The University of Massachusetts Boston's Self-Study for NEASC Reaccreditation

Steering Committee:

Peter Langer and Celia Moore (Co-chairs), Luis Aponte-Pares, Jennifer A. Brown, Jay R. Dee, Virginia Smith Harvey, Winston Langley, Sherry Merrow, J. Keith Motley, Daniel Ortiz, Russell Schutt, Steven Schwartz, Asgedet Stefanos, Kathleen Teehan, Janet M. Wagner

1. Mission and Purpose

Celia Moore (Chair), Professor, Psychology, CLA
Joan Becker, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Support Services
Carroy U. Ferguson, Chair, CPCS Curriculum Council
Cathy Greene, Graduate Student
William Hagar, Associate Professor, Biology, CSM
Raymond Liu, Associate Professor, Management and Marketing, CM
Kenneth Rothwell, Associate Professor, Classics, CLA
Paul Watanabe, Associate Professor, Political Science, CLA, and Director, Institute for Asian American Studies

2. Planning and Evaluation

Jennifer A. Brown (Co-chair), Director, Institutional Research and Policy Studies
Jay R. Dee (Co-chair), Assistant Professor, Leadership in Education, GCE
Sarah Bartlett, Administrative Dean, CPCS
Clara Estow, Professor, Hispanic Studies, CLA
Mohsin Habib, Assistant Professor, Marketing and Management, CM
Mari Koerner, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, GCE
Catherine Lynde, Associate Professor, Economics, CLA

3. Organization and Governance

Sherry Merrow (Chair), Undergraduate Nursing Program Director, CNHS
Varda Konstam, Professor, Counseling, GCE
Kenneth Lemanski, Associate Chancellor
Dirk Messelaar, Dean, Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education
Joyce Morgan, Interim Assistant Dean of Students
Linda Perrotto, Information Technology
Marietta Schwartz, Associate Professor, Chemistry, CSM, and University Director, Undergraduate Education

4. Programs and Instruction

Russell Schutt (Co-Chair), Professor, Sociology, CLA
Kathleen Teehan (Co-Chair), Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management
Janet M. Wagner, (Co-Chair), Associate Professor, Management Science and Information Systems and Associate Dean, CM
Pamela Annas, Professor, English and Director, English M.A. Program, CLA
Jeffrey Burr, Director, Gerontology Institute
Caroline Coscia, Graduate Student

Estelle Disch, Professor, Sociology, CLA, and First Year Seminar Coordinator
Alicia Dowd, Assistant Professor, Leadership in Education, GCE
Lester Goodchild, Dean, Graduate College of Education
Susan Haussler, Associate Professor, Nursing, CNHS
Jeffrey Keisler, Assistant Professor, Management Science and Information Systems, CM
Joan Liem, Associate Professor, Psychology, CLA
Terry McLarney, Chair, Undergraduate Faculty, CPCS
Anna Madison, Professor, Human Services, CPCS
Erica Mena, Undergraduate Student
Theresa A. Mortimer, Vice Provost, Academic Support Services
Kevin B. Murphy, Research Analyst, Institutional Research and Policy Studies
Mark Pawlak, Director, Academic Support Services
Hannah Sevian, Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, GCE and Chemistry, CSM
Susan Smith, Undergraduate Student
Judith Zeitlin, Associate Professor, Anthropology, CLA

5. **Faculty**

Winston Langley (Chair), Professor, Political Science, CLA, and Associate Provost
Jane Adams, Associate Professor, Psychology, CLA
James Bennett, Associate Professor, Finance, CM
Kenneth L. Campbell, Professor, Biology, CSM
David Hunt, Professor, History, CLA
Emily McDermott, Professor, Classics, CLA , and Dean, Graduate Studies
Linda Eisenmann, Associate Professor, Leadership in Education, GCE
Arthur Goldsmith, Professor, Management and Marketing, CM
Margaret Hart, Associate Professor, Art, CLA
Robert Nappier, Undergraduate Student
R. Timothy Sieber, Professor and Chair, Anthropology, CLA
Greg Sun, Director, Engineering, CSM

