

大学評価 第3号 平成15年9月(論文)

[大学評価・学位授与機構 研究紀要]

Internal and External Assessment Practices at the University of
Maryland, College Park

Frank A. Schmidlein

Research in University Evaluation, No.3 (September, 2003) [the article]

The Journal of University Evaluation of National Institution for Academic Degrees and University
Evaluation

Introduction	133
Student Assessment	133
Faculty Assessment	135
Academic Administrator Assessment	138
Staff Assessment	138
Academic Program Assessment	139
Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Studies and Policy Research	140
University System of Maryland Assessment	140
Maryland Higher Education Commission Assessment	140
Accreditation Agency Assessment	142
Program Rankings by Private Organizations and Institution	143
Conclusions	143
Bibliography	144
要旨	145

Internal and External Assessment Practices at the University of Maryland, College Park

Frank Schmidlein*

February 7, 2003 (revised 5/28/03)

Introduction

This paper describes the array of quality assessment practices, both internal and external, that occur at the University of Maryland, College Park. These practices take place at many levels and are concerned with a great variety of University functions. Students are assessed at various points from application for admittance to post-graduate accomplishments. Faculty, administrators, and staff have their potential and performance reviewed in various ways. Academic programs and departments are subject to both internal and external assessments. Finally, the entire institution is assessed by external agencies. The public, business leaders, and government officials often do not appear to be aware of these multi-layered assessment efforts or are familiar with only one or a few of them.

Student Assessment

Assessment for Admission

Admission decisions in the United States are made by the colleges and universities. Typically, undergraduate admission decisions are made by staff in central admissions offices but often college (faculty) or departmental level staff are involved. Some selected academic programs may be authorized to set higher admission standards than the institution-wide standards. Consequently, these programs' staff may become involved informally or formally in admission decisions.

Selection criteria for undergraduates. More than 45 variables are used in making admission decisions at the University of Maryland (Milton & Schmidlein, 2000). These include:

- high school graduation,
- test scores on national examinations such as the SAT and ACT,
- high school grade point averages,
- high school class rank,
- evidence of required high school course work,
- students' personal statements,
- quality of students high school course work (e.g. honors courses),
- recommendation letters,
- Maryland residency (the number of out-of-state students is limited),

* Associate Professor of Higher Education (Emeritus) Department of Education Policy and Leadership University of Maryland

geographic diversity,
status of high school attended,
extracurricular activities, work, and community activities, and
background information such as whether students are first in their family to attend college,
first to speak English, economically disadvantaged, minority race, relatives attended
university, extenuating circumstances if academic measures are low, special talents or skills,
breadth of experience, and demonstrated interest in the University.

Placement. The University requires newly admitted students to take a placement test in mathematics and those who score low are placed in remedial mathematics courses. In 1998, 18 percent of the freshmen admitted were placed in these courses.

Transfer student performance. The University has articulation agreements with the Maryland community colleges that permit their students to enroll in the University and get credit for their community college courses when they take the agreed upon courses at their college. The University periodically compares the performance of these students with that of students admitted as freshmen.

Selection criteria for graduate students. Graduate student applicants are evaluated and admitted by the academic departments in which they seek to enroll. Consequently, the admissions standards vary across the 60 departments. Even within a department, different program areas might have somewhat different admissions criteria. These differences pose some problems for the University and it regularly urges departments to increase their graduate admission standards. Typical factors that influence admission decisions are:

- student undergraduate grade point averages;
- student scores on tests such as the Graduate Record examination, Miller Analogy Test, Test of English as a Second Language, and other specialized tests in various fields such as business administration;
- samples of their writing;
- letters of recommendation;
- career experiences;
- demographic characteristics;
- special skills;
- results of interviews with faculty; and
- other indicators of students' motivation, clarity of purpose, and past accomplishments.

