

REPORT OF THE ACADEMICS SUB-COMMITTEE

Chairs: Donna Kuizenga, College of Liberal Arts

Robert Chen, College of Science and Mathematics

Membership:

1. Cynthia Aber, College of Nursing and Health Sciences
2. Jeffrey Burr, McCormack Graduate School
3. Alan Clayton-Matthews, McCormack Graduate School
4. Robert Crossley, College of Liberal Arts
5. Judith Goleman, College of Liberal Arts
6. Rick Houser, Graduate College of Education
7. Jean-Pierre Kuilboer, College of Management
8. Winston Langley, Academic Affairs, ex-officio
9. Theresa Mortimer, Vice Provost, Academic Support Services
10. Steve Mrozowski, College of Liberal Arts
11. Denise Patmon, Graduate College of Education
12. Mary Stevenson, College of Liberal Arts
13. Karen Suyemoto, College of Liberal Arts
14. Janet Wagner, College of Management
15. Roberta Wollons, College of Liberal Arts

CHARGE:

Recognizing that the curriculum was not an issue with any representative group, the academic group will focus more on the “structure” of academic life at UMB.

PROPOSED ISSUES:

- Faculty workload: teaching, research and service (what does a 2/2 mean?)
- Enhance teaching effectiveness
- Class size
- Credit hours per course
- Number of courses relative to enrollment
- Part-time faculty
- Recruitment of faculty
- Faculty retirement projections
- Junior faculty retention plan
- Advising strategies for students
- Mentoring strategies for faculty; faculty professional development
- Faculty compensation
- Recognition for outstanding service
- International Strategy
- Student Learning Outcomes
- Organization of graduate studies (with research)
- Structure of CCDE
- “15 × 10” – academic involvement in increasing enrollment

The Academics Sub-Committee divided its charge into three broad thematic areas: Student Learning Cultures, Faculty Workload and Development and Faculty Composition and Targets for Growth. We requested assistance from outside groups of faculty on two additional areas, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment and Educational Technology.¹ In all of these areas, we are making substantive data-based recommendations.

Because of leadership changes which took place during the committee’s work, the matter of the organization of graduate studies is being handled through the Provost’s office and not the committee. The Strategic Planning Task Force took the structure of CCDE off of our charge. Finally, because our charge was so large, we did not take up the issue of faculty compensation per se, and offer only a list of concerns that must be addressed in undergraduate advising rather than making specific recommendations about restructuring.

¹ The technology report was the work of Jean-Pierre Kuilboer, Kenneth Campbell, Gonzalo Bacigalupe, Fred Johnson, Celia Moore, Eugene Gallagher and Eleanor Kutz. The student outcomes report was authored by Judith Zeitlin and Judith Goleman.

VISION AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The Academics Sub-Committee began its work by creating a consensus on a set of core academic values and expectations which we agreed would underpin all of our recommendations. These values and expectations speak to the kind of University we wish to be, and to the value-added ways in which we should enact the “Bigger, Better and More Engaged” agenda. In this narrative we group the values and expectations thematically, but we emphasize that they are in fact an integrated package and are intended to be enacted as a whole.

Our first core value is a *high quality academic experience for both undergraduate and graduate students*. The fulfillment of this value will depend on the meeting of many expectations including the following:

- UMass Boston’s learner-centered culture will be maintained and enhanced for undergraduate and graduate students.
- Graduate students will complete degrees in a timely way because of sufficient support, both financial and intellectual. [Principally the responsibility of the Research and Graduate Studies Committee, but tied to faculty workload issues].
- Undergraduate and graduate students will reach their academic goals due to the presence of appropriate infrastructure (including library, technology, laboratories, classrooms and studio space).
- Undergraduate and graduate students will be intellectually engaged and will profit from the richness that comes from studying at a research university in combination with the student centered education, a strength of the university more typically associated with small liberal arts colleges.
- Student retention and degree completion will increase due to our effective advising/mentoring infrastructure.
- Our diverse student body will succeed due to access to the tools and support it needs.
- UMass Boston graduates will be culturally literate and sensitive, and have equal access to what the world has to offer.

Our second value is a *high quality infrastructure to support successful teaching, research, service, and outreach*. The fulfillment of this second value will support the first value and will depend on meeting many expectations including the following:

- Academic oversight of all our offerings, whatever their time frame or delivery format will be implemented for assuring success of our offerings.
- Faculty will be able to teach, do research and engage service/outreach effectively due to optimal adjustment of faculty size, composition and workload.
- Faculty development and mentoring programs will be in place to support success in research, teaching and service.

- The urban mission, as a key organizing principle, will be supported in all its facets from teaching to applied research and community involvement with the city of Boston to research and involvement that addresses urban issues globally.
- As an academic community, we will engage in a continuing reflexive process that looks at the relationship between what we say about our values and what we do to enact them.

Armed with these core values and expectations, the committee made recommendations about student learning cultures, speaking to the needs of both undergraduate and graduate students. For undergraduates, looking at the National Survey of Student Engagement has allowed us to identify best practices for maintaining and increasing the academic engagement and success of our students and our recommendations are grounded in those best practices. In this context, we use the information provided by the two faculty groups whom we asked to look at educational technology and outcomes assessment. We also identify significant concerns with undergraduate advising. Since the committee did not have the time to research and evaluate the particular structures we should use in the future to address these issues, we recommend that the University immediately undertake a thorough examination of our advising practices in the light of best practices and necessary resources. Increased academic engagement and improved instruction and advising are critical success factors if the University is to recruit and retain larger numbers of students.

A second area in which the committee makes recommendations is the matter of faculty composition. Research shows that especially for students who come from disadvantaged backgrounds, the excessive use of contingent faculty, especially in basic general education instruction, has a negative effect on student learning outcomes and retention and graduation rates. This research, summarized in one of the appendices of this report, makes a powerful case for the University's need to reverse the trend that has seen the percentage of FTE tenure-stream faculty drop from 75% to 66% in the last ten years. Addressing faculty workload, development and composition issues is critical if we are to attain our research and enrollment goals, and if we are to attract and retain the best faculty who can help us realize those goals.

For current graduate students and any increase in the numbers of graduate students, it is clear that increased stipend support is critical. On the one hand, an absolute increase in the amount of funding we devote to graduate stipends is essential. It is also important to note, however, that in disciplines where students need teaching preparation, increasing the number of teaching assistantships would simultaneously help us move toward our goal of decreasing our dependence on contingent faculty. Increased use of teaching assistants will not suit all graduate students or all programs, and will require carefully constructed and monitored teacher training and mentoring programs. While the quality of graduate advising has not been identified as problematic, we do recognize the need for increased services for graduate students, including expanded hours of campus services, something that will help undergraduates as well.

A third area the committee examined is the kind of workload faculty should have in order to instruct and mentor undergraduate and graduate students effectively and to be productive researchers and good University citizens. In conjunction with the matter of workload, we also make recommendations for faculty development, since workload alone will not provide faculty with the tools they need to be fully successful. We have a particular concern for the development and mentoring of faculty of color, on whom the University sometimes places an especially heavy burden.

The committee also provides some recommendations for growth, not so much in terms of which areas should grow, but more in terms of how the University should grow, since regardless of whether we increase current programs or add new ones, we must not undercut our current strengths. We identify seven issues the University must address in this area:

- As we move to 15,000 and beyond, we must solve pressing problems of faculty composition, infrastructure and support staff. If we were to grow beyond 15,000 without plans in place to deal with these issues, we would lose both students and faculty as fast as we gain them.
- To maintain the university's overall quality and reputation, we must harmonize and coordinate academic program growth and the research enterprise. One of the differences between high schools, community colleges or teaching colleges and research universities is that research universities require and support research across the span of disciplines, both as part of their contribution to society, and as an integral component in the education of students.
- It is essential to examine the costs associated with growth, so that our investments are sound and earn us more than we spend. We must take demographic predictions about where our students will come from into account.
- The University must look at alternative models for support staffing and professional advising to find the best ways to sustain growth.
- Recognizing that student growth will be essential to the University's future financial welfare, we encourage the exploration of opportunities to offer cooperative programs with other parts of the UMass system in order to maximize the efficient use of resources.
- As we grow, and as our mix of curriculum delivery evolves, it is essential that the academic units exercise oversight on curricular and program quality, whatever the venue or delivery model of our course offerings.
- Growth must be coherent with the University's fundamental obligations, and our present and historical strengths, which emphasize fostering research for the good of society in the broadest sense and educating the workforce and citizens of the future.

