncts in American higher education. Adjunct faculty have been the backbone of the stateside instructional staff, and they have always played a significant role in the overseas divisions. For these reasons, adjunct faculty have long been incorporated into the academic life of the UMUC with respect to curricula, textbooks, syllabi and governance in general.
3. UMUC academic programs have always been overseen by full-time faculty/academic administrators. However, the number of these full-time faculty/academic administrators stateside has always been quite small relative to the very large number of adjunct faculty who

---

<sup>1</sup> This appendix was developed by Dr. Greg von Lehmen, former Provost and later Senior Vice President at UMUC. As a draft, it benefitted greatly from review by former senior UMUC administrators whose lived experience at UMUC provided important context or clarification. These included Dr. Nicholas Allen (Interim President and Provost Emeritus), Dr. Joseph Arden (Vice President, Overseas Military Programs), Dr. John Golembe (Director, Europe), Dr. Paula Harbecke (Vice President and Director, Asia; Vice President and Director, Europe), Dr. Mary Ellen Hrutka (Vice Provost and Dean, School of Undergraduate Studies), and Dr. Julian Jones (Vice President and Director, Europe and Vice President and Director, Asia). Dr. Theodore Stone, an early chair and long-serving member of the UMUC Faculty Advisory Council, contributed to the section on governance.

dominate the instructional staff. The ways of classifying these administrators and the qualifications for their positions have changed over time.

4. UMUC's own governance has had three characteristics that distinguish it in crucial ways from the common model centered on the traditional Faculty Senate. First, its governance structures have been fluid, changing as UMUC itself has changed. This fluidity is reflected in each and every of the self-studies from 1965 onward. Second, UMUC's own governance structures have always been advisory. Third, as already noted, and consistent with UMUC's instructional model, these structures have included adjunct faculty.
5. MSCHE site visit teams have not fundamentally questioned UMUC's faculty administrative model, its faculty classifications, its heavy reliance on adjunct faculty, or its approach to governance, recognizing their congruence with the institution's mission and as otherwise meeting the Commission's Standards.

### Overview of UMUC's Institutional Development

UMUC's development as an institution is complex and requires some discussion to provide the necessary context for engaging the questions above. This section canvasses UMUC's provenance, its designation as a UM campus and later as a member of the USM, and its subsequent efforts to achieve both academic and administrative integration.

#### Provenance and Mission

UMUC has its roots in the land-grant tradition of the University of Maryland (UM). "Prior to 1947, the various Colleges, Departments, or individual faculty members of the University [of Maryland] offered off-campus courses for adults on a non-coordinated basis where need was evidenced and arrangements could be effected."<sup>2</sup> With the end of WWII and the surge in the demand for these offerings, there was a need for a separate college on the UM campus to centrally manage these efforts. Consequently, in 1947 the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland approved the creation of a new unit within the University, the College of Special and Continuing Studies.<sup>3</sup> In 1958, this unit was renamed "University College".<sup>4</sup> From the start, this unit was financially self-supporting, a fact that has changed little through its history.

Of course, UMUC's mission was not limited to the State of Maryland. It quickly included active-duty military personnel not only in Maryland and the District of Columbia but also overseas under contracts with the US Department of Defense. In the story that is well known, the University of Maryland began offering courses to US Forces deployed in Europe in 1949, in the Atlantic (Newfoundland, Labrador, Greenland and Iceland) in 1951 and the Far East (Japan,

---

<sup>2</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), pp. i-ii.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), p. 1.

Korea, Okinawa and Taiwan) in 1956.<sup>5</sup> While originally organized as three overseas divisions with separate Directors—Europe, the Atlantic and the Far East—by 1986 this organization was resolved into two overseas divisions, the European Division and the “Asian Division” which stood side-by-side with the “Stateside Division” as units within University College.

### UMUC as a UM campus

In 1970, the University of Maryland Board Of Regents approved a plan to make UM a multi-campus institution.<sup>6</sup> The purpose of the change was to allow UM to better serve the State during a period of enormous enrollment growth.<sup>7</sup> The campuses were College Park, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Eastern Shore, and the “University of Maryland University College”.<sup>8</sup> College Park continued to be the academic and administrative center of gravity for the multi-campus UM. In language that seems peculiar today, each of the five campuses, including UMUC, was led by a Chancellor who reported to the UM President and his “central administration”.<sup>9</sup>

The titles and numbers of positions reporting to the UMUC Chancellor changed as UMUC continued to grow as a UM campus. By 1986, UMUC’s organization included a Vice Chancellor for Statewide Programs who reported to the Chancellor and whose broad portfolio included all credit and non-credit academic programs offered in Maryland. His reports included a Graduate Dean, who was responsible for managing UMUC graduate programs stateside. The Vice Chancellor sat side-by-side on the organization chart with the overseas Directors who also reported directly to UMUC’s Chancellor and had analogous academic and administrative responsibility for their programs.<sup>10</sup>

It is critical to note that its designation as a UM campus set in motion a disengagement from College Park, although this development was complex.<sup>11</sup> UMUC’s distinctive mission as a campus continued to be that of bringing the larger University of Maryland to students who could not go to school full-time or during day-time hours. “University College”, the 1976 Self-study reports, “is the College which embraces the entire University to take the talents and resources of the many parts of the larger system to the people of the community”.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, the 1986 Self-

---

<sup>5</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), p. 3

<sup>6</sup> UMUC 1976 Self-Study (Stateside), p. 39.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid*, p. 25.

<sup>8</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 145 (Appendix II A)

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid*, Appendix IIA, p. 145. At this time, the titles of Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and Assistant Chancellor were institutional titles of campus officers.

<sup>10</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp. 22 – 24.

<sup>11</sup> Reviewer comments by both Dr. Joseph Arden and Dr. John Golembe were particularly helpful in understanding this development.