6. **Student Services**

J. Keith Motley (Chair), Interim Chancellor
John Applebee, Director, University Advising Center
Milton L. Butts, Jr., Assistant Professor, Sociology, CLA
Carol DeSouza, ADA Compliance Officer, Human Resources
Christopher Hogan, Special Assistant to the Chancellor
Judy Keyes, Director, Financial Aid
Margaret McAllister, Associate Professor, CNHS
Michael M. Mahan, Coordinator, International Student Services
Marybeth Maneen, Academic Advisor, University Advising Center
Maria Rocha-Tracy, Graduate Student
Jillian Spooner, Graduate Student
Raul Ybarra, Associate Professor, CPCS

7. **Library and Information Services**

Daniel Ortiz (Chair), Director of Libraries
Robert Caron, Assistant Director, Computing Services
Reebee Garofalo, Professor, Community Media and Technology, CPCS
Martyne Hallgren, Chief Information Officer

Jean-Pierre Kuilboer, Associate Professor, Management Science and Information Systems, CM
Carlos Maynard, Graduate Student
Mark A. Schlesinger, Director, Communication Studies, CLA
Woodruff Smith, Professor, History, CLA
Forrest Speck, Director, Auxiliary Services

8. **Physical Resources**
   Luis Aponte-Pares (Chair), Community Planning, CPCS
   Robert B. Beattie, Director, Environmental Studies Program
   Stephan Chait, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance
   Kathleen Golden McAndrew, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs/Executive Director, University Health Services
   Anita J. Miller, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
   Ellen O'Connor, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance
   John Warner, Professor, Chemistry, CSM

9. **Financial Resources**
   Steven Schwartz (Chair), Associate Professor and Chair, Psychology, CLA
   Thomas Fencil, Interim Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement
   Burton Holmes, Assistant Dean, Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education
   Neil Rosenburg, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Administration and Finance
   David Terkla, Professor, Economics and EEOS

10. **Public Disclosure**
    Virginia Smith Harvey (Chair), Associate Professor, Counseling and School Psychology, GCE
    Dianne Cleary, Associate Research Analyst, Institutional Research and Policy Studies
    Jon Hutton, Director, Enrollment Information Services
    Jeffrey Mitchell, University Editor
    Joseph Peters, Webmaster

11. **Integrity**
    Asgedet Stefanos (Chair), Associate Professor, CPCS
    Elsa Auerbach, Professor, English, CLA
    Reyes Coll-Tellechea, Associate Professor, Hispanic Studies, CLA
    Angeline Ellison, Associate Dean of Students
    Mark Preble, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources
    Madison Thompson, Director, Affirmative Action and Multicultural Affairs
    Philip L. Quaglieri, Dean, College of Management

Overview

The rise of public urban universities is one of the great stories of late 20th century higher education. If the transformation of sister land-grant universities during the last century is a guide, public urban universities will undergo substantial growth and development in the 21st century. The University of Massachusetts Boston is proud to be part of this national movement, and we seek to remain on its leading edge. We are the only public university in Boston. Our relatively brief history chronicles increased capacity to fill this unique function in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as well as increased stature in the nation and abroad.

We have increased substantially in complexity during the past decade while remaining relatively constant in size. We project that this pattern will continue during the coming decade as we respond to the needs of our students and the public. Our increased complexity is shown by the diversity of the student populations we serve, the number of different programs and academic units we offer to serve these diverse students, and the increase in research and service functions undertaken by the University. Student diversity has increased in several ways, adding to a mix that includes graduate and undergraduate; transfer and first-year entrants; a wide range of ages; different racial, ethnic, national, and language backgrounds; and various educational goals. The most obvious change in programmatic complexity is the increased number of academic units, including the recent split of the College of Arts and Sciences into the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science and Mathematics and the formation of the John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies. We have become a doctoral-intensive university, with research programs in all colleges, centers, and institutes. Research productivity and external funding to support research have increased markedly during the past decade. Increased research and scholarship have brought parallel increases in professional service to address local, regional, national, and global concerns.

The University has much to celebrate as it marks the 40th anniversary of its founding. The excellence of its past accomplishments and the value of its contributions to its many constituents are strong motivators to do everything possible to remain a vital, effective institution. As this self-study reveals, meeting this fundamental goal requires that we take vigorous action to address three pressing challenges: improving the physical infrastructure, rebuilding the faculty, and stabilizing student enrollment. Our major projections for the next decade can be summarized within these three overarching concerns. They touch all that we do.