Faculty Grading

The primary method of assessing students' academic progress is through the award of grades by faculty. There is a great deal of discussion in the United States of various ways to assess student learning that will provide a more detailed, accurate, and objective form of assessment than faculty grading, and/or provide important information not revealed by grades. A number of institutions are experimenting with such processes but they have not changed the primacy of faculty grading at the University of Maryland. There is some evidence that these forms of assessment correlate quite closely with grades and they tend to be expensive to administer (discussion of G. Kuh & T. Banta and

M. Peterson research findings at 2002 Association for the Study of Higher Education's annual conference in Sacramento, California, November 20-24). The grade of "A" is the highest awarded. If students perform below a "D" level grade, they are marked "F" for failure. Grade reports also show a "W" for withdrawn if a student does not complete a course and an "I" if a student has not completed all of the work for a class by the end of the term but is permitted to complete work during the following semester. If students are caught cheating in a course, a special mark is entered in their record to reveal that fact. Recently, the University gave faculty the option of adding "pluses" and "minuses" to grades to show more precisely levels of accomplishment. Graduate students typically get grades of "A" through "C", with a "C" grade indicating unsatisfactory work.

Assessment of post-graduation performance

The University often conducts reviews of its graduates to determine whether they have been successful after graduating. They examine factors such as admission to graduate schools and the quality of these graduate schools; passing state, national, and professional association examinations; job placement, receipt of honors of various kinds such as Rhodes scholarships; and success in their professions. The University has developed plans to implement, in the near future, a formal annual process for assessing students' post-graduation experience. The Maryland Higher Education Commission also conducts a survey each year to gauge how pleased employers are with the graduates of the State's colleges and universities.

Faculty Assessment

Employment Assessment

Faculty are employed both for long-term appointments that lead to, or offer, tenure (termed "tenure-track" appointments) or for specified periods of time that do not lead to a tenured appointment (termed "non-tenure" appointments). Non-tenure appointments typically are for faculty hired for a specific research project, teaching assignment, or some other task that has a specified ending date. Recently, some faculty who have extensive, outstanding professional experience but do not have the research and scholarly credentials of tenure-track faculty have been hired as "professors of practice" in professional fields such as education and business. Both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty receive employment contracts that specify the nature and conditions of their appointments.

When tenure-track faculty vacancies occur, the University advertizes them nationally and, sometimes, internationally. Those who apply go through a rigorous screening process. Typically, departments create a faculty recruitment committee that establishes the requirements for the position and prepares the announcements. The announcements are approved by the Provost and an office responsible for ensuring efforts are made to attract minority candidates. Applicants are required to submit their vitas and other documents that describe their experience such as teaching evaluations and honors and awards, copies of their publications, and letters of recommendations by leading scholars in their fields. Search committees conduct an initial review of those submitting their applications and select a small number, perhaps five to 15, for further consideration. The committee then solicits letters of recommendations from persons they know to be leading scholars in

the applicants' field, asking them to review the applicants' publications and accomplishments and provide their appraisals to the search committee. The leading candidates, usually three to six, are invited to the University for interviews and to present a lecture on their research or scholarship. The committees then complete their reviews of the candidates and make recommendations to departments' faculty promotion and tenure committees. These committees then prepare their evaluations of the candidates and submit them to their department chairs. These recommendations are then voted on by all of the tenure-track faculty who are at or above the rank of the position for which the candidate has applied. Following the faculty vote, if the appointment is approved, the department chairs prepare a letter containing their recommendations that goes to the dean of the college. The dean then has the applicant(s) reviewed by a college-level faculty promotion and tenure committee and, following their recommendation(s), in the case of a non-tenured assistant professor, approves or disapproves of the appointment. For associate and full professor appointments, the dean prepares a letter of recommendation to the University Provost. The Provost then submits the application to a University-wide promotion and tenure committee and, in the light of their recommendation(s), submits his/her recommendation to the President for approval. This process typically takes five to six or more months. This time consuming effort is justified on the basis that the University is often making a multi-million dollar investment when hiring a young tenured faculty member. The salary levels for newly appointed faculty typically are negotiated by the department chair and approved by the Dean within broad guidelines set by the Provost. For example, the ranges for a full professor for a nine-month contract goes from a minimum of \$37,570 to \$109,370, for an assistant professor the range goes from \$25,070 to \$76,388 (these salary ranges are up-dated annually and can be seen on the University web site: www.inform.umd.edu/EdRes/provost/persbud/Forms/SalFac4.pdf). Extraordinary salary levels require specific approval by the Provost and President.

