

REPORT OF A FOCUSED VISIT

TO

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
Ann Arbor, Michigan
March 1-8, 2000**

for the

**Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools**

EVALUATION TEAM

William Chafe, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Duke University, Durham, NC 27706

Suzanne C. Ferguson, Professor of English, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH
44106

Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, Vice President/Chancellor, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
47405

Phillip E. Jones, Vice President for Student Services, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242

Cora B. Marrett, Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of
Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003

Daniel M. Neuman, Dean of the School of the Arts and Architecture, University of California,
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Mark S. Paller, Assistant Vice President for Research, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis,
MN 55455

Bernard Roizman, Joseph Regenstein Distinguished Service Professor of Virology, University of
Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637

Catharine R. Stimpson, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Science, New York University,
New York, NY 10003

Orlando L. Taylor, Dean of the Graduate School, Howard University, Washington, DC 20059

Edward H. Jennings, President Emeritus and Professor of Finance, Ohio State University,
Columbus, OH 43210 (Chair, Audit Sub Team)

Richard C. Alkire, Charles and Dorothy Prizer Professor of Chemical Engineering, University of
Illinois, Urbana 61801 (Chairperson)

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Report Sections	
A.	Report of Sub-Team One: The Audit Team.....	5
1.	General Institutional Requirements.....	5
2.	North Central Association Criteria for Accreditation	5
a.	Mission Statement and Statement of Purposes	5
b.	Organization of Human, Financial, and Physical Resources	7
c.	The Institution is Accomplishing Its Educational and Other Purposes	8
d.	The Institution Can Continue to Accomplish Its Purposes and Strengthen It's Educational Effectiveness	11
e.	The Institution Demonstrates Integrity In Its Practices and Relationships	12
3.	Observations of The Audit Team	13
B.	Report of Sub-Team Two: The Special Emphasis Team	15
1.	Scope of the Special Emphasis Initiative	15
2.	The Central Issues Addressed and the Processes Used to Gather Information about the Special Emphasis Initiative.....	16
3.	Relationship between the Special Emphasis Self Study and the Criteria for Accreditation	16
4.	Summary of Interactions between the Special Emphasis Team and Institutional Representatives	18
5.	Comments by the Special Emphasis Team	18
a.	Key Institutional Strengths	21
b.	Key Institutional Challenges	22
c.	Other Findings	23
6.	Recommendations	24
III.	Recommendation and Rationale Section	26
	Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status (SAS)	

I. Introduction

This is the report of a comprehensive team evaluation of the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor for continued accreditation by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. Based on prior arrangement with the Commission, the University focused its self-study on *New Openings for the Research University: Advancing Collaborative, Integrative, and Interdisciplinary Research and Learning* as a special emphasis initiative. The evaluation visit was conducted as a two-part activity with the twelve-person team being divided into two sub-teams. Sub-team One, a group of four persons referred to as the Audit Team, visited the campus on March 1-3, and focused its attention on the University's compliance with the *General Institutional Requirements and the Criteria for Accreditation*. Sub-Team Two, a group of eight persons referred to as the Special Emphasis Team, visited the campus on March 6-8, and focused its attention on the special emphasis initiative.

The University presented a comprehensive self-study document that indicated that considerable attention had been given both to the audit dimensions of the visit as well as to the special emphasis initiative. Supporting documentation was made available on the University's Intranet system as well as in its well-organized Resource Room. The sub-teams found university personnel to be accessible, congenial and helpful in all dimensions. The teams were able to meet with representatives of the administration, faculty, staff, and students, in order to cover a wide range of university operations and programs.

This report is presented as a summary of the findings determined by the two sub-teams and it also reflects the consensus of the full team relative to the continued accreditation of the

University of Michigan-Ann Arbor. This summary report is presented in two parts, reflecting the perceptions and recommendations of the two sub-teams.

II. Report Sections

A. Report of Sub-Team One: The Audit Team

The audit sub-team of the North Central Association Accreditation Team visited the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor on March 1-3, 2000 where it conducted a review to determine the University's compliance with *The North Central General Institutional Requirements and Criteria for Accreditation*. The Audit Group recommends on behalf of the full team to (a) continue the accreditation of the University of Michigan -Ann Arbor; and (b) to schedule the next compliance visit for 2009-10, as shown on the Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. The reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

1. General Institutional Requirements

The audit team is satisfied that the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor is in full compliance with the General Institutional Requirements.