We believe that the ensemble of our recommendations will allow UMass Boston to reach its full potential as an outstanding research institution with a special but not exclusive focus on urban issues, and to be an institution that provides an engaging, rigorous academic program to both undergraduate and graduate students, and to realize our mission to provide access to excellence for underserved populations.

The Committee also acknowledges that the University faculty harbors considerable doubts not about the rightness of our recommendations but about their feasibility. In the appendices to this report, we provide estimates of costs and suggested ways of implementing our recommendations. We agree with Chancellor Collins that armed with a consistent pattern of growth and a strong strategic plan, it will be possible to increase our resource base. We also believe that we can use our resources more efficiently and more consciously to achieve our goals. We respect the doubts expressed at the Committee's open meeting with university faculty and staff held in early February, and we know that a number of recommendations will have to be implemented in stages over a number of years. However, we are confident that if accepted, our recommendations will help make UMass Boston a truly first-rate urban university, and one that is indeed bigger, better and more engaged.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Promote best teaching practices that result in student academic engagement across the curriculum at all levels from first-year undergraduate through graduate education. This recommendation advocates using the best practices for active and engaged learning derived from the National Survey of Student Engagement.² In this context, we also recommend that the institution make a better use of its instructional resources by making a judicious increase in large classes, and in the use of technology, using best practices for student engagement and active learning. Finally, we must institute student outcomes assessment programs whose results may be used to improve our teaching practices. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 1.
2. Institute a career-span, institution-wide program of faculty development activities and mentoring. Special attention must be given to junior faculty, and especially junior faculty of color, in order to recruit and retain faculty with strong commitments to both research and teaching. Support for faculty teaching and research activities, through a career-span program of faculty development, is necessary to achieve our teaching and research goals. Appropriate integration of technology into our teaching practices must be a part of this development program. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 2.
3. Implement a program of hiring that will insure that the majority of instruction at both undergraduate and graduate levels is provided by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Move the faculty composition of full-time equivalent tenure-stream faculty from the current 66% to a minimum of 70%. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 3.
4. Reform course release policies to provide a 2+2 in class instructional load to all probationary faculty and to all research-productive senior faculty. This recommendation will align the in-class instructional load with our expectations for research productivity and student advising and mentoring as we transition to a

² The faculty development program described in recommendation 2 provides the vehicle for acquainting faculty with these best practices, including the thoughtful use of technology.

- permanent 2+2 structure. It will also increase our ability to attract and retain the most talented faculty. The appendix to this recommendation provides a more extensive rationale and strategies for implementation.
5. Undertake an immediate examination of undergraduate student advising to address concerns about availability, quality and consistency of advising, including the appropriate mix of professional and faculty advising. The committee affirms the value of good advising whatever its organizational structure as it affirms the importance of advising free of racism or stereotypes. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 5.
 6. Ensure continued commitment to the urban mission, to global and local cultural literacy, and to diversity in students and faculty that makes UMass Boston a distinctive educational leader. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 6.
 7. Support graduate education by increasing stipend amounts and offering additional stipends both for research and for teaching in programs where students are qualified and interested in teaching and where training programs can be provided for graduate student teaching assistants I or II. This recommendation supports graduate education, increases our recruitment competitiveness, and also addresses in part the issue of faculty composition in recommendation 3. For more detail see the appendix to recommendation 3.
 8. Coordinate research growth and program growth. Align growth in student numbers with growth in human and physical resources, consistent with appropriate benchmarks in student engagement. Investigate collaborations with other UMass campuses that would enable us to offer cooperative degree programs in areas such as engineering, health, and education. Increase academic oversight of all our offerings whatever their delivery locus or format. For more detail, see the points made above related to recommendations for growth and also the appendix to recommendation 8.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 1: Teaching and Learning

Recommendation: *Promote best teaching practices that result in student academic engagement across the curriculum at all levels from first-year undergraduate through graduate education. This recommendation advocates using the best practices for active and engaged learning derived from the National Survey of Student Engagement.³ In this context, we also recommend that the institution make a better use of its instructional resources by making a judicious increase in large classes, and in the use of technology, using best practices for student engagement and active learning. Finally, we must institute student outcomes assessment programs whose results may be used to improve our teaching practices.*

IF

“Learning begins with student engagement, which in turn leads to knowledge and understanding.” (Lee Shulman, “Making Differences: A Table of Learning,” quoted in NSSE 2006)

AND

Our question is: How can we increase enrollment in a way that preserves a high quality of student learning?

THEN

Our provisional answer is: Preserve and improve all means of student engagement that are relevant to the UMB student body and culture in order to produce knowledge and understanding. Do not direct undue efforts toward engagement methods that are not realistic for retaining UMB students in an effort to increase enrollment.

SO

What do we know about UMB students in order to determine what engagement efforts make sense?

UMB students:

- Are more ethnically diverse than the national average
- Are more likely to come from other countries than the national average
- Are more likely to speak another language than English at home than the national average
- Come from families that report incomes of \$25,000 or less (45/56%, freshman/senior)
- Work more than 20 hours per week (33/51 %)
- Are less integrated into extracurricular campus life than the national average
- Have more responsibility to dependents (51/62%)
- Are less likely to attend school full time (77/64%)
- Expect that work or family commitments will delay degrees (25/32%)
- Expect that financial problems will delay degrees (49/38%)

³ The faculty development program described in recommendation 2 provides the vehicle for acquainting faculty with these best practices, including the thoughtful use of technology.

UMB students also:

- Work harder than they thought they could at the national ratio (57/60%, freshman/senior)
- Asked questions in class at or above the national ratio (65/65%)
- Come to class unprepared less often than the national average (6/15%)
- Spend as much time studying as the national average (45/55%)
- Are less likely to have participated in a community-based project (81-68%)

(Selected data from NSSE 2004, *Student Characteristics and Factors Affecting Retention and Persistence of UMB Students*, Brown and Murphy)

NSSE Report Conclusions:

UMass Boston students differ from their colleagues on a number of background measures. Several of the background characteristics seem to involve stresses that may impose time constraints on UMass Boston students that limit their participation in activities outside of class time or aside from directly preparing for class. This may adversely impact their ability to become academically or socially integrated into the life of the university, and therefore may adversely affect retention and persistence. (Brown and Murphy 43)

The conclusions we draw from the NSSE Report:

- UMB students invest the time they do have in their courses where engagement is high and this is where we should invest our greatest engagement efforts too.
- Retention is likely to remain a problem as it is inextricably related to issues of social justice and economic stratification in the country as a whole.
- To raise enrollment, the university will need to attract more students as freshmen, transfers and graduate students rather than expect significant changes in retention based on the current student body.
- To preserve and enhance a high quality of student learning, the university will have to follow best education practices within the curriculum – the sphere in which UMB students are most engaged. These practices, cited in NSSE 2006 as Benchmarks of Effective Education Practices, are as follows:⁴
 - High level of academic challenge
 - Active and collaborative learning
 - Reflective thinking for deep learning
 - Student-faculty interaction
 - Enriching educational experiences
 - Supportive campus environment
- To preserve and enhance a high quality of learning, the university will need to use technology to enhance teaching and learning.

⁴ NSSE 2006 reports that these effective education practices produce engagement for students of color and historically underserved students in a way that has compensatory effects on persistence.

- To preserve and enhance a high quality of learning, the university will need to increase course offerings and faculty to providing a balanced mix of large and small classes, all of which promote student engagement and active learning.
- Increase the number of teaching assistant stipends in programs where teaching is a relevant part of graduate preparation. Institute strong training and mentoring programs for graduate teaching assistants working as either TAI or TAI. We expect that the increased number of teaching assistantships will allow us to offer more large sections in ways that assure all students will have opportunities for active and engaged learning.
- An on-going program of development for continuing faculty is essential to promoting the best practices in both small and large settings.

FINALLY

Where these practices are in place, they should be preserved. We also feel strongly that new initiatives in every college and at every level from freshman to graduate should be undertaken to improve student engagement and student learning as enrollments increase. We offer below a list of suggestions for new initiatives and a (very partial) list of current practices that stand out as benchmarks of effective practices at UMB.