Improving the Physical Infrastructure

The impressive new Campus Center stands as a highly visible monument to the value we place on our students and as a beacon for our future. It commands our attention as we begin to feel the impact of its symbolic and real potential for all members of the University community. Nevertheless, we must direct our attention to a comprehensive capital plan for the campus, beginning with its least visible aspect – the megastructure foundation of the five original campus buildings. This foundation, which also serves as a site for parking, shows clear signs of deterioration, due in part to the salty air of our harbor location. It must be repaired within the next few years to prevent irreparable damage to the buildings it supports, and this repair work requires prior investment in a new parking facility. The University and the Commonwealth have already begun to develop plans to address this problem. We anticipate that a comprehensive capital infrastructure plan will be accomplished in the next few years. This plan will address immediate concerns and establish a long-range vision for the future of the physical campus. Such a vision will serve as a framework for evaluating specific proposals during the coming decades.

Sound financial planning is the most difficult part of the infrastructure project. The scope of the current problem is such that we require the strong partnership of the University of Massachusetts system and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to fashion a financial plan that will maintain the physical integrity of the campus and not overwhelm this campus with debt service. This is essential to our ability to move forward on the actual work of the University. Although we anticipate that help will be forthcoming, we are mindful that in the current sociopolitical context, the campus must rely more and more on its own resources to fulfill its mission.

The projected costs of repairing the physical foundation of the campus are dramatic, but are not the only anticipated infrastructure and deferred maintenance costs. Reallocation of existing spaces, some vacated by the move to the Campus Center, is needed to support new teaching and research initiatives as well as for routine repairs and upgrades to existing facilities. Radical changes in information technology motivate other infrastructure plans. We anticipate greater collaboration among the library, media, and information technology services. Projections include greater reliance on electronic resources in the library and elsewhere; increased access to these resources for faculty, staff, and students in wired and wireless spaces throughout the campus; and increased support of faculty in the uses of technology.

Rebuilding the Faculty

The University has recently experienced its first major cycle of faculty retirement. The faculty must now be rebuilt. The timing of this retirement spike is due to the age of the University, but its coincidence with significant budget problems has exacerbated its effect. Furthermore, there has been a parallel spike in retirement of support staff. We have been working diligently to recruit both faculty and staff in light of strategic priorities. High standards are being used to recruit and hire new tenure-track faculty, with clear expectations for both scholarly productivity and excellent teaching. We recognize the importance of retaining new recruits and anticipate investing in new faculty with appropriate support, ranging from mentoring in teaching and service roles by experienced faculty to improved research infrastructure. Increased faculty research is anticipated, measured in part by a projected increase in external grant support from $30 to $50 million by 2008.

We have addressed the decline in tenured faculty in part by substantially increasing the number of part-time instructors. This approach was in large part a response to budgetary realities. Although we will be replacing 80% of recently retired full-time faculty within the next five years, we project the continued importance of part-time faculty, many of whom are supported through the Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education. Finding ways to integrate full- and part-time faculty into one university presents one of the most significant issues we will face during the coming decade.

Stabilizing Student Enrollment

The first two major challenges focus on what we must do to remain an effective university that offers excellent education, research, and service. The third challenge focuses on the extent to which we are effective in delivering what we have to offer to the students we seek to serve. Education of our students is the core of our mission. Two important measures of our success are whether we are successful in attracting and retaining students. By these measures we know that improvement is needed: enrollment has declined below capacity in the past few years

and retention rates are low in comparison with peer institutions. We are committed to improving both measures, and our plans include a number of actions to achieve these goals.

We anticipate increasing our total enrollment and stabilizing it at 13,000-13,500 over the next decade. Improved retention is a significant part of this enrollment plan. As a doctoral-intensive university with a strong commitment to undergraduate education, we project selective growth in graduate programs (indexed primarily by a projected increase in enrollments to 25% of all students and improved national rankings) and improved undergraduate education (indexed primarily by improved retention). The recent reorganization into a more complex college structure should support increased faculty research and improved graduate programming. This will be balanced by greater attention to cross-collegiate collaboration to deliver important parts of undergraduate education (e.g., general education; honors). Improving the quality of both graduate and undergraduate programs will continue to be a crucial goal of the cyclical academic program review process.