2. North Central Association Criteria for Accreditation

a. Mission Statement and Statement of Purposes

The University of Michigan has clearly delineated its mission of teaching, research and service to society and is fully in compliance with the mission criteria.

The teaching mission at both the graduate and undergraduate levels has been outlined in considerable detail and speaks to a variety of institutional responsibilities to prepare students to master a particular discipline, to have an acquaintance with their society's

past, to have the training required to assume a productive role in society, to have an awareness of the need for self-criticism, to feel a responsibility toward the knowledge they have acquired, are prepared to question the uses to which their skills are being put, to recognize their responsibilities to society and their fellow man, to have the will to preserve and enhance the legacy of the past, to continue to develop intellectually, to respect and value intellectual rigor, and to respect intellectual freedom.

The research mission is also developed in considerable detail recognizing the necessity of a university to give constant attention to the production, dissemination, systemization, and preservation of knowledge. The research mission recognizes several responsibilities including the university as society's "organ of memory," the university as a source of new knowledge and new techniques for its application, the need to constantly re-interpret the lessons and the facts of the past, the responsibility for transmitting knowledge to all constituents, the responsibility to develop principles concerning the use of knowledge, the vigorous defense of all those who seek knowledge under its auspices, the responsibility to be alert to its own biases and limitations, and to be supportive of individuals and institutions that share its commitments.

Within the same context, the service mission is also well developed including the institutional commitment to prepare persons who will fulfill society's need for trained professionals, to extend educational opportunities beyond the campus, to provide service through its professional schools, to work for constant improvement in the whole educational system of the State, to provide a broad range of service functions from law to public health, to cooperate with other institutions of higher learning in the State, to work unremittingly to insure the relevance of the information it imparts, and to respond to a dynamic society.

b. Organization of Human, Financial and Physical Resources

The University of Michigan is well organized in every respect and is in full compliance with the organization criteria.

The University has a well-developed governance structure with a publicly elected Board of Regents and a well-defined executive staff. The responsibilities of the faculty and staff are well defined and communicated in several ways and the numbers are sufficient to accomplish the institutional mission. There is also a well-developed system of faculty governance both centrally and at the collegiate and departmental level.

The financial resources of the university are also well organized, although the institution is currently in the process of a major revision of the financial database and the system of financial reporting. While the implementation of the new system has created some short-term difficulties, the team is confident that these will not present major disruptions. Indeed, upon completion of the implementation, the team believes that the financial controls and resource allocations will represent a considerable improvement over the existing system.

In terms of physical resources, the university is currently developing a new Campus Master Plan. The plan seeks to find ways to maintain coherence and an overarching sense of community that connects the six campus areas. The primary concern is that recent growth has led to disconnected spaces that could diminish the kind of connectivity that is necessary for collaborative and inter-disciplinary research and learning.

c. The Institution is Accomplishing Its Educational and Other Purposes

The University of Michigan is clearly living up to its mission and purposes of teaching, research, and service and is full compliance with this criteria.

Through the excellence of the programs and resources of its schools, colleges and divisions, the University of Michigan fulfills its mission and achieves its purposes in excellence and leadership in research, teaching and service. The schools, colleges and divisions of the University maintain undergraduate, graduate and professional programs that demonstrate the highest levels of accomplishment and commitment to the institution's goals. Across the University, units examine the effectiveness of learning, and teaching and gather information in order to further strengthen programs of instruction. The University and the academic units maintain the highest standards of excellence and provide ongoing support for the development of faculty, staff and administrators so that these may be achieved. As well, the University maintains a comprehensive range of services for students and staff that contribute to the effectiveness of the institution and the accomplishment of its purposes.

The University of Michigan's contributions to research are among the top in the nation. In addition to being, first in total annual research expenditures (exclusive of expenditures at university-associated federally-funded research and development centers), Michigan faculty are leaders in many research fields: a recent survey in Science Watch rated Michigan fifth in the nation overall and first among public universities in rankings that measure the frequency with which academic papers are cited by other researchers.