New Initiatives

(Note: #1 and #2 below are especially relevant to the professional colleges and graduate programs for increasing enrollment while preserving a high quality of student learning. These initiatives combine the benchmarks of a supportive campus environment with a high level of academic challenge and enriching educational experiences.)

1. Provide more flexible curricular options than are currently available to students at UMB for the diverse needs of the current and emerging student population, e.g.:
 - Develop part-time curricula for those students who need to slow up their academic pace to ensure success
 - Develop second degree/fast track programs for those students who qualify in order to move more efficiently through course work with fewer obstacles. Consider a cohort model and year-round, accelerated models.
 - Develop more post-baccalaureate certificate programs for students who do not necessarily need or want a second baccalaureate degree but who are considering career changes.
 - Develop more blended or on-line courses for students to meet academic requirements without having to come to campus as often. This should be done where this delivery format is appropriate to the nature of the course.
 - Revise and/or adapt courses to meet weekly for longer periods, reducing trips to campus.
 - Create engaged learning communities for commuter, resident and distance learning students.
2. Provide better assessment of students' prior course work with the use of waiver or challenge exams when in doubt: i.e. less red tape, more innovation.

3. Recognize that a student taking time off for a semester/year to get finances in order, to deal with family and/or other personal issues does not necessarily imply that the student is withdrawing from the university.
4. Provide quicker student access to 200-level courses so that students' enthusiasms can be addressed earlier in their course work.
5. Provide more tenure-track faculty in freshman seminars so that students can come into contact with professors who, by virtue of being closer in age to them, can serve as role models and mentors.
6. Provide more incentives for and better mentoring of the junior faculty, helping them to see the value of teaching freshman seminars as conduits to their upper level classes and as a means of modeling intellectual life in a way that our students can imagine for themselves.
7. Develop methods for faculty to exchange information across colleges, regarding little known undergraduate and graduate programs that need advertising.
8. Increase student engagement in academically challenging work within the classroom and beyond:
 - Creating effective learning portals that integrate various modes of learning and connect students, faculty, and resources
Current best practices: Smart Classrooms; WebCT and other interactive websites for classroom and distance learning activities, pedagogical practices that include various ways of engaging in discussion (large group, small group, dyads) to address different cultural and individual learning styles, connections between campus events and classes or disciplines, multidisciplinary courses and collaborations that expand students' access to learning and resources.
 - Inquiry and research
Current best practices: library electronic resources, electronic reserves, research apprenticeships, graduate and undergraduate research connections.
 - Collaboration and teamwork
Current best practices: Web CT discussions and chats, course-based Wiki's and blogs; group projects resulting in campus events or displays, collaborative pedagogical practices such as Jigsaw Puzzle approach, collaborative study groups, peer evaluation and feedback, student posting and response capacity on English/Gen Ed website, synchronous course meetings
 - International and intercultural understanding
Current best practices: use of www resources (such as Words Without Borders); email, blog, and wiki exchanges of paired classrooms across different settings (English 101 students at UMB and UNC/Greensboro, study abroad programs, community-based learning projects that emphasize intercultural exposure and understandings.

- Creativity, design, composition
Current best practices: use and production of visual images, video and audio for study, analysis, and critique and in student projects; availability of Media Space resources to students as well as faculty.
- Applying learning in the real world
Current best practices: community engagement projects, service learning, community research, collaborations between academic classes and research institutes; e-portfolios; online degree programs.

Exemplary Programs and Initiatives that represent benchmark practices at UMB

(Note: the following list is partial and inadequate; the items herein should not be seen as selected but only as symbolic of best curricular practices already underway at UMB.)

1. Title III Project to improve curricular alignment with primary feeder institutions, reduce credit loss and enhance course and program equivalency with a focus on general education, high demand and emerging programs with low equivalency and alignment.

2. Directions for Student Potential: A six-week summer program, using a cohort model, for motivated students from disadvantaged backgrounds who lack the credentials for admission to UMass Boston but provide other evidence that they have the potential to successfully complete college-level work. Directions for Student Potential is currently funded in part by the Disadvantaged Student Program. DSP targets three groups: urban students whose grades and SAT scores are below the minimum required for admission to UMass Boston; students who have a high school diploma or the equivalent, but have been out of school for several years; and students who have a high school diploma or the equivalent whose first language is not English. Students who are admitted into Directions for Student Potential are admitted to the University upon successful completion of the program.

Structure:

- Faculty get to know the students quickly and well
- Students get to know the faculty quickly and well
- Students get to know each other quickly and well
- Students form strong, lasting bonds with both faculty and each other
- Faculty is able to continually and accurately assess students throughout the program, and to make appropriate placements for fall classes

Class size is another important feature. All classes are kept to a maximum of 20, and all classes have a tutor, or co-teacher assigned to them. This small setting provides students with the opportunity to:

- Get individual attention from faculty
- Get help and support from tutors
- Feel confident about speaking up
- Feel confident about taking risks
- Feel confident that their concerns will be addressed

3. History Department Proposed Programs in Archives and Public History

- Classes combine lecture with community-based research
- Use of nearby research institutions: JFK Library, Massachusetts Archive, Boston Public Library, local historical societies

ASSESSMENT

The effectiveness of the recommendations above must be assessed in ways that allow us to continually improve our practices. Across the university, we do have quite a number of assessment programs, although we are much stronger on course assessment than on student outcomes assessment.

Course assessment here refers to an ongoing evaluation of how well courses continue to meet a set of targeted goals, and this kind of assessment is widely practiced in the schools and colleges and in the General Education program. There are many ways in which course assessment is performed, from student responses on departmental course evaluations to regular review of the course syllabi, assignments, and student course work. *Student outcomes assessment* refers to an evaluation of the quality of work done by students enrolled in a particular course or set of courses. At a minimum, student grades given by individual instructors are a form of outcomes assessment, but the standards of student assessment used by NEASC today favor outside evaluations independent of the teacher-student relationship developed in a course or set of courses, and these forms of evaluation are less well developed across the campus.

Although it has yet to be institutionalized as a regular assessment structure, the College of Management initiated systematic reviews of two important components of its GenEd curriculum, CM's Intermediate Seminar (MGT 330) and the capstone course (MGT 490), in 2001-2 and 2002-3. In addition to examining course syllabi, a sample of student papers from all sections of both courses was reviewed by an independent team of CM faculty, using a scoring rubric similar to that used for the Writing Proficiency Examination. Summary reports from these evaluations were given to instructors of both courses. Improved writing performances in the capstone course over that seen in MGT 330 was noted, and efforts were subsequently made to strengthen writing instruction in the CM Intermediate Seminar. In the two other colleges, course assessment is less formally developed on the program level. CNHS uses student outcomes on national or statewide exams to inform its program committee. CPCS has strong curriculum development groups, but as yet has not developed detailed procedures for linking student outcomes measured by competency portfolios back to program assessment.

Looking at practices from the student outcomes assessment perspective, however, both CPCS and CNHS have strong practices in place. Its competency-based pedagogy requires CPCS students to develop individual portfolios of learning projects, including work that reflects General Education standards, and these portfolios are evaluated by independent faculty teams. CNHS (particularly the Nursing program) employs national

examinations at two points in each student's career, prior to beginning clinical studies and as exit examinations linked to the capstone course. Among other colleges, there are individual departments that may use some form of standardized examination as part of their capstone for licensure purposes (Classics, for example), but exit exams are not normally part of undergraduate majors.

For the majority of UMB students, the Writing Proficiency Examination serves as a mid-career outcomes assessment (not for CM students, whose WPR is satisfied through a single course taken before MGT 330, or CPCS students, who complete a late-career communications portfolio). A team of outside evaluators has recently visited campus and has recommended ending the test option and requiring all students to submit portfolios. These recommendations include:

- Work to develop a portfolio assessment that closely matches the competencies outlined for general education. The assessment instrument should be both a valid measure of student writing abilities and should match the content actually being taught in the courses.
- Work to develop a writing portfolio assessment that spans colleges and is portable, perhaps through an e-portfolio system.
- Consider changing the performance essay to a self-reflective essay as the culminating piece in the portfolio.