Projected improvements in undergraduate recruitment include increasing the proportion of first-year students and improved articulation with feeder community colleges for appropriate preparation of transfer students. Access for low-income and minority students will remain an over-arching priority, to be addressed in part by a projected increase in needs-based scholarships and by weaving diversity goals into all aspects of university functioning. We project an improvement in student retention to result from continued attention to academic quality, improved faculty advising of first year students, and improved student acculturation to the campus from initiatives such as linked first-year courses and co-curricular programming in the new Campus Center.

Full consideration of these three challenges means that we must pay careful attention to the financial dimension in all that we do and plan to do. It seems evident that the cost of education at a comprehensive, doctoral-granting university will continue to rise in the immediate future. Our institutional effectiveness will be limited by our ability to meet this fiscal challenge while maintaining our mission of access for lower-income students. With a commitment to affordable tuition and fees and decreased assistance from the state, fiscal planning includes a major focus on alternative sources of revenue. We project an increase in revenue from philanthropy, sale of services and rental of facilities, external grants, and continuing education initiatives, including distance learning. Furthermore, we will pay close attention to operational efficiencies and internal budgeting processes that tie allocation of funds to assessment of unit effectiveness and strategic priorities. In other words, we will do everything in our power to keep UMass Boston affordable.

The reflection stimulated by this self-study has uncovered some formidable challenges for the coming decade. However, it has also afforded opportunities for celebrating our many achievements and for effective, integrative planning for the future. To that extent, this self-study is meant to be read as a companion piece to our strategic plan. The details outlined in this present document describe our current situation, offer useful appraisals of what works and what needs improvement, and outline specific projections of where we will be at the end of the next decade. We look forward to the challenge of realizing those projections.

Standard One: Mission and Purposes

Task Force Members: Celia Moore (Chair), Joan Becker, Carroy U. Ferguson, Cathy Greene, William Hagar, Raymond Liu, Kenneth Rothwell, Paul Watanabe

Description:

The University of Massachusetts Boston (UMass Boston) is the public university of Boston. It was founded in 1964 as part of the University of Massachusetts, which was first established as the Massachusetts Agricultural College in 1863. UMass Boston opened its doors in 1965 and graduated its first class in 1969. Boston State College was merged with UMass Boston in 1982. The history of Boston State College began with the founding in 1852 of Girls' High School, a normal school to train elementary school teachers. The core values of the University were thus shaped by the convergence of three great historical forces in public higher education: the nineteenth century land-grant and teacher training traditions and the twentieth century movement to shift the focus of public higher education to urban centers (Main dates in UMass Boston's History.)

These core values remain central to the mission of UMass Boston, and include equality of access to the highest caliber of university education for all, public service, and deep connections with the city in our teaching, research, and service. The original Statement of Purpose for UMass Boston reflects these values: "Our mission is to develop in Boston a great public urban university, which will preserve and extend in the best tradition of the Western world the domain of knowledge and nurture intellectual freedom and integrity, and with the kind of program, service and leadership given rural communities over the past century by the land-grant universities....The urban university must stand with the city, must serve and lead where the battle is. That is what the University of Massachusetts at Boston must do."

The current UMass Boston mission and vision statements were approved by the Board of Trustees and the Higher Education Coordinating Council during the 1992-93 academic year and reaffirmed during the 2003-2004 strategic planning process. The central paragraph of the mission statement is as follows:

> The University of Massachusetts Boston . . . . is nationally recognized as a model of excellence for urban universities. A comprehensive, doctoral-granting campus, we provide challenging teaching, distinguished research, and extensive service which particularly respond to the academic and economic needs of the state's urban areas and their diverse populations."

The vision statement elaborates on the mission statement and describes campus aspirations:

> The University of Massachusetts Boston, a doctoral-granting, research university, will be a leading urban public university in the nation. Through the depth and breadth of its commitment to the following areas of endeavor, the University will serve as a model to other such institutions. The University of Massachusetts Boston will:
>
> - sustain a superior faculty dedicated to excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching;

- provide innovative and often interdisciplinary programs that can respond in a timely manner to societal issues and problems;
- meet the needs of both traditional and nontraditional students; continue to promote diversity among students, faculty, and staff; and conduct educational, scholarly, and service activities that contribute to meeting the needs of a diverse society;
- nurture both pure and applied research to advance knowledge and to create a better society for all;
- devote a high proportion of research and public service activities to the cultural, social, and economic development of the Commonwealth and the global community; and dedicate itself especially to understanding and improving the environment and the well being of citizens of this region.