<sup>12</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 1. See also page 3: “Certainly UMUC is not wholly separate [from UM]—nor does it wish to be—since it continues to rely on the departments of other campuses for courses, faculty review, staffing and some degree of monitoring of the courses it offers. It also depends on the facilities of the other campuses...And like the other campuses reports to the University of Maryland central administration and to the Board of Regents”.

study, notes that “University College has the mission of extending the resources of the University [of Maryland] to students who cannot or choose not to attend college full-time at a traditional campus”.<sup>13</sup> Still, the relationship between UMUC and College Park no longer completely defined UMUC. In various ways and at varying speeds, the different divisions of UMUC began to develop independently of College Park.

The College Park departments came gradually to delegate academic oversight to the overseas programs because of their distance, complexity and size, although links in some cases were still retained with those departments.<sup>14</sup> While UMUC stateside remained much closer to College Park, administratively and otherwise even as late as 1986, it began to offer a limited number of its own courses and degree programs to fill needs in Maryland that College Park and the other campuses were not meeting.<sup>15</sup> These included select undergraduate and graduate programs.<sup>16</sup> Growing independence was manifested in other ways. These included the initiation of student course surveys across all divisions, which stateside applied to all faculty including College Park professors teaching for UMUC on overload.<sup>17</sup> All divisions also increasingly took responsibility for faculty development.<sup>18</sup>

#### UMUC as Member of USM

It was with the formation of the University System of Maryland in 1988 that UMUC began to operate in a way that was completely uncoupled from College Park and the other campuses. In that year, Maryland reorganized its six State teachers colleges, the five UM campuses and two research centers into the then 13-member USM.<sup>19</sup> The campus-level titles—Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and so forth—became system-level titles. Each of the five former UM campuses were led by their own Presidents, Chief Academic Officers and Vice Presidents. Within this change, UMUC’s movement toward an identity not defined in reference to UM or the other campuses came into its fullness. UMUC became completely independent with respect to its mission, academic governance and programs.

---

<sup>13</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 1. See also the 1986 reaffirmation letter from MSCHE which states that UMUC is “the continuing education campus of the University of Maryland and extends the University’s resources to part-time students throughout the state and overseas”. June 30, 1986 letter from Henrietta T. Smith, Vice Chair, MSCHE, to Dr. T Benjamin Massey with copy to President John S. Toll, President, University of Maryland.

<sup>14</sup> This point was emphasized by several of the reviewers.

<sup>15</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp. 53, 99-103.

<sup>16</sup> See 1986 Self-study, p. 53. The Master of General Administration was the first graduate program in 1978. What followed was a rapidly expanding graduate portfolio that was developed *de novo* without reference to the College Park curriculum and designed to focus on emerging workforce needs. For background on UMUC’s development of graduate programs, see 1976 UMUC Self-study, pp. 37-38 and 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp. 99 – 103.

<sup>17</sup> See 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 27. Dr. Golembe drew attention to this point and the next in his review of a draft of this appendix.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. See also 1986 Self-study, pp. 63ff.

<sup>19</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p. 5.

## Momentum toward Institutional Integration

Throughout these years, what was called University College was in large measure a confederation of relatively autonomous divisions.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, in important ways the divisions were not equal. Reflecting the large overseas deployment of Forces during the Cold War up until the mid-1990s, the overseas divisions, particularly Europe, were by far the preponderant operations within the UMUC as measured by enrollment and financial contribution. By 2006, however, the relationship among the divisions had decisively changed. The overseas' contribution had shrunk to "25 percent" of UMUC-wide revenue, and the Stateside Division by every measure had become the dominant operation.<sup>21</sup> This change was one factor among several that facilitated the consolidating efforts, led by the Stateside Division, that are clearly reflected in the 2006 Self-study.

The 2006 Self-study attributes the swing in relative size of the divisions partly to the US military drawdown abroad in the 1990s but even more to UMUC's embrace of technology to make it one of the first movers in distance education.<sup>22</sup> Led by the Stateside Division, this commitment to technology and its possibilities for education are evident in the 1996 Self-study which describes "distance" courses conducted through "computer conferencing" and "email" and includes a task force report on the "UMUC's future as a Virtual University".<sup>23</sup> By 2006, the Self-study is announcing online enrollments "surpassing 142,000 in FY 2005".<sup>24</sup> As will be seen below, the rapid development of technology, the launch of online education and the emergence of Stateside as the dominant division were all factors that created the momentum for making UMUC truly one university.

## The Relationship of the Curricula across UMUC Divisions

The ten-year period 1996 to 2006 was pivotal with respect to how UMUC managed its curricula across its divisions. Before this period there was a high degree of autonomy among the divisions in their offerings and how the courses were taught. By 2006, the curricula were becoming much more standardized. This pattern is consistent with the development of UMUC sketched in the foregoing section.

### The Period to 1996

The degrees at the center of this discussion are the BA, BA and AA degrees. The BA and BS degrees have been offered and continue to be offered across all University College divisions. While never offered stateside in competition with community colleges, the AA nonetheless has been a degree that the overseas divisions have each provided. University College graduate

---

<sup>20</sup> This description of the divisions as "relatively autonomous" occurs in the 1976 University College Self-study (Stateside) p. 10; the 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 19, and the 1996 MSCHE Team Report, p. 6.

<sup>21</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 6

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p 27-28 and Appendix E

<sup>24</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 1

programs do not play a role in this discussion. With exceptions both rare and brief, they have only been offered stateside.<sup>25</sup>

The self-studies indicate that the BA, BS and AA degrees went through a number of revisions—beginning as general studies degrees and later structured around concentrations or specializations and ultimately majors and minors. The courses—the building blocks—for these concentrations were for many years mostly the result of a coordinated curriculum development process at College Park. Consequently, they were courses of the larger University of Maryland or courses approved by the College Park departments for UMUC to offer. Even so, the curricular offerings diverged for a number of reasons.