Tenure-Track Faculty Promotion Assessment

Assistant professors initially are given a three year contract. A review of their performance is conducted during the second year of the appointment to determine if they are making satisfactory progress and in what areas they need improvement in order to qualify for a tenure-track appointment and promotion to associate professor. After this initial review, if satisfactory progress is being made, the assistant professor is given another three year contract. No later than the second year of this second contract, an extensive evaluation of the professor is conducted, one that is similar to that described previously for a new faculty appointment. The applicants compile an extensive file of all of their accomplishments in research, publishing, teaching, and public service. This includes student assessments of the quality of their teaching in each of the classes they have taught. Both the candidates and the department solicit recommendations from leading academics in the candidates' fields. After approval by the faculty and the chairs, recommendations go from the department to the college and on to Provost for reviews similar to those described earlier. If assistant professors successfully attain tenure status, they are promoted to associate professor. Assistant professors do not have to wait until the fifth year of their contracts to be considered for promotion and tenure if they believe their academic accomplishments support earlier consideration

and their department chairs agree.

The review of associate professors for promotion to full professor follows the same process as that for assistant professors, with reviews in the department, college, and at the University level. A copy of the criteria the University employs to evaluate faculty for employment and promotion can be viewed on the University of Maryland, College Park website at: www.inform.umd.edu/faculty/policies/.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Assessment

Non-tenure-track faculty are evaluated at near the end of their contracts if they are being considered for re-employment.

Post-Tenure Faculty Assessment

The University about ten years ago instituted a post-tenure review process for faculty. This process is intended to identify faculty whose contributions are less than desired and to take steps to help them improve their performance. It has not resulted in faculty being dismissed but does put social pressure on faculty whose performance is unsatisfactory. In addition to counseling on ways to improve their performance, sometimes such faculty informally have been given incentives to retire early and received counseling on other opportunities they might explore.

Annual Faculty Merit Performance Assessment

Faculty are required to up-date their vitas and provide information on their accomplishments each spring semester to their department chairs so the chair can evaluate the faculty members' performance. This information also provides data for a "Performance Accountability Report" required of all public institutions by the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC). The department chairs' evaluations are intended to provide both feedback to faculty members on ways they can improve their performance and to provide a basis for "merit" salary increases when State funding is available for that purpose. Chairs are required to make an annual pre-tenure assessment of all assistant professors and provide "feed back" to them after consultation with the tenured faculty. When the State economy is healthy (not the case in 2003), public institutions often get funds to provide all faculty with a "cost-of-living" salary increase and, additionally, funds to provide merit salary increases to a small portions of faculty who have outstanding records of research, publishing, instruction, and public service activities. These increases are awarded by department chairs in consultation with a faculty committee or on the basis of the recommendations of a department faculty review committee. They are subject to review by deans. In some cases, deans retain some of the merit salary increase funds to increase the salaries of particularly meritorious faculty members and to help retain outstanding faculty members who receive offers from other institutions. The University places restrictions on the percentage of faculty who can receive merit salary increases and, also, on the size of merit awards. If the award exceeds 15 percent of the faculty member's previous salary, then it has to be approved by the Provost or President.

Academic Administrator Assessment

Deans and Department Chair Evaluation

After every five years of service, evaluations are made of the performance of deans and department chairs. A review committee composed of faculty, staff and students is appointed by the Provost or Dean to conduct the review. The committee solicits information from faculty, peers, and students; conduct interviews; and obtain data from the dean's college or chair's department. The committees complete their reports and recommendations and forward them to the appropriate dean or Provost for their review and potential decisions. The chairs or deans are given an opportunity to respond to any information or conclusions in the reports that they deem inaccurate or missing. At the conclusion of a review a chair or dean can be given a new five year contract or his/her contract not be renewed. In most cases these administrators also have faculty appointments which they can assume in the event their contracts are not renewed.

Officer/Associate Dean/Academic Administrator Evaluation

Each year the supervisors of associate vice presidents, assistant vice presidents, associate deans, and assistant deans engage in a "Performance Review and Development Process" that included completing a "Setting Expectations and Final Appraisal Form." This form provides rating of administrators on a number of their functions, classifying them either as outstanding, exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, below expectations, or unsatisfactory. A copy of this form is available on the University of Maryland, College Park web site at: www.personnel.umd.edu.