In 1995, as required by the Commission, the University of Michigan submitted a plan for learning assessment. This plan outlined a process in which the academic units were to develop and report on assessment programs as part of a regular cycle of unit review that the central administration planned to implement. The Commission accepted this plan as appropriate to

the structure of a large, complex and decentralized research University, which accords important autonomy to schools, colleges and divisions in determining their academic programs. With changes in University leadership that took place shortly after the plan was developed, the envisioned cycle of unit review, which was to be the vehicle for reporting assessment plans and programs, was not put into practice.

In preparation for reaccreditation, fresh thought has been given by the Office of Academic Affairs about how best to organize assessment-planning processes. The goal has been to devise a coordinated process that takes into account the diverse programs, experience and needs of the schools, colleges and divisions and that establishes the importance of learning assessment as an effective tool for improving learning and teaching.

In general, academic units across the University have become more alert to the need to deepen the scholarship of learning. Over the past decade, different academic units of the University have adapted the tools of learning assessment in order to learn more about the learning that is taking place and to make changes in instruction and evaluation methods and delivery of curriculum. Some units, such as the College of Engineering and the School of Medicine, have developed assessment programs in order to guide substantial revisions of their curriculum. As well, a number of departments have adapted assessment techniques in order to understand more fully how curricular changes might improve the learning environment and, in the instance of Mathematics, to develop new approaches to basic curriculum that have become national models of excellence. The Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program has developed an assessment program to better understand the effectiveness of research-based learning. Faculty who have developed an innovative interdisciplinary course on Global Change are using learning assessment to evaluate the effectiveness of the course and its use of web-

based learning tools. A number of faculty, recognizing the value of assessment, have devised evaluative tools in order to get a better understanding of the learning that takes place in their classrooms and to refresh their approach to teaching. In many ways, then, the University has been turning to learning assessment at the grass roots.

Academic units and faculty often turn to the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT), an academic service unit reporting to the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. CRLT works with departments and individual faculty to clarify learning goals, to develop assessment tools and to develop informative feedback mechanisms. Another source of expertise is found in the School of Education's Center for the Study of Higher and Post-secondary Education, where several faculty are leading national experts in learning assessment in higher education. Academic units can draw on this experience, as well as on what has been learned nationally, to build assessment tools appropriate to local circumstances. The Office of Evaluations and Examinations prepares teaching questionnaires that units may adapt to use as a supplement for learning assessment.

In 1998, the Provost established the Michigan Assessment Project, a steering group to help disseminate information regarding learning assessment and to coordinate learning assessment efforts taking place within the schools and colleges. Tasks include gathering assessment plans from academic units; providing a clearinghouse for inventories of assessment plans, techniques, resources, links and information; and coordinating other resources as needed in order to assist in the development of assessment tools. The purpose is to assist faculty and units to be better informed about learning that takes place in the many diverse settings of the University, and to encourage the development of innovative and effective teaching that makes use of the special resources of a great public research university.

Schools and colleges were asked to name an individual to take part in the Michigan Assessment Project. This group convened in the winter and spring of 1999 to share examples of approaches to methods of learning assessment, to identify possible assessment tools that might be shared, and to share these ideas with their units. These examples were reviewed and discussed among the group. The schools, colleges and divisions were asked to draw up assessment plans that met local needs and interests. A website containing plans, resources, and other learning assessment materials is being established in conjunction with the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching.

d. The Institution Can Continue to Accomplish Its Purposes and Strengthen
Its Educational Effectiveness

The University of Michigan will continue to accomplish its mission and purposes and is in full compliance with this criterion.