First, each of the University College divisions sought approval of courses and concentrations that served their students but were not necessarily offered by the other divisions.<sup>26</sup> Second, in some cases, the overseas divisions created and offered their own “special topics” courses sometimes without College Park involvement. Third, the requirements of even common concentrations allowed considerable freedom in the specific courses the divisions might offer to permit students to fulfill them.<sup>27</sup> The result was a curriculum in some measure dividing along geographic lines with the divisional location of the student determining the availability of concentrations and courses.<sup>28</sup> As the decades passed, even the numbering of ‘common’ courses did not always match.<sup>29</sup> As late as the 1996 Self-study, “UMUC courses and degree programs offered worldwide” are not described as the same but as “comparable”.<sup>30</sup>

Apart from varying programs and courses, there was no standardization in how classroom courses were taught. All of the documentation through 1996 reflects the model in which faculty, subject to a common course description, textbook, syllabus examples of other faculty, and other general guidelines, created their own syllabi and assignments for face-to-face courses. Instructional quality control in part consisted of a periodic review of the syllabi and examinations

---

<sup>25</sup> The AA degree was offered in Europe beginning in 1951 and was later extended to Asia. The BA in General Studies was authorized in 1953 and the BS in General Studies by 1973. Both degrees became staples of all UC divisions. University College had no graduate programs of its own prior to 1976. In the years that followed, however, its graduate portfolio steadily expanded, so that by the 2006 self-study UMUC had 20 master’s programs and the Doctor of Management. With rare exceptions, these programs were not offered through the overseas divisions. See 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), Introduction; 1976 University College Self-study (Stateside), Chapter IV; 1986 UMUC Self-study, Chapter 7; 1996 University of Maryland University College Self-study, Chapter 4; 2006 UMUC Self-study, Chapters 10-11. Note that starting in 1947, the Stateside division coordinated a BS in Military Science at off campus locations for the UM Department of Military Science, Physical Education, and Recreation. This degree was transferred to University College in 1958 but was phased out starting in the fall 1963. See 1965 University College Self-study [Europe], p. II-2

<sup>26</sup> Examples are the AA and later the BA with a focus on Japanese studies. The 1981 Periodic Review Report for the Far East observes (p. 6) that. “(b)eginning in 1975-1976, the [Far East] Division developed a 60-hour Associate of Art degree in Japanese Studies”. Similarly, the 1986 UMUC Self-study reports that “(t)he Asian Division has devoted considerable effort to provide a *unique* concentration in Asian studies and plans to make further enhancements” [p.97]. Emphases provided. These concentrations were not offered in Europe.

<sup>27</sup> See for example the University College 1965 Self-study, Appendix D.

<sup>28</sup> 1976 University College Self-study (Europe), p. III-1

<sup>29</sup> This is an observation of Dr. Nicholas Allen, commenting on the undergraduate curricula as late as 1998/1999.

<sup>30</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p. 9

put together by faculty members.<sup>31</sup> The exception by 1996 at the undergraduate level were “distance education” courses which were developed by teams as standardized “course packages” with the “core materials” being the syllabus and “course guide” that defined the “student learning outcomes and performance standards”, “integrated print and non-print media” and included “sample written assignments and exam questions”.<sup>32</sup> By 2006, this trend toward standardization encompassed all courses regardless of modality.

#### The Period 1996 – 2006

The 2006 Self-study reflects three major changes that produced greater uniformity in the curricular experience of UMUC students worldwide:

- First, there was the consolidation of “the stateside and overseas undergraduate departments under the School of Undergraduate Studies”.<sup>33</sup> While the relationship continued to be consultative, this nonetheless placed the stateside campus at the center of academic decision-making and was meant to align the administration of undergraduate academic programs across all divisions with a common vision provided stateside by the undergraduate school.
- Second, there was the vision itself which included “revising and standardizing undergraduate syllabi” worldwide.<sup>34</sup> The vehicle for this standardization was the “common syllabus” which specified for each course, whether offered face-to-face or online, its “learning outcomes, teaching materials, and suggested approaches to teaching the course”.<sup>35</sup> Allowance was made for approved differences in textbooks overseas in cases where using the same textbook presented logistical problems. Without changing common elements, instructors were able to adapt to them to the varying lengths of face-to-face and online course formats and to supplement with their own expertise.<sup>36</sup> These changes were promoted to support a common standard of quality, better sequencing of courses, and learning outcomes assessment.
- Third, by 2006, developments enabled UMUC to move in the direction of a truly common undergraduate catalog available to all UMUC students regardless of location. This was facilitated both by the ubiquity of online delivery and by a conscious effort, supported by student success considerations, to stipulate or recommend the courses needed to complete each degree.<sup>37</sup> Flexible at the “backend” for transfer credit, the streamlining of the curricula provided students with an explicit path to degree completion and reduced the course inventory and the cost of maintaining it.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study 70-71, 1996, p49 and 1996 MSCHE Summary of Findings, p. 5.

<sup>32</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, pp. 37-38.

<sup>33</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 5

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, p. 97 and 2006 MSCHE Team Report, pp. 23-29, 34.

<sup>36</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, pp. 96-97.

<sup>37</sup> Dr. Mary Ellen Hrutka underscored the retention-related considerations as central to this change in her review.

<sup>38</sup> See 2005-2006 School of Undergraduate Studies Catalog.

## The Importance of Adjunct Faculty

A consistent theme across the self-studies is high value UMUC places on adjunct faculty. They have played an enormous role in the delivery of UMUC programs. They are included in governance structures, given adjunct rank and even invited into support roles in academic administration. Likewise, extensive development programs for them become fixed features at UMUC.<sup>39</sup> Its ‘adjunct culture’ is contrasted with the departmental culture of the larger University of Maryland centered on full-time faculty expected to do research as well as teach.<sup>40</sup> This difference is ultimately rooted in University College’s teaching mission to adult, “career-oriented students”.