The consultants' suggestion that the WPR measure broader general education competencies is an extremely promising new avenue to explore. Since another campus group is presently examining e-portfolios, this is a timely suggestion, and we look forward to learning more about how e-portfolios might work for our students.⁵ At present we envision them as a medium through which students would submit a variety of projects that illustrate their work both in GenEd capabilities, everything from quantitative reasoning to critical reading and analysis, and in disciplinary areas, from the student's major to GenEd Distribution subjects. The e-portfolio medium would permit teams of faculty evaluators to retrieve those pieces that they particularly were interested in examining, from Natural Science lab reports to information technology projects. E-portfolio projects could thus serve both as an efficient means of student outcomes assessment (one tied more directly to the GenEd curriculum), and a means of providing data for course or program assessment. Such a format ideally would be applicable to all undergraduate colleges, enabling students to move their WPR with them if they transfer to another college within the University.

In conclusion, we note that course assessment and student outcome assessment are not evenly accomplished across General Education, let alone the majors. The challenge that

⁵ Through a Signature Initiative Grant from the UMass President's Instructional Technology Council, a number of units and programs have been exploring instructional technology, including e-portfolios, for teaching and learning. The units/programs include: College of Management, Graduate College of Education, Honors Program and Gen Ed Program. The principal investigator of the grant is Peter Langer.

lies ahead is to build a network of assessment measures that are useful, revealing, sustainable, and, to the greatest possible extent, built on what is already in place. General Education has developed strong course assessment and student outcome assessment models for the First Year and Intermediate Seminars. There is reason to be optimistic that the WPR can and will be revised to assess more directly the capabilities named in the General Education Seminars and the complementary expectations of the Freshman English program.

Assessment in the hundreds of Distribution courses and the relatively new Capstone requirement is weak and needs further examination and innovation. We are particularly interested in the work being done on campus that investigates the use of e-portfolios. Through the cross-referencing capacity available in sophisticated e-portfolio technology, we see the potential for reviewing student learning in a way that fulfills our call for useful and revealing measures that are not so labor-intensive as to make their sustainability unrealistic.

In regard to outcome assessment in the majors, we are mindful of the independence of academic departments and feel that the university needs to invest significant funds for bringing experts to campus who can assist departments in designing specific, stimulating approaches to outcome assessment and who can also offer non-redundant global models for improving student learning through outcome assessment at the university.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 2: Faculty Development

Recommendation: Institute a career-span, institution-wide program of faculty development activities and mentoring. Special attention must be given to junior faculty, and especially junior faculty of color, in order to recruit and retain faculty with strong commitments to both research and teaching. Support for faculty teaching and research activities, through a career-span program of faculty development, is necessary to achieve our teaching and research goals. Appropriate integration of technology into our teaching practices must be a part of this development program.

Fitting hand-in-glove with our strong recommendation to restructure the teaching formula of the university to be consistent with past and future expectations of increased scholarly productivity is the need to pay more attention to, and put more resources toward, faculty development, including the appropriate use of technology. While we hold this to be true across all faculty ranks, it is intensely important for junior faculty. It is clear that a teaching formula commensurate with scholarly productivity expectations alone will not be sufficient.

A corollary to the above is our need to pay particular attention to the urban mission of the university along with the unique needs of our faculty of color. Many faculty members of all demographic and cultural backgrounds seek out UMB because of its reputation as an intellectual environment embedded in the stories of peoples and communities who find themselves outside the mainstream of American society. These educators bring a passion for working with these groups that is widely embraced and makes our University distinctive. We should embrace this passion and work toward enhancing this particular strength of the university. Below, we outline some mechanisms for improving the recruitment and retention of faculty. These concrete faculty development strategies are not rank-ordered.

- More generous financial support for research and travel is needed. The university has a policy regarding start-up costs. This policy should be evaluated with respect to whether it is sufficient to help us attract the best qualified faculty across all fields. Resources of this type should be considered as an investment that allows us to compete with other research universities for the best people.

While the UMB library system has improved substantially over the last few years after years of budgetary strain, there remain gaps in services relating to some specific academic fields. These gaps should be identified and solutions should be put into place. For example, for scholars in the humanities both electronic and print materials in the library are substandard for a research university and that deficiency needs to be addressed.

Attending conferences to present the fruits of one's scholarship and to engage in professional networking and traveling to collect data for research are two activities necessary for professional success. There is a lack of sufficient support on campus for

professional travel. Unit budgets should be increased to enhance participation in this activity.

- More systematic support for innovative teaching is required. In line with Recommendation 1, we need a consistent program that supports best practices for engaged and active learning in multiple types of class settings ranging from small to large. This support is needed by both junior and senior faculty, who should have the necessary assistance to make the best use of instructional technology. Specific recommendations include:
 - Support and design programs for department/program and course-focused faculty development. Current examples include CIT faculty seminar on teaching with technology; English Department and general education seminar websites with support and workshops.
 - Introduce and expand faculty understanding of how to use currently available technologies. Introduce new technologies as they become available. Current examples include IT workshops, with significant focus on WebCT, IT Media Space with instructional help and a range of software and GRC with instructional help focused primarily on WebCT and related technologies.
 - Integrate a focus on technology with other teaching concerns, such as addressing the needs of diverse learners. Current examples include CIT seminars and workshops.
 - Pilot industry emerging technologies; podcast, webcast.
 - Develop a teaching-focused induction experience for new faculty with teaching with technology included as an integral component. Nothing is currently in place targeting new faculty.
 - Recognize the time-intensive nature of work with technology with appropriate credit and rewards through the annual review and tenure processes.

- More systematic and imaginative mentoring of junior faculty is required. Junior faculty arrive at UMB with varying degrees of professional socialization and personal resources for ensuring successful careers, including what should be routine teaching and research skills and aptitudes for dealing with complex organizational environments. We must establish a new commitment to mentoring junior faculty. We recognize that “one size does not fit all” when it comes to the amount and type of mentoring needed by new assistant professors. Here we list some strategies to consider:
 - Assign one or more senior faculty members to mentor new junior faculty members (in some cases these assignments could be made even before the junior faculty member arrives on campus). In the case of junior faculty of color, attempts should be made to assign a senior mentor who is of the same background. The senior faculty mentor would be responsible for among other things, providing frequent feedback on scholarly and teaching activity, advice on the “ins and outs” of university life, and time management.

- Mentoring junior faculty on service activity is also critical. While participation in service to the mission of the university is important, junior faculty members need advice on how much service to provide and when to provide it. They need support and assurances from their departments. Especially important here is the service commitments of faculty of color. The university values the service commitments of its diverse faculty. However, it is often the case that a particularly burdensome level of service is required of persons of color. Departments, colleges and the university must be cognizant of the sometimes excessive amount of service required of persons of color. Either a conscious effort at reducing service for persons of color must be put into place or the activity must be given a larger weight at important points in the career stream (e.g., merit evaluation, tenure and promotion).
 - Interactive events should be established to connect faculty of color with constituent groups on campus. Resources should be made available for “meet and greet” interactions that allow faculty of different experiences, backgrounds, and ranks to informally discuss all aspects of life at our unique university.
 - Unless and until Recommendation 4 on faculty workload is implemented, a campus-wide policy permitting a reduction in teaching obligation prior to the tenure and promotion review year should be established and the necessary resources should be made available. This could take many forms, including allowing junior faculty members to take course reductions at times of their own choosing or setting a standard (such as following a successful fourth year review). Establishing a pre-tenure review sabbatical may be another useful strategy. Paying close attention to the composition (e.g., number of new preparations in short time periods) and scheduling of courses (e.g., do not schedule courses for all five days of the week in a single semester) is also important to ensuring a proper pace of work activity that balances scholarship and teaching.
- Targets of opportunity hiring policies should be developed and implemented. Such policies would allow the university the flexibility to act on unanticipated opportunities to improve itself through targeted recruitment and hiring. Examples of targets of opportunity would include the recruitment of a scholar with an extraordinary national or international reputation in her/his field who could provide an immediate enhancement to one of the many strengths of the university. Another target may be an opportunity to hire a faculty member of color who has a strong record and reputation in her/his field and who would add leadership and diversity to our faculty. Yet another opportunity may be to hire the spouse or partner of a person who is being hired for a position on campus but for which the second position was not anticipated. In all cases, the university must

insist on the highest possible levels of professional qualification and adherence to appropriate hiring processes.