Institutional leadership encourages ongoing attention to improvement and engagement in planning processes that chart the future directions of the University at all levels. The University is continuously working to strengthen the quality of the academic programs of its schools, colleges and divisions. Across the University, faculty review and revise curriculum in order to respond to changing learning needs, to incorporate the latest advances in knowledge and to expand and diversify opportunities for students at all levels. The University's schools and colleges seek to bring the unique resources and strengths of a great research institution into the learning experiences of students at all levels. The University sustains an on-going iterative process of planning at all levels that ensures the future strength of the institution in its continuing role as a national leader in comprehensive excellence in higher education.

e. **The Institution Demonstrates Integrity
In Its Practices and Relationships**

Across its many units, the University demonstrates a clear and consistent commitment to integrity in its policies and practices. With strong leadership from the President, Provost, and Executive Officers, the University of Michigan is a national leader in its passionate commitment to diversity and affirmative action. Policies are clearly articulated in institutional publications and statements, and review and oversight are exercised through a variety of mechanisms. The University also maintains a rigorous set of policies and oversight mechanisms regarding intercollegiate athletics. As well, the University has developed a full set of policies that address research practices and responsibilities.

3. **Observations of The Audit Team**

During the audit team visit to the University of Michigan campus several observations were made that may assist the institution in further strengthening its educational purposes.

There exists concern among some of the faculty that the central administration initiatives are in conflict with the traditional Michigan culture of decentralization and "bottom-up" changes. The concerns exist along side of strong support for the central administration initiatives even among those concerned faculties.

There is strong support for the University's vigorous legal defense of its affirmative action policies. However, there is some evidence that the institution's position is not as well communicated among faculty and staff as would be desirable. In addition, because of the legal situation, much of the truly excellent programs to aid diversity are not as well known and understood as would be preferred. Michigan has, for many years, been a leader in diversity

development and while that leadership continues the internal awareness of those programs seems to be suffering.

As might be expected, the revisions in the institutional data and financial reporting continue to cause concern among many faculty and staff as might be expected when major changes are implemented. Concerns were expressed to the team in terms of the need for more training in the new systems, the need for additional staff, and the possibility that the new systems will not provide information that has been traditionally relied upon at the departmental and collegiate levels. The team believes that the university is fully aware of these issues some of which are real and some of which are the natural result of a changing environment. The team also believes that the changes are necessary in this dynamic environment and that resource management will be much improved when the revisions are complete.

The team also observed that faculty members were pleased with the central administration efforts to improve the teaching mission but as might be expected some concern was voiced that excellence in teaching was not rewarded financially. This, of course, is a complicated and continuing issue that deserves serious attention at all levels in the university. However, with the renewed emphasis on teaching, one can predict that the salary issue as it is related to teaching will take on a greater significance than has been the case historically.

There was also concern expressed over a lack of training of Department Chairs and Chairs to be in addition to an expressed unevenness of the mentoring and the review of junior faculty. Graduate students expressed similar concerns. In each case it should be emphasized that the team found excellent examples of mentoring and review as well as well trained new Department Chairs. Hence, the unevenness conclusion.

The Audit Team recognizes that the position of Vice President for Student Affairs is

currently filled on an interim basis, and that the former incumbent left the University just prior to the academic year. The quality of educational, administrative, mental/physical health, social/recreational, career/placement, and auxiliary services for students at the University of Michigan is excellent. There are living/learning programs in residence halls and there is an excellent service learning initiative on the campus. As one student said "...there are many opportunities to make a niche for yourself aside from academic life." There appears to be strong and coordinated support for student learning outside the classroom among the associate deans from the various undergraduate programs.

While there is strong leadership emanating from the Office of the Provost for developing equality of opportunity educational programs and services, the initiatives in Student Affairs in this area seem not as sound. From a leadership perspective, there appears to be a difference between student life and student affairs. There appears to be a need for a clear philosophical position on the quality of student life in the educational community as a whole from the Student Affairs perspective.

Strategic planning was the focus of the 1990 accreditation review. There was very little discussion of Student Affairs in that report. Currently, there appears to be no strategic plan for Student Affairs. Even though there appears to be good coordination between Student Affairs and other units, the initiative for leadership seems to be coming from other sources. There appears to be a void in philosophical direction from Student Affairs. Development of a strategic plan for Student Affairs may mitigate a missing opportunity to integrate co-curricular activity in a more comprehensive way with academic programs to achieve educational outcomes that combine cognitive and affective learning experiences.