The statements of campus mission and vision were last re-evaluated by the University Planning Council in 2003 as part of the strategic planning process. The Planning Council reaffirmed the statements without revision, and they have been used as a foundation for the current strategic plan (The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation). The current UMass Boston mission and vision statements are included in catalogs and other appropriate print and electronic communications directed to the University community and to the outside world (See Standard 10).

The University comprises seven colleges and schools (College of Liberal Arts, College of Management, College of Nursing and Health Sciences, College of Public and Community Service, College of Science and Mathematics, Graduate College of Education, and the John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies) that offer 78 undergraduate and 64 graduate degree programs. There are 26 Centers and Institutes, some freestanding and others associated with colleges, a Division of Corporate, Continuing, and Distance Education, and many other units to support teaching, service, and research activities, student life, and the physical plant on which these activities depend. Deans and vice chancellors engage in planning to align the goals of their units with the campus mission. (See the Letter from Provost announcing strategic plan.) Similarly, individual academic departments and programs engage in mission-driven planning as part of their cyclical review process (AQUAD: Academic Quality Assessment and Development).

Appraisal:

The stated mission of UMass Boston is consistent with the founding goals as articulated by the Massachusetts state legislature. This 1964 legislation established a new public university that would provide the diverse citizens of the Boston metropolitan region with access to an excellent university education and with quality research and service responsive to urban needs. The mission is also consistent with the 1991 vision statement of the University of Massachusetts system. Throughout its progress to a doctoral-intensive university, UMass Boston has approached its academic mission with a distinctively urban orientation that is unique in the system. It has as its peers other public, urban, American universities with similar missions.

Regular assessments of institutional effectiveness indicate that the mission of the University is realistic and that we have been effective in meeting its goals (e.g., Statistical Portrait; Common Data Set; National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE); University Performance Measurement System (UPMS)). We provide a diverse student body access to excellent education, and we engage in teaching, research, and service that is responsive to the needs of the state's urban areas.

Many undergraduates (56% in 2002 NSSE survey) are first-generation college students; their mean age is 27 and their median age is 24; and many have significant financial need. Approximately one-third receive Pell grants and approximately half work more than 20 hours a week; 62% of first-year students and 72% of seniors reported working more than 10 hours a week (2002 NSSE survey). Faculty and administrators are deeply concerned that recent budget cuts, particularly when combined with changes in federal financial aid policies, will eliminate access for many of our low-income students. With tuition and fees at 7.7% of state median income (2002 UPMS Annual Indicators), we remain affordable for many who do not have the means for private education, but we may be losing students at the lower economic end (See Standard Four and Standard Nine). We must find ways to maintain access for deserving students who are in danger of being priced out of a university education. We remain firmly committed to this important part of our mission. (See Standard Four.)

Of four-year institutions of higher learning in New England having over 2500 undergraduates, UMass Boston is the most racially and ethnically diverse public higher education institution. The percentage of minority undergraduates has grown from 14% in 1980 to 39.7% in 2003, which currently exceeds the diversity of the geographical region from which our students are mostly drawn (See Diversity at the University of Massachusetts Boston). As has been true throughout our history, many students are recent immigrants or children of recent immigrants. Approximately 40% report speaking a language other than English at home (2002 UPMS Annual Indicators). In one recent survey, our students listed more than 80 different languages (2004 Graduating Student Survey). The University has sought to provide this diverse student body with a curriculum attentive to diversity issues (Standard Four) and with a diverse faculty (Standard Five). Thirty-eight percent of the tenure-track faculty hired to replace retirements during the last four years are faculty of color.