- Initiation of recruitment devices to enhance our competitive position in the academic market. In the process of recruiting and retaining high quality faculty, we are competing with several limiting forces of both a local and national character. We compete with other colleges and universities in the eastern Massachusetts area that have more resources, and we compete with other regions of the country that often have lower costs of living, especially housing costs. Other universities have found innovative ways of making it attractive to relocate to their campuses and the Boston area. One example is mortgage assistance. Another example is provision of moving expenses, and yet another is the provision of high quality and cost competitive daycare for children.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 3: Faculty Composition

Recommendation: Implement a program of hiring that will insure that the majority of instruction at both undergraduate and graduate levels is provided by tenured and tenure-track faculty. Move the faculty composition of full-time equivalent tenure-stream faculty from the current 66% to a minimum of 70%.

Summary:

In the past ten years, the percentage of tenure stream FTE faculty at the University has dropped from 75% to 66%. This drop was not the product of a plan, but rather the result of a combination of funding cuts and early retirement buy outs. The question we must answer is whether this change has impacted on the academic quality of the institution. In terms of research productivity, as measured by publications, grant funding, and regional, national and international recognition of faculty research, the answer is clear. Since contingent faculty (instructors who are neither tenured nor on a tenure-track) have no research obligations, and since they have heavy teaching loads at one or more institutions, the majority are understandably not research active.

In terms of student outcomes, while there is general agreement that reliance on contingent faculty has increased, there is less agreement on whether this change has had deleterious effects on student outcomes. Although the evidence for adverse effects on student outcomes is far from unequivocal and much more careful research needs to be done, there is a sense emerging that this shift away from tenure and tenure-track faculty has taken its toll on the academic success of students, and especially among those students who are less advantaged.⁶ The committee thus recommends that the University embark on a carefully calibrated plan to redress the faculty composition to at least a ratio of 70% tenure stream faculty and 30% contingent faculty. At that point the University should again reassess the situation.

The number of new faculty required and the costs will depend on a number of factors. Changes in class size will allow us some economies.⁷ We currently spend approximately \$10M in contingent faculty salaries, coming from state funds, CTF dollars, hybrid dollars and other sources. We need to take into consideration how much of this funding might be used for tenure-stream faculty. Finally, the reform in course release policies and resulting teaching loads will impact the number of additional tenure stream faculty needed. An estimate done independently by the committee, and one which does not take all of the factors listed in this paragraph into account, provides an estimate of approximately 250 additional faculty.⁸

⁶ A summary of the research is found at the end of this appendix.

⁷ The matter of class size is treated in detail in Recommendation and Appendix 1.

⁸ Details on the calculations are found at the end of this summary.

Faculty Composition and Student Outcomes: Research Summary

Based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), while those who were tenured or tenure-track comprised 57% of the total faculty in postsecondary institutions in 1975, that proportion fell to 43% by 1995 (calculated from Benjamin 2002, Table 1) and fell further to 40.1% in 2003 (calculated from table presented in Jacobe 2006). According to Jacobe's data for 2003, in English and literature, only 33.3% of the faculty were tenured or tenure-track.

Ernst Benjamin of the AAUP acknowledges that there are instances in which adjunct professors who are practitioners in a given field can add valuable real-world experience to the classroom. They are an important element of training in professional programs in business, journalism, the health professions, and the performing arts. Benjamin's concern is that the largest increase in the use of contingent faculty does not occur in these settings of professional training but in the teaching of humanities, social sciences, and mathematics. He argues that reliance on contingent faculty to teach the general education core of post-secondary education is not desirable. Given that contingent faculty are used more widely in lower division courses and in non-elite schools, he argues that the negative effects fall most heavily on less-advantaged students who are at the outset of their higher education careers.

Observers like Benjamin and Kerber (2006) argue that the negative effects are not a reflection on the individuals who comprise the contingent faculty workforce but rather on the circumstances under which they operate and the lack of institutional support provided for them. They are less likely to have offices or computers, and less likely to receive support for professional development. Benjamin argues that while practitioner-adjuncts who teach in professional programs are likely also to have full-time jobs with benefits and to limit the number of courses they teach, the contingent faculty member who teaches in the general education core is likely to be teaching many class sections at multiple institutions and still not have health benefits or economic security.

Benjamin is particularly concerned with "faculty involvement in student learning." The most telling evidence he offers on this matter is the difference in the ratio of non-classroom instructional time to classroom instructional time between full-time faculty and part-time faculty, reported by type of institution. Portions of Benjamin's Table 4 are reproduced below, and they show that the ratio is two to four times higher for full-time faculty compared with part-time faculty, with the largest disparities occurring at the less-elite institutions. Non-classroom instruction time includes activities such as grading papers, course preparation, curriculum development, mentoring individual students and advising student organizations.

Ratio of Non-Classroom Instructional Time to
Classroom Instructional Time
Full time faculty Part-time faculty

Type of Institution	Full time faculty	Part-time faculty
Research	2.2	1.0
Doctoral	1.8	0.6
Comprehensive	1.7	0.4
Liberal Arts	1.9	0.5
Community College	0.8	0.2

Benjamin also cites his own previous research showing that part-time faculty are less likely than full-time faculty to use essay exams and that part-time faculty are far more likely than full-time faculty not to hold office hours (50% versus 2% at two-year institutions; 31% versus 7% at four-year institutions). In other words, hiring instructors “on the cheap” may reduce costs, but may also reduce the quality of the service delivered.

While Benjamin and Kerber are more concerned with differences in input measurements, economists like Ehrenberg and Zhang (2004) and Jacoby (2006) have focused more on output measures like graduation rates. Ehrenberg and Zhang emphasize that very few studies have been done that examine the impact of contingent faculty on student outcomes and that the results of the existing studies are contradictory, with some finding no adverse effects and others finding negative effects on persistence (students returning the following semester) and on the likelihood that a student will take a subsequent course in a subject. Ehrenberg and Zhang examine the impact of contingent faculty on graduation rates, using panel data from the College Entrance Examination Board’s Annual Survey of College Standard Research Compilation data file as well as other sources. Holding other factors (such as measures of students’ socioeconomic backgrounds) constant, they find an inverse relationship between a school’s graduation rate and its proportion of contingent faculty. The effect is stronger at public institutions than at private institutions, and strongest at public sector masters’ level institutions. They do not find these adverse effects at two-year colleges. However, Jacoby, using a different data set (from the NCES) does find an inverse relationship between a school’s graduation rate and its proportion of part-time instructors at two-year institutions.

Although there is much more work to be done in this area, the growth of contingent faculty is a matter of concern. In particular, the use of contingent faculty to teach the general education core may have serious negative effects on student outcomes.

Sources

Benjamin, Ernst. 2002. "How Over-Reliance on Contingent Appointments Diminishes Faculty Involvement in Student Learning," *Peer Review*, Fall.

Ehrenberg, Ronald G. and Liang Zhang. 2004. "Do Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Matter?" Cornell Higher Education Research Institute, unpublished manuscript, December 13.

Jacobe, Monica F. 2006. "Contingent Faculty Across the Disciplines," *Academe*, November-December.

Jacoby, Daniel. 2006. "Effects of Part-Time Faculty Employment on Community College Graduation Rates," *The Journal of Higher Education* - Volume 77, Number 6, November/December, pp. 1081-1103.

Kerber, Linda K. 2006. "Depending on the Contingent: The Hidden Costs for History," *Perspectives*, April.

Preliminary Faculty Needs Estimate

The following table presents our preliminary “back of the envelope” calculation for the number of new faculty needed to meet the 15x10 goal, and also to meet the goal of reducing the in-class teaching load for TTT faculty from 3/3 to 2/2.

These estimates are based on college-wide average relationships that existed in the fall of 2005. The most critical relationships are the number of faculty per 100 students (6.78 on a FTE basis), and the annual instruction cost per 100 students (\$529,470 on an IFTE basis). The estimates assume that new enrollment will be distributed across the colleges, programs, and degrees as they are currently. To get a feel for how much the estimates might vary if new enrollment is distributed differently, the first part of the table presents these two critical relationships by college.