B. Report of Sub-Team Two: The Special Emphasis Team

The Special Emphasis Team of the North Central Association accreditation team visited the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor on March 6-8, 2000, where it conducted a review of the self-study report entitled, "New Openings for the Research University: Advancing Collaborative, Integrative, and Interdisciplinary Research and Learning."

1. Scope of the Special Emphasis Initiative

The Provost in consultation with the Deans of the schools and colleges chose this topic for self-study because it embodies a range of important issues of broad significance for the entire institution. Over recent years, the number, scale, diversity and sophistication of these activities has increased to the point where it was appropriate to reflect broadly on the institutional implications of these activities. The goal of the self-study project is to produce a set of working documents that:

- Seek to understand and report on cross-cutting academic work;
- Identify issues, problems, and opportunities associated with these activities;
- Provide ideas and generate further discussion and thought across the University community;
- and
- Contribute to institutional improvement.

As a part of the North Central Associated accreditation process, the University designated the self-study project as the topic for special emphasis.

2. The Central Issues Addressed and the Processes Used to Gather Information About the Special Emphasis Initiative

With oversight from the Office of the Provost, and in regular consultation with the Associate Provosts and Associate Deans Group, four Working Groups were established to produce reports in areas of significant concern:

- Faculty
- Graduate and Professional Studies
- Research
- Undergraduate Teaching and Learning

The special emphasis team was favorably impressed by the process used to gather information about the special emphasis initiative. The team found that the documents demonstrate the high energy and diversity of viewpoint that is characteristic of a world class research university. The team expressed a positive reaction to the reports, finding them to be energizing, to exhibit a problem-solving state of mind, and to be holistic in dealing with broad linkages and structures. While many specific difficult challenges are described, what emerges from the documents is a broad articulation of the values and institutional strengths that provide the foundation for moving forward in the larger discussion.

3. Relationship between the Special Emphasis Self-Study and the Criteria for Accreditation

The special emphasis team visit was carried out with the participation of the institution as represented by the self-study reports as well as by extensive interviews and discussions as described below. The team was also aware that it was participating in an innovative manner in the NCA accreditation process itself. The goal of the special emphasis team visit was more

experimental in nature and therefore distinctly different from the audit team. The special emphasis team recognized that it was not feasible to accredit the University *per se* on the topic of the self-study, and therefore chose to engage its efforts by hosting an academic forum on the special emphasis topic which is of broad significance not only to the University of Michigan in particular but also to higher education in general. The team chose for the spirit of the forum, "Interdisciplinarity As Intellectual Freedom" --- the freedom to move where you may to access the tools and the capabilities to do scholarly work.

Although the task of accreditation was thus interpreted differently by the special emphasis team in comparison with the audit team, it became abundantly clear that the Working Groups addressed many issues that are central to the five criteria for NCA accreditation:

- Publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission,
- effectively organized resources,
- accomplishment of purposes,
- strengthen educational effectiveness, and
- integrity in practices and relationships.

In the course of the self-study initiative, and throughout the documentation of the Working Groups, the University of Michigan has shown clear evidence that each of these criteria was used repeatedly for charting institutional improvement and educational excellence. While the audit team addressed each of these issues explicitly in its report, the special emphasis team focused its efforts as mentioned previously on the approach of an academic forum. The special emphasis team is satisfied that the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor is fully in compliance in the way it has drawn on these criteria in addressing the broad issues associated with collaborative, integrative, and interdisciplinary research and learning.

4. Summary of Interactions between the Special Emphasis Team and Institutional Representatives

The special emphasis team arrived at its conclusions and suggestions by reading materials sent in advance, and by conducting twenty sets of on-campus interviews (including one that we asked to schedule with junior faculty). These interviews along with our deliberations upon them paralleled in many but not all ways the reports of the four Working Groups. In what follows we use the term "interdisciplinary" to cover the broad spectrum of intellectual activities involved here. While recognizing that there are nuances that may make the use of other terms appropriate, the team did not seek to prescribe such additional definitions for the purpose of the present broad review.