We have been effective in maintaining an excellent faculty and in developing a broad range of programs for our undergraduate and graduate students. Eighty-two percent of seniors rate their education as good or excellent (2002 NSSE survey). Many students achieve at high levels, securing excellent jobs or gaining admission to top graduate schools (President's Office Alumni Survey). We have had two Rhodes scholar finalists, one Marshall scholar, and four Fulbright scholarship winners in the past five years (2004 UPMS Report). The faculty are active scholars, and many are national or international leaders in their fields; 92% of the faculty hold a Ph.D. or equivalent degree (Standard Five; 2003 Common Data Set).

In keeping with our mission, our contributions to the Commonwealth are impressive. Ninety-one percent of the undergraduates we serve are from Massachusetts, and 80% remain in Massachusetts following graduation (2004 UPMS Report). Faculty and staff also serve the Commonwealth through research and service. Academic departments, institutes, and centers provide research on public policy; health, education, and human services; community and economic development; and environmental issues of particular concern to urban community groups, local and state agencies, and legislators. The University has over $34 million in sponsored projects, of which approximately 60% are used to address concerns of urban areas of the Commonwealth. Research, public service, and outreach contribute to economic development, P-12 education, public policy, and to quality-of-life for diverse populations of urban residents. (See Summary of Sponsored Program Activity.) We have determined, however, that we need to do even more research for the Commonwealth and also do a better job explaining those contributions to the public. Therefore, progress in research and progress in reputation have been identified as two of the three major goals in the 2008 strategic plan.

UMass Boston has grown more complex since it first opened its doors in 1965. Since the last accreditation review, this evolving complexity has been reflected administratively in the formation of the new John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies from the starting nucleus of the endowed McCormack Institute and other interested faculty groups and to the formal split of the two faculties in the former College of Arts and Sciences into the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science and Mathematics. Within the last two years national searches have resulted in new deans for the Graduate College of Education, the College of Science and Mathematics, the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Management, and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences. This year there are national searches for deans of the College of Public and Community Service and the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies. Furthermore, the growth of distance learning, advances in information technology, and the increased importance of research have led to the formation of the new Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education; the hiring of our first Chief Information Officer; and increased investment in the research infrastructure, including the hiring of a Vice Provost for Research.

As part of a growing culture of planning and assessment, the colleges and their departments have engaged in self-definition, planning, and assessment activities for the last seven years (Standard Two). This planning has taken on added urgency because early retirement programs in 2001 and 2003 have hastened the retirement of 96 faculty and 105 staff members. Not all colleges are at the same stage in their planning, however, due in part to the newness of some colleges and the recent turnover in deans. Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD) is an iterative departmental- or program-level process of planning and assessment that was instituted in 1999 and has a seven-year cycle. To date, 39 of 46 scheduled AQUAD reviews have been completed. This process requires departments to write a mission statement that takes account of the relevant discipline or profession; students and others served by the department; and the mission of the university. Planning is the first criterion external reviewers are asked to evaluate: "[A] program should demonstrate effective planning within the context provided by the mission, goals, objectives, and resources of the academic units housing the program and the campus as a whole" (AQUAD procedures). The University Planning Council was convened in October, 2002 to write a new strategic plan for the campus, informed by a report on the Year 2000 Strategic Plan and a charge from the Chancellor that outlined planning assumptions. The Planning Council, comprised of over 50 faculty, administrators, staff, and students and chaired by the Provost, worked together to complete a draft plan in June, 2003. The vice chancellors and deans were then asked to contribute specific plans to align with the three major campus goals of retention, research, and reputation. A working plan was completed and posted on the Web for further refinement and use by the campus in February, 2004. One result of these efforts is that more faculty are now familiar with the mission and purposes of the university.

The UMass Boston mission statement remains useful. The 2003 University Planning Council reaffirmed it without change as the basis for the 2008 strategic plan. It is sufficiently broad and rich to accommodate the increased complexity of our administrative structure and the increased range of functions housed within major academic and support units. Colleges, academic departments, and other units are able to locate their missions and plans within its framework, and administrators are able to use it for allocation of resources (Standard Nine). Nevertheless, there are faculty and staff who have expressed concerns that some plans and decisions regarding resource allocation may not be in keeping with our urban mission (e.g., University Planning Council April 23, 2003 open meeting on urban mission; the July, 2003 Town Meeting to discuss the recommendations of the Committee on University Revenues and Expenditures (CURE); and comments made during the present NEASC accreditation self-study). Concerns focus on potential shifts in the nature of our student body to a more traditional student population and on the balance

between serving our students and serving the public. It is clear there are differences of opinion within the campus community about these expressed concerns.