The heavy reliance on adjunct faculty in the stateside is a prominent theme throughout the self-studies. The 1965 Self-study suggests that all of University’s College’s courses stateside were offered by individuals who taught for it on a part-time basis.<sup>41</sup> In 1976 and 1986, no less than 95% and 99% of the faculty, respectively, are reported as teaching part-time.<sup>42</sup> In 1996, a small percentage of courses are taught by “faculty administrators” but most offerings are by adjunct faculty.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, in 2006, the backbone of the stateside instructional staff continued to be adjuncts, although full-time faculty had grown to 14% of the active faculty headcount.<sup>44</sup> The terrific growth of the stateside programs meant that by 2006 the largely adjunct character of its faculty, as a sheer matter of proportionality, defined the face of the instructional staff for UMUC as a whole.<sup>45</sup>

The importance of adjunct faculty has been a fact in the overseas divisions as well. As the staffing models of these divisions evolved, they came to rely on a significant cadre of “core faculty” to staff their courses. This category consisted of annually-appointed faculty normally hired stateside and local faculty who were appointed term-by-term but who taught full course loads each year. The latter group of faculty were logistically sponsored by UMUC so that they could use facilities on military installations and enjoy other benefits connected with sponsorship. In practice, these were professional faculty who relied on their divisions for their livelihood.<sup>46</sup>

But the importance of core faculty did not eclipse the need for adjuncts. The 1986 self-study indicates that 60% of the sections in Asia and 68% in Europe are taught by “core faculty”.<sup>47</sup> In 1996, the number of core overseas faculty (465) is supplemented by a relatively large active adjunct staff (389).<sup>48</sup> In 2006, core faculty and adjunct faculty are each about half of the overseas

---

<sup>39</sup> See 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp 114ff and 2006 UMUC Self-study, pp. 91ff.

<sup>40</sup> See for example the 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside, p. 71.

<sup>41</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. 17 and Appendix G.

<sup>42</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside) p. 64, 1986 UMUC Self-study p 161.

<sup>43</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p. 92.

<sup>44</sup> 2006 MSCHE team report, p. 29 and 2006 UMUC Self-study p. 87.

<sup>45</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 87

<sup>46</sup> See 1976 UMUC Self-study (Europe), pp. V-2-4; 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp 153ff; 1996 UMUC Self-study, pp. 93ff.

<sup>47</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 153

<sup>48</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p. 92



instructional staff by headcount.<sup>49</sup> Adjuncts are consistently recognized as crucial to staffing a significant proportion of overseas courses and valued for what they bring to those programs. This is was the case with military officers who early on taught “military studies” but included mathematics and other disciplines.<sup>50</sup>

A crucial point about the category of part-time or adjunct faculty is who these faculty are. In 1965 and 1976, a third of faculty teaching part-time for University College stateside were “regular” members of University of Maryland faculty offering courses on overload.<sup>51</sup> For a variety of reasons, including enrollment growth that made UM departments less inclined to share “regular” faculty, this group contributed less and less to University College’s staffing over time. The predominant “type” of faculty member teaching for University College became more the part-timer who works outside academia and who brings to the classroom ‘knowledge tested and applied’ every day in professional settings.<sup>52</sup> The 1965 Self-study likens this knowledge to ‘research viewed broadly’, assimilating it to the research that full-time College Park faculty share with their students.<sup>53</sup> In later documents University College unapologetically embraces “[t]he widespread use of working professionals as adjunct faculty” as particularly suited to the instructional mission to part-time adult students.<sup>54</sup> “Career oriented students..... appreciate faculty who can give first-hand accounts of how the subject matter can be applied in the world of work”.<sup>55</sup> In 1996, the term “scholar practitioners” is applied to these adjunct faculty to capture their particular value.<sup>56</sup>

### The Model for Providing Academic Oversight

The chief focus of this section is the Stateside Division since it becomes the center of financial and administrative gravity for UMUC, and its oversight structures thereby assume heightened importance for the University as a whole. As suggested by the discussion of adjunct faculty above, the academic oversight role stateside has always been exercised primarily with respect to a largely adjunct faculty. This has been true regardless of where oversight resided, whether principally with College Park academic departments in the earlier years or later with an increasingly independent UMUC. The chief conclusion of this section concerns the evolution in how the academic oversight role itself has been staffed. Specifically, the evolution is away from traditional faculty in this role—hired principally for their ability to teach—toward individuals who are appointed equally with an eye to their ability to manage. This conclusion becomes particularly clear when tracing the development of faculty classifications and job titles at UMUC.

---

<sup>49</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 86

<sup>50</sup> See for example, 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), p. IV-3; 1976 UMUC (Europe), p. V-3

<sup>51</sup> 1965 Self-study (Stateside), p. 17, Appendix G; 1976 UMUC Self-study, p. 64.

<sup>52</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. 25.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 143.

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, p. 91.

The 1965 Self-Study (Stateside) references three categories for faculty” “full-time administrative faculty”, “full-time teaching faculty” and “part-time faculty”.<sup>57</sup> The “full-time administrative faculty” as a category likely referred to the Dean of University College and the Assistant Deans whose sole or predominant responsibility was programmatic rather than faculty management. At this time the direct oversight of University College stateside faculty, full-time and part-time, rested with the academic department heads at College Park.<sup>58</sup> By far, most of the University College faculty they supervised were “part-timers” whose day jobs were not teaching.<sup>59</sup>

Stateside, University College’s “full-time teaching faculty” and “part-time” faculty were ranked; overseas faculty were appointed annually, did not have rank, and were referred to as “lecturers”.<sup>60</sup> Because of the distance, the supervision of overseas faculty rested primarily with their “area directors”, who monitored their day-to-day teaching performance, and with “subject supervisors” who in general had a link, sometimes less restrictive in practice, with College Park departments and exercised oversight in the matters of textbooks, syllabi and other academic matters.<sup>61</sup> ‘Subject supervisors’ are referred to as “staff”.<sup>62</sup>

The 1965 Self-study (Europe) notes the burden on College Park departments of supporting University College operations.<sup>63</sup> This was particularly true with respect to UMUC’s stateside programs with which College Park was most closely involved. As UMUC stateside programs grew, the larger College Park departments assigned oversight responsibilities to “specific administrators”, usually associate or assistant department chairs in the departments. These positions were financially-supported by UMUC and were referred to as “coordinators” in their “liaison role between the UMUC administration and the particular University of Maryland department or college concerned”.<sup>64</sup> In the Stateside Division, this role was far-reaching. These ‘coordinators’ cleared faculty to teach particular courses and also staffed them to particular sections. They were “formally responsible for faculty performance and [were] contacted by UMUC when a teaching problem arises.”<sup>65</sup> They stipulated or reviewed the selection of

---

<sup>57</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. 17 and Appendix F.