5. Comments by the Special Emphasis Team

During the special emphasis team visit several observations were made that may assist the institution in further strengthening its activities. A historically important institution, the University of Michigan has a strong tradition of decentralization in terms of governance, educational policy, research, and teaching. Decentralization has given great authority and autonomy to individual schools and their deans, departments, and individual faculty members. At the same time, the University has a strong tradition of interdisciplinary work within and among schools. Clearly, decentralization encourages energies that work together in fresh, unpredictable, and important ways. What often unites such interdisciplinary activity is the conviction that the connections among a variety of perspectives serves to expand intellectual horizons, generate new ideas, and alter the curriculum for the good. The underlying structural form of interdisciplinary activities creates a natural tension that arises between the autonomous

process by which individuals create the parts, and the adaptation of all the parts by a larger connected community. Indeed, large-scale initiatives that have the support of the upper administration as well as students and technical experts represent a mark of outstanding leadership at many interconnected levels throughout the institution. The dynamic co-existence of these two successful traditions --- decentralization and connectivity --- helps to distinguish the University of Michigan as an international leader in higher education.

Today, several social and cultural forces are making interdisciplinary work even more important. New technologies are permitting scholars, researchers and practitioners --- be they undergraduate, graduate students, faculty members, or people outside of the university --- to work together in ways and with a breadth that is unprecedented. Contemporary explorations of the natural and human world --- for example, genetics in the natural world or globalization in the human world --- make new demands on the Research University and stretch its capacity for specializing through disciplinary work while interacting through interdisciplinary work. The University of Michigan is a leader in understanding and responding to these demands. The task is to exercise this leadership vigorously and appropriately.

We wish to suggest some of the strengths that the University of Michigan brings to its leadership role as well as some ways in which it might enhance these strengths --- particularly but not exclusively in terms of supporting junior faculty. Obviously, the University of Michigan faces challenges that have some features in common with those faced by other great research universities today. One is the competition from other universities, research centers, and the private sector for faculty and students in cutting-edge areas of work. Another is deploying and financing the new technologies of learning. We will not dwell on these common challenges but

will focus instead on those we found at the University of Michigan itself. Accordingly, we divide the remainder of our report into four sections: (1) Strengths that the University of Michigan embodies as it builds on its traditions of interdisciplinary work; (2) Challenges that the University should consider as it works with its strengths; (3) Other findings about interdisciplinarity at the University; and (4) Recommendations.

a. Key Institutional Strengths

The University of Michigan has a number of strengths that were recognized by the team:

- The University of Michigan has a long tradition of interdisciplinary activity in some areas.
- It appears that the University of Michigan is better than most institutions in interdisciplinary activities and opportunities.
- Decentralized structure allows some activities of interest to develop unimpeded.
- Michigan supports a culture of interdisciplinarity but faculty and administrators alike recognize that "we can in practice be better at it."
- Some faculty members are interested in interdisciplinary research, and some have in the past done interdisciplinary research.
- Both the Rackham Graduate School as well as the Office of the Vice President for Research have played useful roles in the initiation of interdisciplinary programs.
- In some cases deans have contributed in the development of shared resources.
- As the Working Group report demonstrates, the Rackham Graduate School has been a laboratory for interdisciplinarity in graduate education.
- Because the Rackham Graduate School monitors 130 graduate programs and ties those reviews to budget discussions between the Provost and Deans, it is well positioned to sense emerging fields and new configurations for interdisciplinary programs.
- The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP), started as a program for underrepresented students, provides excellent research opportunities for about 1,000 undergraduates across the university, many of whom become involved in interdisciplinary research.

- The Public Goods Council represents an initiative of the Provost that brings together a consortium of leaders of public units that demonstrates opportunities for interdisciplinary activity.

b. Key Institutional Challenges

Virtually all of the challenges identified here were also identified in the Reports of the Working Groups:

- The unevenness of promotion and tenure procedures is a major weakness for interdisciplinary activities.
- Joint faculty appointment criteria are not uniform.
- Some schools have been less successful than have others in lowering barriers to collaboration across disciplines. When different cultures in different schools make collaboration difficult, the result is a significant increase the time and effort it takes to initiate and/or institutionalize interdisciplinary programs.
- The physical separation among campuses is a hindrance to communication and interdisciplinary research and education.
- Problems develop when interdisciplinary activities increase in size and complexity, especially at the scale of the Life Science Institute.
- In planning for the Life Sciences Initiative, which is still underway, there has been to date little coordinated strategic planning or problem solving among department heads.
- The use of multiple definitions of interdisciplinarity causes confusion.