The 1995 NEASC review noted multiple interpretations of our mission in different parts of the University community, and the present self-study reveals that this is still the case. The multidimensional nature of our mission, the broad range of traditional and nontraditional students we serve, and the diverse external audiences we address through our research, service, and outreach make multiple interpretations likely. The increased differentiation of colleges and programs provides new opportunities for meeting our mission in more efficient and specialized ways, but it also creates new challenges for a shared understanding of the University's mission. Furthermore, the 30% reduction in state support in the last three years has led to two rounds of emergency, budget-driven planning in addition to normally scheduled plans. In both cases, budget cuts were targeted rather than across the board, and the primary directive from the Chancellor was to protect academic programs. Therefore, units focused on external service were cut more deeply than teaching units, which has been felt as a threat to the public service part of the urban mandate. Recent concerns about the urban focus of our mission can thus be understood within the context of internal stresses that have sharpened awareness of differences among units through competition for limited resources.

Forces external to the campus provide another important context for understanding these concerns. These forces include the perceptions and goals of political groups, agencies, and other members of our local and regional communities; the governor; and the state legislature. They also include the perceptions and goals of the President and the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts system. The indicators used by the UMass system to measure institutional effectiveness incorporate national standards that were established for a traditional student body, defined as students who enroll as first time, full time freshmen. However, fewer than 20% of our entering students meet this definition: in the Fall 2000 reporting cohort, only 595 of 2262 entering undergraduates (26.3%) were first time, full time freshmen (2002 Retention study). Over two-thirds of our students enter as transfers from community colleges or other institutions, and many attend on a part-time basis. Furthermore, demographic variables (e.g., socioeconomic status, racial and ethnic diversity, native language, preparedness) that distinguish traditional and nontraditional students nationally do not distinguish these groups at UMass Boston. For example, 73% of the 595 "traditional" students participating in the 2002 retention study reported working off campus, some more than 30 hours a week, and 42% reported speaking a language other than English at home. International students were included in this cohort, with 60 different nations represented (2002 Retention study).

We must pay particular attention to retention of first time, full time freshmen because the University system and national ratings use this as a crucial measure of institutional effectiveness. However, attention given to improved retention of a group of students labeled as traditional is perceived by some as a departure from an urban mission that values access for underserved, nontraditional students. This perception has contributed to the controversy surrounding plans to build residential housing for 15% of our student body. These plans grew out of a number of considerations, including the fact that it was one of our students' frequently cited reasons for leaving UMass Boston after the first year, with 14% citing it as the most important reason for not returning (2002 Retention study). Furthermore, residential housing for a modest proportion of students is the norm for public urban universities. Although the housing plan has significant support on campus, some argue that dormitories will move us away from our urban mission by attracting more traditional students. Others point to the diversity of the "traditional" students who enroll at UMass Boston, many of whom are seeking a campus residence, and conclude that the availability of residential housing may both improve institutional effectiveness as measured by

increased retention in this segment of our student population and help fulfill our urban mission. Furthermore, the 24 hour presence of students on campus and the social and cultural programming associated with residential students should add to the quality of university life for all students and create more opportunities for informal learning with peers.

The widely divergent needs of the students we serve require that we entertain multiple strategies for improving institutional effectiveness. Changes introduced to improve retention in "traditional" students may or may not work for the remaining 80% of our undergraduates. Furthermore, there are unique problems facing students who enter with credits from other institutions. Public urban universities recognize the limitations of standard national indicators for judging a student's accomplishments and have begun to develop more appropriate measures. UMass Boston participated in the Urban Universities Portfolio Project, one such national effort supported by the Pew Charitable Trust. This project has informed some of the studies undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research and Policy Studies, which has been tracking a large number of variables important for retention of transfer students. Inadequate articulation agreements with sending institutions and frustrations with advising about transfer credits have emerged as two problems that may be contributing to poor retention among transfer students. UMass Boston has made a commitment to improve articulation agreements and associated advising and is seeking Title III funding to support these efforts. Because transfer from community and state colleges is an important access route for underserved populations, improvement in this area is another important way to improve institutional effectiveness and fulfill our urban mission. But we need to develop additional ways to improve the success of all of our students, and we need to continue making the case for more appropriate benchmarks.