<sup>58</sup> 1965 Self-study (Europe), Introduction, University College Organization Chart. 1965 Self-study (Stateside), pp. i, 2, 19, 26. The 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), pp. i, 32, notes that “Academic control resides with the appropriate academic department who approves all courses, faculty, recommends textbooks and other materials”. The 1965 University College Self-study (Europe) describes the UM departments as approving the particular courses to be offered in Europe, the full-time and part-time faculty to teach them (pp. 3,8), exercising some level of oversight with respect to textbooks and academic policies, and sometimes even visiting division (VI-3). Elements of these statements can be found in the Self-studies through 1986. That UMUC Self-study mentions that College Park or other UM campuses may be involved in the teaching approval of UMUC stateside faculty and that “College Park” in particular is still scheduling faculty for 40% of UMUC stateside courses (p. 162). With respect to the overseas divisions, the 1986 Self-study describes the UM departments as directly approving “core” faculty and in some cases adjunct faculty (pp. 163-165).

<sup>59</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. 17 and Appendix G.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid, pp. 18-19; 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), p. 8-9, V-5.

<sup>61</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Europe), pp. V-19 through V-37.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid, VI-3

<sup>63</sup> Ibid, p. 8

<sup>64</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), pp. 68-69. 1976 Self-study (Europe), p. V-5.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., p. 69

textbooks and even received grade distributions and copies of examinations from the overseas divisions. In general, “departmental coordinators assist[ed] the UMUC administration in monitoring the teaching of UMUC courses from their departments.”<sup>66</sup> The oversight of the overseas programs by these CP ‘coordinators’ continued to be supported by “coordinators” (formerly the ‘subject supervisors’) there.<sup>67</sup> But as noted earlier, these links were sometimes more formal than real with effective delegation of academic program oversight to the overseas divisions.

As had always been the case stateside, the UMUC faculty that the College Park departmental “coordinators” supervised continued to be largely “part-time. These consisted of UM faculty on overload and adjuncts with other day jobs, with the latter group teaching most of the offerings. UMUC continued to have a full-time teaching staff of its own, although by headcount it constituted only 5% of its total teaching staff.<sup>68</sup> By 1976, it adopted the overseas model of annually-appointed “lecturers” and stopped appointing stateside faculty to a traditional rank.<sup>69</sup> The overseas divisions had fully realized the category of term-appointed, logistically-supported faculty as equally, if not more important, to their instructional model than the annually-appointed lecturers.

By 1986, while still a UM campus, UMUC had begun developing courses and academic programs that were independent of the UM departments.<sup>70</sup> When it did so, it extended the familiar administrative model to these programs. “Discipline coordinators” at the undergraduate level and “course coordinators” at the graduate level were appointed to approve faculty, monitor teaching performance, and advise students, among other duties related to their UMUC programs.<sup>71</sup> At the undergraduate level, there was no change in faculty classification—either stateside or overseas—but there was a reduction stateside in the number of annually-appointed lecturers. As a result, UMUC’s stateside coordinators managed an instructional model approaching a fully adjunct one.<sup>72</sup> As graduate programs were started by UMUC, it appointed full-time faculty at a traditional rank instead of using the undergraduate “lecturer” model.<sup>73</sup> Nonetheless, by headcount the number of active graduate adjunct faculty greatly outnumbered the full-time teaching staff.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid

<sup>67</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Europe), pp. V-5 and V-6.

<sup>68</sup> 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 64.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid, pp. 64-65; 1976 UMUC Self-study (Europe), p. V-1.

<sup>70</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. p. 51-53 and 99-103.

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, 51-53 and 1981 Periodic Review Report (Stateside), p. 13.

<sup>72</sup> The 1986 UMUC Self-study indicates that there are a small number of annually-appointed lecturers but does not provide a breakout of stateside full-time and adjunct faculty. See p 161. The 1981 Periodic review Report (Stateside) indicates that the number of annually-appointed faculty positions actually fell by nearly two-thirds from 1976 levels, with an even greater reliance on adjunct faculty. Compare pp. 11-12 with the 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 65.

<sup>73</sup> 1981 Periodic Review Report (Stateside), p. 16 and 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 149.

<sup>74</sup> 1981 Periodic Review Report (Stateside), pp. 35-36.

Originally, these UMUC stateside coordinators were faculty who were hired on the basis of their ability to teach and who performed their oversight and advising roles side-by-side with some level of teaching. However, the experience with this system was that it mismatched people and needs. Faculty recruited and appointed primarily to teach did not necessarily enjoy their non-teaching duties. In the Graduate School, the “overall morale of the full-time faculty was poor and attrition was high”, and it was the first to make changes.<sup>75</sup> By 1986, it had reorganized itself. It appointed “subject area directors” to serve as “academic administrators”.<sup>76</sup> These were classified as faculty but administration was their focus. This was emphasized by making their traditional “professorial” ranks adjunct ranks.<sup>77</sup> “Management experience” was identified co-equally with academic experience as essential for appointment. With this change, moreover, the graduate instructional model was also converted to a completely adjunct one. These “subject area directors” functioned as department chairs “but without full-time faculty.”<sup>78</sup>

By 1996, eight years after UMUC became a USM institution, the graduate school model was adopted by the much larger undergraduate school. UMUC retained a classification system that recognized two categories of faculty in addition to adjuncts: “core faculty” and “faculty administrators.”<sup>79</sup> “Core faculty” came to be the classification applied to lecturers who were annually-appointed and those who were term-appointed and logistically-supported. In 1996, the only core faculty that belonged to the Stateside Division were those it assigned to support a new program it directly managed in Russia; core faculty continued for all practical purposes to apply as a category only to Europe and Asia.<sup>80</sup> The remaining undergraduate faculty stateside were converted to “faculty administrators”.