These estimates also assume that the faculty and instructional costs of teaching the proposed additional students will remain the same as the costs associated with teaching current students (with the exception of the last panel which estimates the effect of going from a 3/3 teaching load to a 2/2 load). That is, the distributions of class sizes, TTT faculty versus contingent faculty, etc., remain the same. Class size in particular is an important factor to consider as enrollment expands. To the extent that existing sections can accommodate more students while maintaining high levels of student engagement, faculty requirements need not expand as much as projected here. On the other hand, larger class sizes mean lower outputs of other services that faculty provide, such as research, time per student of faculty availability to students for advising and office hours, and public service.

Average faculty and instructional costs, by College, per 100 IFTE students...			
College	Faculty (FTE)	Annual Instructional Cost (\$)	
CLA	6.23	414,903	
CSM	7.07	703,552	
CPCS	10.30	949,329	
CM	5.89	564,294	
CNHS	9.11	542,767	
GCOE	6.48	417,913	
MGS	6.05	1,058,570	
Campus Wide	6.78	529,470	
15,000	Enrollment Goal, Total Students (Head Count)		
12,362	Fall 2006, Total Students (Head Count)		
1.21	Goal Factor		
7,847	Fall 2005, Total Students (FTE)		
9,521	Enrollment Goal, Total Students (FTE)		
1,674	Additional Students (FTE)		
8,865,729	Additional Instructional Expense (\$)		
113	Additional Faculty (FTE)		
532	Current Faculty (FTE)		
645	Target Faculty (FTE)		
360	Current Faculty, TTT (FTE)		
0.68	Proportion of Current Faculty that are TTT (FTE basis)		
0.71	Proportion of TTT Faculty with undergraduate 3/3 teaching load (FTE basis)		
312	Number of Target Faculty going to 2/2 load from a 3/3 load (FTE)		
156	Number of New (TTT) Faculty teaching on 2/2 schedule needed (FTE)		
7.82	Number of Students per class		
2,437	Number of Students in Need of Teaching due to 2/2 load (FTE)		
12,903,342	New Instructional Cost due to 2/2 reform (\$)		
269	Total New Faculty needed (FTE)		
21,769,072	Total New Instructional Expense (\$)		

The Bottom Line

The enrollment goal of 15,000 students means:

1. An expansion in enrollment of 21 percent.
2. On an FTE basis, an increase of 113 faculty, 1,674 students, and \$8.9 million in additional instructional expense.
3. If the faculty load for TTT faculty teaching undergraduate courses is reduced from 3/3 to 2/2, an additional increase of 156 faculty on an FTE basis, and additional instructional expenses of \$12.9 million.
4. Combining the requirements of both increased student enrollment and the 2/2 teaching reform, additional faculty of 269 on an FTE basis, and additional instructional costs of \$21.8 million.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 4: Faculty Workload

Recommendation: Reform course release policies to provide a 2+2 in class instructional load to all probationary faculty and to all research-productive senior faculty. This recommendation will align the in-class instructional load with our expectations for research productivity and student advising and mentoring as we transition to a permanent 2+2 structure. It will also increase our ability to attract and retain the most talented faculty.

Faculty responsibilities cover the areas of research/creative activity, teaching and service. Although commonly expressed in terms of teaching load alone, in fact, each faculty member's portfolio is rich and complex. There are three principal rationales for moving to a lower in-class teaching obligation within the overall faculty workload to probationary faculty and to research-productive senior faculty.

- The university increasingly and emphatically defines itself as a research-intensive institution. That status manifests itself both in the number of graduate programs offered in selected units across the campus and in increased research expectations in all units on the campus. The standard teaching formula must be commensurate with this status if the University's reputation is to be credible and if its faculty is to be appropriately productive. We must move as quickly as possible to a new model for calculating work expectations as we move to a greater emphasis on scholarly productivity; we cannot have one without the other.
- To build and sustain the University's reputation, an investment must be made in the faculty, and the assessment of the worth of the investment should be based both on the quality of scholarly production and external funding activity, with the understanding that the latter criterion will apply to some units and individuals in the University more obviously than to others.
- A shift to a more appropriate workload formula will not only enable junior faculty to fulfill their potential as scholars but also make it easier to recruit senior faculty if we have a standard work load comparable to those of the institutions from which they are coming. One reason for the disaffection and anxiety of many current junior faculty is their perception of a lack of connection between their working conditions and the expectations for their success.

A look at the loads at peer institutions reveals a variety of practices, as well as a dissonance between stated load and real faculty work patterns. To assess our own situation, the committee surveyed the deans of the schools and colleges asking about in-class teaching loads and course release policies. The results revealed that we have very different policies in different schools, colleges, and indeed, in departments within a single academic unit. Likewise, we have widely differing course release policies and ways of giving credit for things like teaching graduate courses, directing theses, dissertations, honors theses or independent studies. A study done by OIRP indicates that the average teaching load here is approximately 2+2, but our survey of policies and practices shows

that this load is very unevenly distributed. The OIRP study includes all releases, whether they be for administration, grant buy-outs, dissertation supervision or many other types of activities.

Rather than changing the base load, which is a matter for union negotiations, we believe that the most efficient and fairest way to deal with our expectations for faculty work is to reform our course release policies so that they reflect our expectations in research, teaching and service.

We would anticipate the following benefits from this adjustment in course release policies:

- Establishment of a research-friendly climate on campus, especially for junior faculty, including the development of seminars and workshops on scholarly production parallel to those that now are focused on the improvement of teaching.
- Some alleviation of junior faculty anxieties and some strengthening of junior faculty retention as the university better matches scholarly expectations with teaching demands.
- Improvement of our standing within the University of Massachusetts system and among our peer urban institutions. Enhancement of our capacity to successfully recruit and retain the best faculty at both the entry level and at senior ranks.
- Increased research productivity as measured both by external funding generated and by number and quality of publications.
- Increased attention to the mentoring of both undergraduate and graduate students, including providing them with the kinds of intellectual opportunities associated with studying at a research university.

We recommend that the Chancellor immediately ask the Provost to form an appropriate task force to recommend to him the best way of achieving more realistic and equitable workload policies for tenure-stream faculty across the institution.

Whatever the final policy, and we describe two potential models below, the committee believes that it should have the following features:

- Probationary faculty should automatically benefit from the new workload policies during their first four years.
- If probationary faculty are reappointed at fourth year review, they should automatically benefit from the new workload policies during their two remaining probationary years.
- The present policy of counting the teaching of graduate courses differently from the teaching of undergraduate courses should be ended, but this must be done in conjunction with the creation of a method of crediting the out-of-class work done by those who direct dissertations or masters' theses, and assume other similar

responsibilities in graduate programs. In this same vein, a way must be found to credit the work of mentoring undergraduate theses, research projects and honors projects as well as the teaching of large sections.

- Faculty with external grant funding will continue to be able to buy themselves out following the policies established by the Vice Provost for Research.
- The university will continue to grant suitable releases for the administrative work done by department chairs, and others who occupy similar positions, although these policies should be reexamined on a college by college basis in the light of the overall workload plan once it has been developed.

Determining the in-class teaching loads of senior faculty might be done either prospectively or retrospectively. That is to say, faculty might be asked to submit a three-year research plan, and be granted releases on the strength of that plan. Future releases would be contingent on both new plans, and the accomplishment of the work proposed in the previous plan. Conversely, a faculty member's record for the past year or the rolling average of some number of past years might be used to determine if releases would be granted for the coming year or period of years. Whatever the method used, it should both provide accountability and avoid excessive bureaucracy. It should also respect the balance of power between faculty and administrators in decision-making.

We recognize that there would be some tenured faculty who no longer have active research agendas who would choose not to apply for the releases or whose applications would be rejected. In these cases, we recommend that the evaluation of these faculty for merit, but not for promotion, be more heavily weighted toward teaching and service.

This reformed course release policy should significantly help junior faculty succeed in gaining tenure, and should help research-active faculty better balance their commitments. This reformed release policy should also make faculty more available to mentor students, both graduate and undergraduate.