- The task of defining appropriate benchmarks represents an important challenge. In some parts of the campus, there is heavy emphasis on revenue as the single benchmark for judging interdisciplinary program success.
- Available information about interdisciplinary activities is limited, anecdotal and not systematic.
- Differential transactional costs that accompany interdisciplinary arrangements may exceed those of regular disciplinary activities.
- Faculty hired with central funds that seed hiring for interdisciplinary positions can fail if the working environment and the stewardship of their more complex career path are lacking.
- Consistent guidelines for indirect costs sharing policies are essential for interdisciplinary programs but do not exist.
- Interdisciplinarity as a strategy for undergraduate education does not exist.
- Lack of infrastructure and systematic coordination impedes the possibility of interdisciplinary undergraduate education in many areas.
- Mentoring of graduate students and junior faculty in joint programs is not always adequate.
- Faculty awareness of the working group reports appears to be minimal.

c. Other Findings

The committee observed certain features of the landscape which it regarded as being neither strengths nor challenges, but which it regarded as noteworthy:

- There is a wide array of perceptions of impediments to interdisciplinarity across the university.

- Some of the barriers to interdisciplinary activity are cultural, e.g., different units value interdisciplinarity differently. Other barriers are structural, such as tenure and promotion procedures.
- Some of the barriers to interdisciplinarity result from market driven forces; e.g., different units have different incentives for getting it right. Where it works well, junior faculty and graduate students are attracted to the University of Michigan and their careers prosper.
- There are many concerns regarding the methodology of tuition recovery.
- There is a feeling among some deans and faculty that there was inadequate consultation regarding the Life Science Initiative.
- Despite similar research interests between the medical school and the biology departments in the College of Letters, Sciences and Arts (LS&A), teaching loads are disparate and graduate students have different levels of support. The disparity associated with the situation creates problems in intercollegiate cooperation in the life sciences.
- There were questions regarding the linkage between the social and behavioral sciences in the Life Sciences Initiative.

6. Recommendations

Virtually all of the recommendations identified by the special emphasis team have been previously identified in the Reports of the Working Groups. The team arrived at the following set of recommendations that it regarded to be important if interdisciplinary activities are to flourish at the University of Michigan:

1. Work toward greater uniformity and transparency of procedures for tenure and promotion.

2. Develop equitable ways of evaluating scholarship, teaching, evaluation of tenure, and providing for interdisciplinary activities.
3. Develop new methods to foster faculty collaboration and administrative coordination in order to facilitate problem solving on interdisciplinary matters at a level of administrative scale not currently practiced by the university for large initiatives such as the Life Sciences Initiative.
4. Re-examine how income is derived from tuition on the basis of contact hours and numbers of students, or some other mechanism that would enable and foster interdisciplinary instruction.
5. Obtain more timely and accurate data about interdisciplinary activities.
6. Engage the faculty at significant levels of participation in strategic planning regarding interdisciplinarity.
7. Improve mentoring of graduate students and junior faculty in joint programs.
8. Develop equitable policies for sharing indirect costs between units.
9. Build an infrastructure for interdisciplinary undergraduate education.
10. Obtain follow up data regarding former graduate students of interdisciplinary programs, comparing them with students in single discipline programs.
11. Establish periodic reviews of all interdisciplinary programs and consider eliminating programs that are under performing.

III. Recommendation and Rationale Section

The team's recommendation to (a) continue the accreditation of the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor; and (b) schedule the next comprehensive visit for 2009-2010, are shown on the attached Worksheet for the Statement of Affiliation Status. The rationale for the recommendation follows:

The University of Michigan-Ann Arbor has clearly delineated its mission of teaching research, and service to society. It is well organized with reference to its availability and use of resources. The University is living up to its mission and purposes of teaching, research and service and it is committed to student learning. Institutional leadership encourages ongoing attention to improvement and engagement in planning processes that chart the future direction of the University at all levels and in all program dimensions. The University demonstrates a clear and consistent commitment to integrity in its policies and practices.