‘Faculty administrators’ had teaching responsibilities as part of their professional duties. However, their role was primarily program leadership and faculty management, and they were appointed with attention to those skills as well as to their academic talent.<sup>81</sup> In the undergraduate school these ‘faculty administrators’ were called “academic directors”; in the graduate school they were renamed “departmental directors” and “associate directors.”<sup>82</sup> By 1996, with the undergraduate school making this change, and with its reduction in annually-appointed lecturers, it looked very much like the graduate school. UMUC stateside relied on “a small cadre of academic administrators, who are also faculty, and a large number of part-time faculty—scholarly practitioners—to serve....an astute population of adult learners.”<sup>83</sup>

In the next decade, UMUC stateside had begun to hire full-time teaching faculty again to help anchor large and growing programs. At the same time, it revamped its way of classifying faculty.

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid, p. 149.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid, p. 150.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid, p. 150. Adjuncts had “professorial” ranks as well.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid, pp. 150, 151.

<sup>79</sup> 1996 UMUC Self-study, pp. 92-94.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid, p. 94

<sup>81</sup> Ibid, p. 23

<sup>82</sup> Ibid, p. 93

<sup>83</sup> Ibid, p. 91.

It did this as a result of changes in USM faculty policy. Its new classification eliminated categories like “core faculty” and the title of “lecturer”, instituted “professorial” ranks, and permitted multi-year contracts but without the possibility of tenure. It made these changes for several reasons. One was to ensure recognition that UMUC, as a large and growing university, had a full-time teaching staff; a fact less transparent as a result of using unconventional faculty titles. Another goal was to help ensure faculty quality by providing for a progression in rank and carefully defining the qualifications for each rank.<sup>84</sup> The absence of tenure was a feature mindful of UMUC’s self-supporting financial status.

The two poles of the new classification are “collegiate” and “adjunct” faculty.<sup>85</sup> The “collegiate” category is defined as “full-time faculty hired on 12-month or 9-month contracts annually renewable or in multi-year increments” and includes those faculty who are hired primarily to manage programs but are given a reduction in teaching load to facilitate their administrative role.<sup>86</sup> The category included annually-appointed faculty who taught full-time. It also included term-appointed, logistically supported faculty teaching overseas who were converted to collegiate status. With this change, “academic directors” in the undergraduate school and “programs directors” in the graduate school also became collegiate faculty.

As a classification, “adjunct faculty” is simply defined as faculty appointed to teach on a course-by-course basis. Under the new faculty classification system, adjuncts are also assigned rank and are able to earn promotions on rank. In 2006, adjuncts were limited to 15 semester hours per year.<sup>87</sup> This was the same number of hours that a collegiate faculty member could teach in overload. The application of this same limit to adjunct faculty was the recognition that adjuncts are generally otherwise employed.<sup>88</sup>

As a pilot that for a time became institutionalized, UMUC offered 9-month and 12-month contracts to members of its adjunct faculty and new recruits who were not full-time employed and who desired to teach more than the typical adjunct faculty member. These contracts came with collegiate rank and limited benefits.<sup>89</sup> This type of appointment left intact the load limit policy that otherwise applied to adjuncts and enabled UMUC to more quickly expand its teaching staff to meet the needs of expanding programs. In time, however, this appointment was phased out.

These changes did not alter UMUC stateside’s basic academic instructional model. Even with additional hiring, collegiate faculty remained a small percentage of the total faculty by headcount; the majority of courses were still taught by adjuncts whose number stateside had

---

<sup>84</sup> UMUC 2006 Self-study, p. 4. and Chapter 9. See also UMUC Policy 181.00 (6/30/03) and its successor 181.00 (6/30/07).

<sup>85</sup> UMUC 2006 Self-study, p. 85 and Policy 181 (6/30/07)

<sup>86</sup> Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, pp. 85, 88 and UMUC Policy 181 (6/30/07)

<sup>88</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 88.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid, p. 90.

swelled to well over 1,000.<sup>90</sup> The case remained that managing a largely adjunct faculty was the responsibility of a small number of stateside undergraduate “academic directors” and graduate “program directors” who were classified as collegiate faculty, were appointed on the basis of administrative as well as academic talent, but whose focus was not teaching but academic program management.<sup>91</sup> Moreover, even with additional collegiates, the role of adjuncts continued to expand, with adjunct faculty in the undergraduate school in some cases acting in support roles, such as “course chairs” with responsibility for maintaining the currency of courses.<sup>92</sup>

This structure has not been fundamentally questioned by MSCHE site visit teams. The 1996 MSCHE Team Report observed that “(t)he University employs full-time academic administrators who also teach and fulfill the responsibilities of full-time faculty and a large number of part-time faculty... While the absence of ‘traditional’ full-time faculty necessitated a waiver by the Maryland Higher Education Commission, the team found the waiver fully warranted.”<sup>93</sup> The Report acknowledged that this structure is aligned with UMUC’s mission; that “given UMUC’s mission serving adults in the current workforce, its faculty structure is highly appropriate”.<sup>94</sup> With the enrollment growth that occurs stateside between 1996 and 2006, the 2006 MSCHE Team cautioned, for reasons of “program continuity and reputational prestige”, that UMUC “monitor the balance between collegiate and adjunct faculty to ensure the value of both”.<sup>95</sup> However, the Report did not call for the large stateside programs to abandon its model relying on largely adjunct faculty.<sup>96</sup>

### The role of Faculty in Governance

So long as University College was a college within the University of Maryland, it was simply subordinate to the governance arrangements of the larger university and University College faculty had no special representation in those processes. This was even true with respect to matters concerning courses and programs. These were controlled by the College Park academic departments, their full-time faculty and the UM curriculum approval processes.<sup>97</sup> The academic and other business of University College was accomplished by its administrators working with the appropriate points of contact on the College Park campus.