Benchmarks for success will include better retention of junior faculty, and increased research productivity as measured by grant activity and publications/creative works and tracked through the reapplication or release-granting process. Increased student retention should result in part from better mentoring of students, as indicated above, and from the changes described in recommendation 1, and its associated appendix.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 5: Advising

Recommendation: *Undertake an immediate examination of undergraduate student advising to address concerns about availability, quality and consistency of advising, including the appropriate mix of professional and faculty advising. The committee affirms the value of good advising whatever its organizational structure as it affirms the importance of advising free of racism or stereotypes.*

Because its charge was so vast, the Academics Sub-Committee was not able to provide specific recommendations about the structures of advising at the University. Rather, we have identified a number of issues and concerns. We must indicate at the outset that overall we considered graduate advising to be rather sound, and found that the major issues we face are related to undergraduate advising.

One major issue presented to the committee was the difficulty in getting good, clear and coherent information. Advising structures were seen as fragmented, as was advising knowledge. Communication among the parties—professional advisors, faculty, staff, students—may be a product of our fragmented structures, and does not serve students well. Heavy advising loads lead to advising that is formulaic at best and racist or based on other stereotypes at worst.

As we consider what mix of faculty and professional advising we should offer, we must be aware of the fact that our commuter students often want to see someone immediately, and not have to make an appointment in advance. Many departments are successful with drop-in sessions around registration time, but in general, the desire of students to see someone at their immediate convenience argues for a strong cadre of professional advisors.

We need to examine the value of college-based professional advising as opposed to centralized professional advising. While some undergraduate units have their own professional advising staff, others do not.

We need to look at advising loads for both professional advisors and faculty, and clarify roles and responsibilities. Who should handle career advising? Who should handle course selection? Who should handle empathetic advising? Peer advising has been used successfully in a number of departments and this is also a model that should be explored.

The National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), the professional organization for Academic Advisors, is recognized in the field as an authoritative source for information on optimal advising loads. Their discussion of advisor load asks three questions:

- What do we know about advisor load?
- What do the 'experts' recommend as reasonable loads for academic advisors?
- What institutional factors should guide decisions on advisor load?

The following passage quoted from the organization's web site⁹ summarizes NACADA's thinking on the issue of advising load:

It is interesting to observe that 'experts' in academic advising are not 'on the record' regarding advisor load. That is, there are few, if any published recommendations on this topic. Note also that even the CAS [Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education] standards beg this issue. The standards suggest that advising programs must be adequately staffed with sufficient personnel to meet student needs without unreasonable delay. Yet, the standards provide no quantitative insights into the definition of the terms adequately, sufficient, student needs, or unreasonable. Off the record however, many 'experts' in the field of academic advising suggest that a target advisor load for full-time advisors should be about 300/1 and the target advisor load for full-time instructional staff should be about 20/1. Usually, the 'experts' immediately qualify these recommendations suggesting that many institutional factors should be considered in determining a reasonable advisor load.

The document goes on to recommend lower advising loads when advisors work with students with a high degree of need like many of our students. In assessing faculty advising it will be important to take both undergraduate and graduate advising loads into consideration.

The best information we have on advising loads for the professional advisors in the University Advising Center counts the number of undeclared students assigned to the seven professional advisors in the Center. For FY 06 this ratio was 315/1. The advisee to advisor ratio varies by semester but has ranged from 295 to 343 over the last five years. In addition to advising the undeclared students, advisors in the University Advising Center serve as a resource for and work closely with the faculty who are teaching the First Year Seminars. This adds to their load. Further, even after being assigned an advisor in their major, students frequently check back with the University Advising Center, or are referred back to it regarding overall graduation requirements. Finally, the University Advising Center is responsible for the Student Referral Program. This program provides a channel for professors to refer "high risk" students for help. For these reasons, the ratio of undeclared students per advisor reflects only part of the load.

⁹ <http://www.nacada.ksu.edu/clearinghouse/AdvisingIssues/advisorload.htm>

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 6: Urban Mission

Recommendation: Ensure continued commitment to the urban mission, to global and local cultural literacy, and to diversity in students and faculty that makes UMass Boston a distinctive educational leader.

The committee understands the urban mission to encompass many facets of our teaching, research and service activities. We believe that the Key Working Principles adopted by the Urban Mission Coordinating Committee provide a good description of the University's urban mission (listed at the end of this Appendix).

In specific relation to the charge of our Committee, the commitment to the urban mission is part of the core values we used to guide the development of our recommendations and is reflected within specific aspects of all other recommendations in the Academics Sub-Committee's report. For example:

- Our recommendations about teaching and learning (Recommendation 1) encompass a recommendation that we work to actively maintain the rich diversity of our student body described in the appendix to Recommendation 1 and that we work to actively maintain and expand efforts to ensure cultural literacy for all students.
- Recommendation 2 on faculty development encompasses a recommendation that we recognize the value of a diverse faculty and the value of a body of faculty who are themselves culturally sensitive in their pedagogy and curriculum presentations. Thus, it stresses the importance of attending to the extra demands put on faculty of color in order to contribute to retention of these faculty. It also stresses the importance of providing ongoing faculty development for all faculty to best enable them to meet the recommendations described in Recommendation 1 about best teaching practices for our diverse student body and our goals of ensuring cultural literacy and local and global engagement.
- Recommendation 3 on faculty composition notes that the excessive use of contingent faculty appears to have serious negative effects on student outcomes, and advocates for a plan to increase the percentage of instruction by tenure stream faculty. This concern about the quality of the academic experience is central to our ability to help our diverse students succeed, to our commitment to providing access to education for all students, and to our belief that the Urban Mission benefits all students.
- Recommendation 4 on Faculty Workload encompasses a belief that there is value for urban students and communities in enabling students to have access to faculty who are excellent teachers and researchers and who can involve students in their research and not only through direct classroom instruction. It also reflects a belief that research activities also serve the Urban Mission directly. Thus, recommendation 4, enabling a better balance of these activities, will contribute to maintaining our continuing commitment to the Urban Mission.
- Recommendation 5 on advising stresses the need for attentive and individualized advising and the importance of avoiding stereotypical or formulaic advising, which disproportionately impacts students of color.

- Recommendation 7 on supporting graduate education encompasses a recommendation that we work to open access to more diverse graduate students by increasing financial support. In addition, training graduate students as teachers for our student body and reflecting our institutional goals will contribute to the Urban Mission through training culturally literate and sensitive teachers.
- Recommendation 8 on growth voices a concern for supporting research that is coherent with our urban mission, and emphasizes the need to grow in ways that preserve a strong academic experience for our diverse undergraduate and graduate students.

UMass Boston’s Urban Mission: Key Working Principles

Engagement with urban places, people, and issues, and their complex local, national and global linkages, is a hallmark of UMass Boston’s general mission as an urban public university. We use the term “Urban Mission” to refer to this public urban quality of our university mission, which affirms that: “The University of Massachusetts Boston, one of the five campuses of the University of Massachusetts, is nationally recognized as a model of excellence for urban universities. A comprehensive, doctoral granting campus, we provide challenging teaching, distinguished research and extensive services which particularly respond to the academic and economic needs of the state’s urban areas and their diverse populations.”

The University is a public institution located in one of the nation’s most important metropolitan regions, also the Commonwealth’s capital and major population center. UMB is privileged to provide an excellent university education to residents of Boston and other cities and regions, seeking knowledge and skills to fashion their life’s work. The University of Massachusetts Boston has an institutional obligation and responsibility to employ resources in partnership with urban institutions and residents to help create viable social fabrics, economies, civic and cultural institutions, and healthy service organizations. The interdependence between our university and urban systems and residents is incontrovertible.

As a public urban university our mission is to provide access to the highest quality education, knowledge, and services to the public in all its variety, with particular responsibilities to the underrepresented and underserved, especially communities of color and low income, among others.

All of the traditional functions of the university - teaching, research, and service - can and do contribute to furthering the urban mission. It is important to acknowledge the range of contributions we make, while recognizing that units of the university may contribute to the urban mission in varying ways. Because of this breadth and the evolving nature of our university, it will be an ongoing task to clarify and inventory UMass Boston’s substantial range of contributions across the university in each area.

In concert with the broader university community, the Urban Mission Coordinating Committee (UMCC) will play a key role in the ongoing task of identifying how we meet our urban mission at the level of particular programs, activities, and initiatives. This information is critical as the UMCC seeks to promote these contributions on and off campus and to advocate for the application of the essential principles outlined in this document.