Staff Assessment

The University has two classifications of administrative and clerical staff. Exempt staff are those, primarily in professional roles who are not required to be paid for "over-time" work under Federal regulations. Non-exempt staff are required to be paid over-time under Federal regulations and include positions such as administrative assistants, secretaries, and those in crafts, or responsible for maintaining buildings and grounds.

Exempt Employees Assessment

Exempt employees, typically administrators in academic support and student affairs offices, are evaluated annually, employing a process very similar to that for associate and assistant vice presidents and associate and assistant deans. The form used for their evaluation is also available at the University's web address provided above. These employees are paid according a salary scale comprised of several "grades" with a number of steps within each grade. These grades and steps can be obtained from the University's web site at: www.personnel.umd.edu/Comp/compensa.htm. Employing offices have some discretion in placing a new employee above the first step in their grade but need approval to set a salary above step 5. Employees can get merit salary increases at the discretion of their supervisors when funds are available.

Non-Exempt Employees Assessment

These employees are paid according to 17 pay ranges, each of them having minimum and maximum salaries within each range. For example, the minimum annual salary for pay range 1 is \$17,480 and

the maximum is \$23,180. For pay range 17 the minimum annual salary is \$41,240 and the maximum is \$ 61,860. When funds are appropriated by the State, these employees are eligible for cost of living increases at present. However, on June 30, 2003, the University is planning to base their salaries on studies of salary levels for comparable positions in the local labor market. In theory, employees who are rated “outstanding” by their supervisors are eligible for merit salary increases. However, very little money has been made available by the State for this purpose so these awards are highly competitive. The forms used for annual evaluations of these employees also are available on the web at: www.personnel.umd.edu/Comp/compensa.htm.

Academic Program Assessment

Internal Program Assessment

New course review and approval. Proposals for new courses are prepared by departments and submitted for review by a dean and the Provost. They then are reviewed and approved by the University’s Academic Senate. However, a faculty member can teach an unapproved course, as an “experimental” course, for three years before it has to be submitted for University review and approval.

New academic program review and approval. Proposals for new academic programs are prepared usually by an academic department. However, sometime interdisciplinary programs, that involve more than one department, are prepared by committees appointed by deans or the Provost that include faculty from more than one academic unit. New program proposals must contain extensive justification of the need for the program, its quality, and its costs. New proposals are reviewed by deans, the Provost, the Academic Senate, and the President.

Academic unit assessment. The University of Maryland, College Park conducts periodic reviews of all academic units, principally its departments. These reviews normally take place every five years. The review process has several components; an internal self-study that includes the accumulation of relevant data, an external review of the unit, and proper utilization of the results of the review. The internal committee is selected by the department and charged with the self-study and the accumulation of data. An external committee is selected by the dean, which is composed of both faculty members within the department and from other departments, and they are charged with the external review. The internal self-study and the external review reports are made available to the unit, the dean and Provost in a timely manner. These reviews typically take from six months to a year to complete. In 1991, during a time of severe budget reductions, the campus set up a process to review departments and colleges to determine whether they should be eliminated to permit transfer of funds to maintain the quality of the remaining departments and colleges (Falk & Miller , 1993). This process resulted in the elimination of 29 degree programs, seven departments, and one college although some programs and all tenured faculty were transferred to other departments (Griffith, 1993). Elimination of academic programs typically is a very contentious process and often resisted by faculty in U. S. institutions. However, the University of Maryland’s extensive and multi-layered process ended with nearly a unanimous vote of approval by the University Senate.

Standing and Ad Hoc Committee Studies and Policy Research

Standing and Ad Hoc Committee and Task Force Studies

All levels of the University administration and the University Senate employ a large number of both standing and ad hoc committees and task forces to examine specific topics or issues. Some committees and task forces are joint administration/senate efforts. These studies result in many of the policy and procedural changes undertaken by the University.

One standing committee, the Campus Assessment Working Group (CAWG), was created in 1996 to bring together University groups involved in assessment and quality initiatives. It was charged with developing a “campus Aculture of evidence” in which data and assessment play a key role in campus decision making. In 2002 CAWG was joined with the newly redesigned Office of Institutional Research and Planning (www.umd.edu/oirp). The CAWG responds to the need to regularly gather and exchange information about the student, staff, and faculty experience at the university. Its data can feed directly into program and campus improvement efforts. One of its recent initiatives was to support a program titled: “The Provost’s Conversations on Diversity, Democracy and Higher Education” that examined issues of racial/ethnic diversity affecting students, faculty, staff, and administrators at the University. Information on this “working group” can be obtained on the web at: www.inform.umd.edu/cawg/Org/members.html.