How UMUC evolved its own formal faculty governance structures is a complex narrative. It is marked by three characteristics that distinguish it from the traditional model of College Park. These are the fluid or changing nature of those structures over time, their strictly advisory nature,

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, p. 87

<sup>91</sup> Ibid, pp. 85, 88, 111.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid, p. 96.

<sup>93</sup> 1996 MSCHE Report, p. 16

<sup>94</sup> Ibid, pp. 16, 18

<sup>95</sup> 2006 MSCHE Team Report, p. 22

<sup>96</sup> Ibid, pp 20-22.

<sup>97</sup> See 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. I and 1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside), p. 5. Even as late as 1986 this control was still substantial. See 1986 UMUC Self-study, p 166.

and the inclusion of adjunct faculty as valued members of the teaching staff. This development is summarized and discussed below.

Study Year	Division	Governance Structure	Administrative Point of Contact
1965 (Stateside) 1965 (Europe)	All	None	None
1976 (Stateside, 1976 (Europe)	Europe	Faculty Advisory Council	Division Director
1986 Unified Report	Europe	Faculty Advisory Committee	Division Director
	Asia	Faculty Association with constituent committees on Okinawa, Korea, Honshu	Division Director
	Stateside	Undergraduate Council	Vice Chancellor for Stateside Programs
	Stateside	Graduate Council	Graduate Dean
1996 Unified Report	Europe	Faculty Advisory Council	Division Director
	Asia	Local Faculty Advisory Committees (Okinawa, Korea, Honshu)	Directors for Okinawa, Korea, Honshu
	Stateside	Undergraduate Advisory Council	Undergraduate Dean
	Stateside	Graduate Council	Graduate Dean
2006 Unified Report	All Divisions	Faculty Advisory Council	UMUC President and the Provost & Chief Academic Officer

As the chart indicates, as late 1965 “faculty at University College were not organized in any formal way”.<sup>98</sup> This was true stateside as well as overseas. Faculty input was broadly solicited by University College administrators through surveys and other means in the course of

<sup>98</sup> 1965 University College Self-study (Stateside), p. 120.

performing their roles and captured feedback not only on programs and courses but also on pay, facilities and other matters.<sup>99</sup>

Europe became the first division to establish a formal Faculty Advisory Committee in 1969, consisting of the division director, two assistant directors, and elected full-time faculty “to facilitate communication between and among the faculty and its many constituencies, and [European] administrative staff”.<sup>100</sup> The opportunity for input was open-ended and the faculty focus was reportedly on benefits, pay and housing more than on academic matters.<sup>101</sup> But again, this structure had no connection with the formal governance of College Park; the input was advisory to University College administrators working within the larger administrative structure of UM.

After UMUC became a UM campus, it began to experience a limited autonomy from the College Park academic departments by creating programs that were ‘independent’ of those departments.<sup>102</sup> New program proposals moved between the UMUC Campus Chancellor and the Office of the UM President and its senior advisory committees. Once approved, these proposals were submitted by the UM President to the UM Board of Regents and ultimately to the then-State Board of Higher Education (SBHE). But these proposals did not go through the College Park academic departments or the UM Faculty Senate.<sup>103</sup> With the opportunities for ‘independent’ programs, UMUC stateside, as a UM campus, began to experiment with formal advisory structures to capture the input of its faculty on academic matters.

In this connection, the 1986 Self-study notes that to advise the UMUC Vice Chancellor for Stateside Programs UMUC created an “Undergraduate Academic Council” including the Vice Chancellor, stateside undergraduate faculty members, students, and a number of the “discipline coordinators” representing the “Undergraduate Curriculum Committee”. Its role was purely academic if wide-ranging, viz. “to assist in program development and in formulating policies to monitor the academic quality of the undergraduate program”.<sup>104</sup> Similarly, there was a UMUC “Graduate Council” to advise the UMUC Graduate Dean on “the development and review of graduate programs” for UMUC.<sup>105</sup> Its membership consisted of the UMUC Graduate Dean, one UMUC Graduate Chair, one Graduate Subject Matter Director; an adjunct faculty member, and a

---

<sup>99</sup> Ibid.

<sup>100</sup> 1976 Self-study (Europe), pp. V-11

<sup>101</sup> Ibid.

<sup>102</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp 51-53 and 99-103. Note the qualifying language about reliance on College Park, p. 166

<sup>103</sup> For an example at the graduate level, see the 1986 UMUC Self-study, pp. 99 – 102.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid, pp. 27, 77. The role of the academic council more specifically included the responsibility to “review recommendations concerning new undergraduate courses, concentrations and programs and act as liaison with similar bodies on other [UM] campuses; to assist in formulating procedures for review of existing undergraduate concentrations and programs; to participate in the review of existing undergraduate concentrations and programs and recommend changes as appropriate; to contribute to discussion and review of faculty evaluation procedures; and to participate in the review of policies concerning undergraduate academic standards, including admission, grading practices, sources of academic credit, library services, teaching resources, student retention, and exit policies and practices”.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid, Figure 3.2 and p. 28. See pp 100-101 for its role in the graduate degree approval process within UMUC.



number of members from other UM campuses.<sup>106</sup> The overseas divisions continued to evolve their advisory faculty bodies as well. By 1986, the European Faculty Advisory Council was restructured as a faculty-only body (“Faculty Advisory Committee”), consisting of six elected faculty. The Asian Division had also established a geographically representative “Faculty Association” “chaired by a senior faculty member” and given the broad charge “to solicit faculty views through meetings and surveys and then to discuss this information with the Director and other senior staff at formal meetings”.<sup>107</sup>

For more than a decade after UMUC became a university, its governance structures closely resembled those that it had created while still a UM campus. It is important to note that as structures of a free-standing university no longer coupled with College Park they have met MSCHE expectations. The 1996 MSCHE Team Report was “reassured” by the number of ways in which the UMUC faculty were involved “in those academic matters appropriate to it”.<sup>108</sup> These avenues for involvement included an Undergraduate Advisory Committee and a Graduate Council that included adjunct faculty and students ‘to review all new programs and initiatives’; general faculty meetings each semester and more frequent discipline meetings; and a variety of ad hoc committees and task forces “to provide the unit leader with the best possible information for sound decision-making”.<sup>109</sup>