APPENDIX TO RECOMMENDATION 8: Growth

Recommendation: Coordinate research growth and program growth. Align growth in student numbers with growth in human and physical resources, consistent with appropriate benchmarks in student engagement. Investigate collaborations with other UMass campuses that would enable us to offer cooperative degree programs in areas such as engineering, health, and education. Increase academic oversight of all our offerings whatever their delivery locus or format.

In examining which areas should be recommended for growth, the Academics Sub-Committee took a number of factors into consideration. We looked at the context for growth. We examined the responses of the deans to a questionnaire about growth in their units [results shared with the Enrollment and Financial Aid Sub-Committee] and we looked at the relationship between growth and the Battelle report [prepared for the Research and Graduate Studies sub-committee].

Context

The Committee asked how the University should plan on enrollment growth to 15,000 and beyond 15,000. The Committee believes that as we move toward the 15,000 initial goal, we must address a number of issues fundamental to quality, the ability to sustain a larger enrollment and further growth.

Moving to 15,000 students by 2010 will necessarily increase the amount of instruction by contingent faculty. Moving to 2010 and beyond, we must put into place a comprehensive plan for modifying the faculty composition. The suggested goal is 70% FTE tenure stream faculty and 30% contingent faculty. Modifications in the base teaching load—necessary to reach our research goals—will impact the numbers needed to reach a 70/30 mix.

A second consideration is support services for 15,000 students. As enrollment has increased, there are already concerns about the availability of advisors, tutoring services, and all the other academic support and student life services that this number of students needs. This will require additional resources and additional staff. We encourage the University to look at alternative models for staffing issues, so that we make the most productive investments possible.

A third consideration is our physical plant. While there are data that suggests that we can accommodate this number of students without new buildings, efficient use of our resources, such as an appropriate mix of large and small classes [which would mean more large sections], will be difficult to attain without the proposed new classroom building. Graduate programs are also experiencing an increasing space crunch as they continue to grow. The new classroom building will become a necessity as we grow student numbers.

In sum, we believe the university must make a concerted effort to put the human and financial resources in place to maintain and increase quality, sustain increased enrollments and lay the basis for growth beyond the goal of 15,000 students.

Deans' Views of Growth

The committee considered the growth information submitted by the various deans in response to three questions:

1. What programs in your unit can grow immediately, without new resources? Approximately how many additional students could be accommodated?
2. What programs in your unit can grow in a 2-5 year window? What new resources, if any, would be required? Approximately how many additional students could be accommodated?
3. What programs in your unit can grow in a 5-10 year window? What new resources, if any, would be required? Approximately how many additional students could be accommodated?

The bullet points below summarize our initial readings of the information provided by the deans.

- Growth in GCE and CNHS is driven by a clear societal need. There are limiting factors, however, in being able to employ the faculty needed for this growth. Accreditation is also a factor in both units. The impact of increased numbers of CNHS students on CLA and CSM must also be examined.
- CM has a proven growth record and should continue to grow. A number of new programs are planned. Management projects very large increases at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and we must examine the impact of these targets on the overall University. More specifically, the large projected growth in undergraduates would have a dramatic impact on CLA and an important impact on CSM as well.
- MGS will grow, and will be an important player in the research arena, but its increased student numbers will be relatively small.
- CPCS should be able to grow modestly. Resource issues, issues related to creating a shared vision and path to enacting that vision, and student interest will need to be examined.
- CSM projects growth in a number of areas, but will require additional faculty, additional graduate stipends, additional support staff, equipment, and laboratory space. The details and feasibility of this growth must be worked out in close conjunction with the research agenda.
- CLA projects modest growth, shifting the emphasis from perpetual growth to increases in quality. The College has the capacity to absorb additional students into a number of majors. A few new undergraduate majors will be added to the mix, including Asian Studies. CLA projects growth at the graduate level in a number of areas, including developmental science, creative writing, historical archaeology, the archives track in History, and, with appropriate grant support, applied linguistics. A major concern for CLA is that growth in other parts of the

university not increase its service burden to a level that will diminish the quality of its programs. Growth in CLA must also be coordinated with the research agenda.

Battelle Report and Areas for Growth in Research

The committee had an extended discussion of the Battelle report. The committee understands that the original purpose of the report was to support planning for the Venture Development Center and that it was not intended to reflect the full range of research expertise, capacity and opportunities at UMass Boston. Therefore, the committee considered the Battelle report, but also took a somewhat broader look at campus research and potential research clusters with regard to academic program development.

First, we believe that it is crucial to the quality of our educational programs that graduate and undergraduate students benefit from studying at a research university. As a consequence, we must maintain a commitment to research across the disciplines. We consider this commitment a necessary pre-condition to any discussion of the research clusters proposed in the Battelle Report. If we do not make this a necessary grounding, we will devolve into a two-tier university with research departments and teaching departments, an outcome that would undermine overall quality and the reputation of the University.

Second, our research mission should be enriched but not driven by external funding. We must ask what is good for the whole university, not only what may garner extramural funding. We must also cost out our options, so that our investments yield more than they cost. There must be real “value-added” dimensions to the whole University as we strive for growth in extramural funding.

Third, just as we must invest in new areas to meet the demands of students, employers, and other university stakeholders, so must we support already-established areas of strength. New ventures are untried risks, while our established strengths are what have contributed to our success thus far. In terms of resources, we cannot afford to neglect the areas that have been the foundation of our success as we seek new and, by definition, less certain opportunities.

The Battelle report has identified some important areas of growth. Certainly, the interdisciplinary science programs should grow, but much of the program growth at the University will be outside the sciences. The report focuses heavily on research production in some parts of the university, and neglects some of our greatest areas of strength, including non-applied work in the sciences and social sciences, as well as the humanities, the arts, and education as well as some programs in public policy. In addition, the committee sees considerable dissonance between the Battelle recommendations and the deans’ views of growth potential. As best we can tell, these new clusters will not contribute a significant amount of growth in overall university enrollment, since it appears that they will be relatively modest in size and focused mostly

on graduate students. The new clusters may enhance our reputation in some areas and bring needed revenues through indirect cost recovery. A key to success will be to ensure that these advantages are shared throughout the university.

We believe that as we move from the report to a full vision of growth that incorporates both increased numbers of students and increased research in a coordinated way, we will need to enlarge the scope of what is currently in the Battelle report. Some of the items in the Battelle report should, in our view, be expanded so that their meaning is not too narrow. Sustainable systems for example should include issues of human welfare and sustainable communities as well as environmentally sound technological issues. Further, we would suggest that additional clusters be considered. For example:

- **Urban Studies, Health, and Public Policy:** This is a reformulation of Urban Health and Public Policy, which broadens the definition to include not only health, but also to encompass areas of current strengths in public policy, urban planning, and other issues related to our urban mission. We expect our public policy impact to be broad and think the Battelle formulation implicitly narrows the focus too much.
- **Human Development and Learning:** This is a reformulation of Developmental Science, which encompasses this idea, but also brings in our work in science education, in research on education and learning more generally, and the broader area of developmental science.
- **Creative Economy and Cultural Capital:** This is an addition which addresses the important role that the university and its research/creative activity plays in creating viable and livable communities recognizing the roles of cultural capital for social and economic success, and weaving the fabric of citizenship encompassing local, national, and global concerns relevant to the new century.

In addition, the committee notes that the Battelle report uses predictions of where business will grow, but does not deal with fundamental questions of workforce development, and thus needs to be supplemented by a discussion of the foundational skills all university-educated workers of the future will need, including critical thinking, well-developed written and oral communication abilities, the capacity to deal with diverse populations, life long learning, creativity and so forth.¹⁰ This consideration calls attention to the need to balance resource allocation between potentially competing interests of research areas and the preparation of students as citizens in a more holistic sense. It also emphasizes again the necessity of preventing a two-tier system by highlighting the ways in which research, societal needs/development, and academic areas for growth intersect. In relation to a specific research connection, we might align the suggested Human Development and Learning cluster with this important part of our educational mission.

Our overall conclusions are contained in the main report.

¹⁰ See *College Learning for the New Global Century*. Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2007. http://www.aacu.org/advocacy/leap/documents/GlobalCentury_final.pdf.