Policy Research

The University has an Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP) that collects, analyzes, disseminates data throughout the University, the University System of Maryland, and Maryland state agencies to help them assess the condition of the University. It also provides the data for the U.S. Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). OIRP also undertakes many policy research projects to provide information on various issues confronting the University. Most U.S. colleges and Universities have such an office and many of their staff members belong to the Association for Institutional Research which holds national and regional “forums” each year that focus primarily on data analysis and policy research at institutions, state higher education agencies, and higher education associations.

University System of Maryland Assessment

Program Approval

After the President approves a University program proposal, it is submitted to the Chancellor of the University System of Maryland for further review and for approval of the Board of Regents, the lay Board that has formal governing authority for the University System of Maryland’s 11 institutions, including the University of Maryland at College Park.

Maryland Higher Education Commission Assessment

Accountability Reporting

The Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) is required by law to have an “accountability” process for the public colleges and universities in Maryland (Maryland Higher

Education Commission, November, 2002a and 2002b). Institutions are required to prepare extensive reports and MHEC must review them and present its assessments and recommendations to the Governor and the State legislature. In addition, the private institutions also submit periodic reports to MHEC on a voluntary basis.

Performance accountability report. This report comes in two volumes and contains performance indicators for each institution and the bench marks they seek to achieve. In 2000 this reporting system was combined with a State-wide “Managing for Results” reporting system to produce a single system that replaced the standardized set of indicators used earlier with a new set of goals, objectives, and performance measures. For the University of Maryland, College Park, these indications include:

- student satisfaction with job preparation
- student satisfaction with graduate/professional school preparation,
- six year graduation rate of all students,
- six year graduation rate of African-American students,
- Second year retention rate,
- percent of African-American of all undergraduates, and
- employment rate of graduates.

The MHEC 2002 Performance Accountability Report is available on the MHEC web site at: www.mhec.state.md.us.

Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis. MHEC also has instituted a “Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis” process (MHEC, 2002c). Each Maryland public institution selects ten comparable institutions to serve as “performance peers” and to provide a funding standard and a basis for comparison between institutions. Fifteen outcome-oriented performance measures have been developed to compare Maryland institutions against their performance peers. In some cases institutions add specific indicators that are more reflective of their role and mission. Maryland institutions are expected to perform at or above the levels of their performance peers on most indicators. Performance measures for institutions in the University of System of Maryland institutions include:

- Average SAT score of incoming students,
- percent of minority of all undergraduates,
- percent of African-American of all undergraduates,
- second year student retention rate,
- six year graduation rate,
- six year graduation rate for all minorities,
- six year graduation rate for African-Americans,
- pass rate on Praxis II examination (examination for prospective teachers),
- passing rate on nursing licensing examinations,
- passing rates on other licensure examinations,
- average alumni giving rate/average undergraduate alumni giving rate,
- total research and development expenditures,

average annual percent growth in federal research and development expenditures, dollars in total research and development expenditures per full-time faculty, number of faculty research awards per 100 faculty, and institutions-specific measures.

MHEC Academic Program Review

All proposals for new programs in both public and private institutions in Maryland, after approval by their governing boards, are submitted to the Maryland Higher Education Commission for its review before they can be offered. MHEC has to approve all new programs in public institutions and makes non-binding recommendations on programs proposed by private institutions. The private institutions generally have accepted the recommendations of MHEC.

MHEC policy research. In addition, to its performance reports, MHEC periodically undertakes policy studies to examine specific issues affecting institutional quality. For example, in recent years there has been a major examination of teacher education programs.

Accreditation Agency Assessment

Accrediting agencies are non-profit organizations created by colleges and universities to conduct assessments to ensure institutions are meeting minimum professional standards. Institutions pay annual dues to support the work of these associations. There are two types of accrediting bodies: 1) regional accrediting agencies, that examine the status and performance of an entire institution, and 2) specialized accrediting bodies that examine only certain programs or types of institutions.