Absent at UMUC stateside in 1996 was a general faculty advisory group akin to those in Europe and Asia that was not limited to academic matters but was created more generally to enhance communication and to provide faculty a forum to express any issues of concern. This changed following a new USM governance policy in 2000. In a sweeping change in step with its administrative and academic consolidation, UMUC created a unified worldwide network of advisory groups that included students, faculty and staff.<sup>110</sup> As an initiative of the then-President and Provost, the purpose of the new structures was precisely to enhance communication, build ownership of UMUC’s mission among widely distributed constituencies and leverage their combined strength to build a stronger university.<sup>111</sup>

The worldwide Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) was one of these groups. As a general advisory body, FAC is charged “to consider and advise” the administration on a wide range of issues, including UMUC’s mission, vision and budget priorities, the curriculum, and faculty policy, among others.<sup>112</sup> It is structured to include faculty elected from each of the three divisions and therefore supersedes the overseas advisory groups as UMUC’s official faculty governance body. It also ensures representation of both full-time and adjunct faculty.<sup>113</sup> The Council originally

---

<sup>106</sup> Ibid, pp.150-151

<sup>107</sup> 1986 UMUC Self-study, p. 167. In his role as Director of both Europe and Asia at different times between 1970 and 1990, Dr. Julian Jones characterized the meetings of these advisory groups as “productive and collegial”.

<sup>108</sup> 1996 MSHE Team Report, p. 16.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid, p. 17

<sup>110</sup> 2006 Self-study, p. 57 ff. See also UMUC Policy 020.20 (10/22/01)

<sup>111</sup> Dr. Nicholas Allen was the Provost and Chief Academic Officer at the time and provided this insight into the reasons for the change.

<sup>112</sup> See FAC Constitution, Article I.B and the 2006 UMUC Self-study, p. 60 for examples of FAC activity.

<sup>113</sup> 2006 UMUC Self-study. pp. 59-60.

consisted of 12 faculty seats, three of which were reserved for adjuncts. However, FAC grew in number over time as additional adjunct seats were added.<sup>114</sup>

The 2006 Self-study indicates that FAC members represented their Council on other formal structures at the university. This was true of the curriculum development process led respectively by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Council. The former was chaired by the undergraduate Dean and the latter by the graduate Dean, reflecting the university's organization as two large schools, undergraduate and graduate. The regular members of these groups were largely collegiate faculty administrators and some staff; the undergraduate committee in particular included representatives from Europe and Asia.<sup>115</sup> To link the curriculum development process with the Faculty Advisory Council, a member of FAC sat on both groups.<sup>116</sup> Underlying these structures were the other forums of activity that were well established at UMUC, including general and discipline meetings and various ad hoc committees on which the teaching faculty, including adjuncts, had representation.

As in 1996, the 2006 MSCHE Team Visit Report affirmed that the new worldwide governance structure was meeting the Middle States standard on governance. While calling for continued efforts to facilitate communication between the highly distributed world-wide governance groups and the administration, it took no issue with the Faculty Advisory Council membership or its advisory role in particular.<sup>117</sup> As UMUC continues to change as an institution, the record suggests that its governance structures will continue to evolve as well.

---

<sup>114</sup> As recalled by Dr. Theo Stone, former chair of FAC For changes in FAC through 2013, see "UMUC Faculty Advisory Council" at [https://www.umuc.edu/faculty/council/faculty\\_reps2007.cfm](https://www.umuc.edu/faculty/council/faculty_reps2007.cfm)

<sup>115</sup> 2006 Self-study, pp. 95-96

<sup>116</sup> This is documented in the 2004-2005 Graduate Catalog, p. 175, for example, but was also the practice at the time on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

<sup>117</sup> 2006 MSCHE Team Report, pp. 15, 22, 28.

## SOURCES

### Self-studies

1965 University College Self-study (Stateside)  
1965 University College Self-study (Europe)  
1976 UMUC Self-study (Stateside)  
1976 UMUC Self-study (Europe)  
1981 UMUC Periodic Review Report (Stateside)  
1981 UMUC Periodic Report (Far East)  
1986 UMUC Self-study  
1996 UMUC Self-study  
2006 UMUC Self-study

### MSCHE Documents

MSCH Evaluation Team Report. Prepared on the basis of the self-study report and campus visits on April 6-8, 18-24, May 11-12, 1986.  
Reaffirmation Letter from Henrietta Smith, Vice Chair, MSCHE to Dr. Benjamin Massey, UMUC Chancellor. June, 30, 1986  
MSCHE Evaluation Team Report. Prepared on the basis of the self-study and campus visits on April 14-17, April 28-30, and May 12-13, 1996.  
Summary Findings and Recommendations of the Report of the Evaluation Team Representing MSCHE. 1996 Decennial Review. UMUC.  
MSCHE Evaluation Team Report. Prepared on the basis of the self-study and campus visit to the campus on April 2-5, 2006.

### Other Sources Consulted

UMUC Faculty Advisory Council Constitution  
<https://www.umuc.edu/faculty/council/upload/UMUC-FAC-Constitution.pdf>  
UMUC Faculty Advisory Council Member Archives  
<https://www.umuc.edu/faculty/council/>  
UMUC 2004-2005 Graduate Catalog  
<http://www.umuc.edu/students/catalogs/upload/gradcatalog04-05.pdf>  
UMUC Policy on Governance 020.20 (10/22/01)  
<https://www.umuc.edu/policies/generalpolicies/gen02020.cfmhttps>  
UMUC Policy on Faculty Appointment, Rank and Promotion. Versions 181.00 (6/30/07)  
<https://www.umuc.edu/policies/facultypolicies/fac18100.cfm>