Regional Accreditation

The University of Maryland, College Park obtains regional accreditation from the Middle States Association (MSA). The six regional accrediting agencies tend to follow somewhat similar assessment practices but the criteria they employ vary somewhat. This process requires the University to conduct a self-study every five to ten years, with extensive collection and analysis of data. This study is submitted to the Association for its review and analysis. The MSA then forms a team to visit the University, consisting of academics and administrators from comparable institutions with specializations in the areas that will be under review. Given the scope of the University's programs and operations, the review teams generally try to focus their reviews, to some extent, on issues posed in the institution's self-studies. The review teams collect documentation and interview considerable numbers of the University's faculty, administrators, and staff. At the conclusion of their review, they prepare a report on their observations, conclusions, and recommendations. This report is provided to the MSA staff and to the University for comments and reactions. After receiving comments from the University, the report is revised and re-submitted to the University. The University can be given "full accreditation" or "provisional accreditation" and future reviews can be conducted earlier than is usual to assess the University's correction of any serious problems discovered in a review. Such circumstances, however, are not common for major graduate/research universities. The reports are intended to help the University improve in areas where it has weaknesses and, therefore, are treated confidentially by the both parties. However, some of the information in these reports tends to "leak" out over time. About 15 years ago, the

earlier Maryland State Board for Higher Education (SBHE) developed a joint review process with the MSA to make more use of the additional data available to SBHE and to reduce institutions' costs for reviews that were duplicative to some extent. This innovative process, however, did not last long. Perhaps mixing the "formative" evaluation focus of the accreditation agency (seeking assist institutions to improve) with the "summative" evaluation focus of the SBHE (seeking information for state-level policy decisions) was not feasible.

Specialized Accreditation

A number of University professional programs, such as education, business, and engineering, are accredited by specialized agencies. These agencies follow processes that are very similar to those employed by the regional accrediting agencies, with self-studies and team visits, followed by reports and recommendations. However, these agencies go into much more detail on the characteristics of academic programs than do the regional accrediting agencies. They are regularly criticized by institutions as requiring practices based on theories and assumptions that do not have empirical support and that, sometimes, are not cost effective. Professional colleges sometimes have been accused of using these accrediting processes as leverage for obtaining funding beyond what institutional administrators believed was merited.

Program Rankings by Private Organizations and Institution

A number of private organizations have developed frameworks and criteria for creating comparative rankings of institutions and their programs. The relative sophistication of these rankings varies and their shortcoming are criticized by institutions; particularly if their rankings are not satisfactory. However, institutions increasingly are using these rankings to advertize their quality to prospective students, parents, and the public.

National Research Council Rankings

This prestigious national organization periodically issues evaluations of graduate programs at universities. They do not advertize their evaluations as rankings but institutions quickly seize on them to assess their relative standings among their peers and to publicize areas where they are comparatively strong.

Magazine Rankings

Some magazines publish rankings of institutions and programs notably Newsweek and Money magazine. Again, these rankings receive a good deal of criticism but are used to promote institutions. Good rankings appear to have some affect in attracting additional numbers of students to highly rated institutions.

Conclusions

The quality assessment practices at the University of Maryland are generally similar to those undertaken by most public graduate/research universities in the United States. United States universities engage in extensive evaluation processes, probably more than any other kinds of institutions with the exception, perhaps of hospitals. These processes are very time consuming and

expensive. Consequently, a careful examination of existing assessment practices, and their relative effectiveness, would be wise before adding more processes to existing ones. Quality assessment is essential but no systems can compensate for incompetence and dishonest behaviors. In such cases, the answer most often is new leadership or adequate sanctions for offenders, not more bureaucratic procedures. A major issue confronting governments is to determine the extent to which assessment efforts should be directed at specific situations as they arise in contrast to establishing comprehensive processes that are intended to reveal problems. Politically, it is appealing to create comprehensive new processes to deal with a problem but such processes are very expensive and seldom appear able to discern and prevent future problems. Also, they often identify situations which appear to be problems when they are not. Processes never compensate for incompetence (Schmidtlein, 2003).

Bibliography

Falk, D.S. & Miller, G.R. (1993) "How Do You Cut \$45 Million Dollars From Your Institution's Budget? Use Processes and Ask Your Faculty". In *Educational Record*, Vol. 74, Fall 1993, pps. 32-38.

Griffith, R. (1993) "Budget Cuts and Shared Governance". In *Academe*, November-December, pps. 15-17.

Maryland Higher Education Commission (2002) "2002 Performance Accountability Report: Maryland Public Colleges and Universities, Volume I". Maryland Higher Education Commission, 839 Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD, (November, 2002).

Maryland Higher Education Commission (2002) "2002 Performance Accountability Report: Maryland Public Colleges and Universities, Volume II". Maryland Higher Education Commission, 839 Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD, (November, 2002).

Maryland Higher Education Commission (2002) "Funding Guidelines Peer Performance Analysis: University System of Maryland, Morgan State University, St. Mary's College of Maryland". Maryland Higher Education Commission, 839 Bestgate Road, Annapolis, MD, (January, 2002).

Milton, T.H. & Schmidtlein, F.A. (2000) *The Bridge Project: Strengthening K-16 Transition Policies. Maryland Case Study*. Report prepared for Stanford Institute on Higher Education Research, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, 140.

Schmidtlein, F.A. (2003) "Assumptions Underlying Governmental Assessment and Accountability Practices." Paper presented at the national Institute for Academic Degrees, Tokyo, Japan, February 7, 2003.

別 紙

[要 旨]

大学の内部及び外部評価の全体像 メリーランド大学カレッジパーク校を事例として

フランク・A・シュミットライン*

本論文では、メリーランド大学カレッジパーク校における、内部及び外部評価の全体像を描いている。評価は、多層にわたり、また多様な目的で実施されている。学生に対する評価は、学士課程の選抜から大学院の修了までの種々の段階で実施されている。教員、管理職者、教員外職員は、様々な形で、その能力と実績を評価される。教育課程や学科は、内部と外部両方からの評価の対象である。そして、大学全体が、外部機関による評価を受ける。公衆、経済界のリーダー、そして政府当局者は、往々にして、大学で、こうした多元的な評価が実施されていることに気付いていないか、ほんの一部しか認識していない。

この大学で行われている評価は、アメリカの州立の研究大学で実施されているものの典型といてよい。アメリカの大学は、おそらく病院を除けば、すでに他のどの組織よりも厳しい評価に従事している。そして、その評価は多くの時間、労力、費用を要するものである。政治的には、新しい評価制度導入は魅力的でも、それは新たな問題を発生し、又、多額に費用を要する点に、留意する必要がある。

本論文は、以下の内容で構成されている。

はじめに

1. 学生の評価

入学受け入れのための評価

学士課程の学生の選抜基準

補修授業が必要かの評価

転入学生の実力評価

大学院学生の選抜基準

教員による成績評価

卒業後の実績評価

2. 教員の評価

雇用のための評価

テニュア・トラック（終身職種）教員の昇進のための評価

非テニュア・トラック（終身職種）教員の評価

終身権保持教員の評価

教員の毎年の実績評価

3. 教学系管理職者の評価

ディーン（学部長級）及びチェアマン（学科長）の評価

その他の教学系管理職者の評価

4. 教員外職員の評価

- 専門職職員の評価
- 非専門職職員の評価
- 5. 教育課程の評価
 - 内部の課程評価
 - 新授業科目の評価と承認
 - 新教育課程の評価と承認
 - 教学組織（学科）の評価
- 6. 調査のための常置及び特別委員会並びに政策調査
 - 常置及び特別委員会並びに特命調査
 - 政策調査
- 7. メリーランド大学機構による評価
 - 教育課程の承認
- 8. メリーランド高等教育委員会（MHEC）による評価
 - アカウントビリティ（説明責任）報告
 - 実績アカウントビリティ報告
 - 財政基準同等者実績分析
 - MHEC による教育課程評価
 - MHEC による政策研究
- 9. アク্রেディテーション（適格認定）機関による評価
 - 地域アクレディテーション
 - 専門アクレディテーション
- 10. 民間組織及び機関による教育課程評価
 - 全米研究評議会によるランキング
 - 雑誌によるランキング
 - むすび

* メリーランド大学カレッジパーク校教育学部名誉準教授
 科学研究費補助金「日、米、欧における国際的通用力を持つ大学評価システムの形成状況と日本の課題の研究」海外共同研究者