Projection:

Continued planning at university, college, and department levels will maintain the strengths and address some of the problems identified in the appraisal section. The 2008 Strategic Plan is designed to be updated annually throughout its five-year life. Colleges and other units will add action items as planning proceeds in these units, and the University Planning Council will serve as an advisory board for fine-tuning the campus plan over time. Cyclical academic quality assessment and development (AQUAD) will continue in departments, and the AQUAD review process will itself be revised as necessary.

The Urban Mission Coordinating Committee was convened in April 2004 to provide a forum for debate and progress on the issue of the University's mission as a public urban university. This is a large committee, broadly representative of faculty and administrators in all major units, that reports to the Chancellor. A set of key working principles, which provides a shared definition of the campus's urban mission, has been adopted by consensus of the full committee and an initial forum on urban connections has been held. This forum generated a high level of participation, and a second forum is in the planning stage. Ongoing work of the Committee will publicize, assess, and facilitate initiatives falling under its umbrella and contribute to improved internal and external communication about the diverse ways that we fulfill our mission.

The University has recently experienced a major turnover in its administration and faculty. Such transitions create conditions for reflection about mission and purposes. This was particularly evident at the close of the 2004 academic year, when it became apparent that we would have a new interim chancellor. A strongly voiced theme in campus discussion of this transition was a desire for continuity, forward progression along the path we have charted in recent hiring decisions and the strategic plan, and stability of the new administrative team (See

the minutes of the June 9, 2004 Special Faculty Council meeting with President Wilson). Searches in progress will determine our next permanent Chancellor and complete the process of hiring permanent deans. Hiring of new tenure-track faculty will continue, with a projected replacement of 80% of retirements within the next five years. Recruitment to replace retired faculty and classified and professional staff will be informed by planning for appropriate reallocation of lines and reorganization of support structures to meet identified goals. Completion of these hiring goals should provide a more stable faculty, staff, and administration to support greater institutional effectiveness and enable us to continue providing a quality education for our students.

Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Task Force Members: Jennifer A. Brown and Jay R. Dee (Chairs), Sarah Bartlett, Clara Estow, Mohsin Habib, Mari Koerner, Catherine Lynde

UMass Boston undertakes a continual cycle of planning and evaluation to further its mission. This cycle is replicated throughout the University in academic and administrative areas and is embedded in resource allocations.

Planning and evaluation at UMass Boston includes six major topics: Strategic Planning, University Performance Measurement System, Budget Planning, Student Access and Retention Planning, Student Outcomes Assessment, and Academic Program Planning and Evaluation. (Information technology, facilities, and institutional advancement planning are addressed in the relevant sections later in this self-study.)

Description:

Strategic Planning

In February, 2004 the University completed a new strategic plan. Appraisal and review of the old strategic plan found many areas in which plans were accomplished and some in which little or no progress had been made. These latter areas were assessed as part of the preparation for the new strategic planning cycle and the results have been available to the internal and external communities on the University Web site.

Review of the prior plan and the development of the current plan included a broad range of campus constituencies. Additional UMass Boston planning documents were incorporated into the new plan, including the 1995 NEASC Reaccreditation Self-Study and the 2000 NEASC Fifth-Year Interim Report (and the Interim Report's data tables.)

The current Strategic Plan, "The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation" describes the campus's commitment to assessment, and includes specific outcome measures that can be used to assess the University's progress. The plan also includes accountability by assigning responsibility to specific offices for particular activities.

University Performance Measurement System

The University Performance Measurement System (UPMS) is a set of key fiscal and academic indicators that are reported each year to the Board of Trustees. UMass Boston aligns its goals with these indicators (2008 Strategic Plan, p.3). The indicators are used in planning and evaluation at the University, and the UPMS is an example of the ways in which we demonstrate the achievement of our goals.

The UPMS indicators are developed in collaboration with the President's Office and include measures of academic quality, student success and satisfaction, access and affordability, service to the commonwealth, and financial health. The annual review of indicators includes comparative benchmarks against a group of peer institutions.

Budget

Description and analysis of the complex state budget process can be found in Standard Nine. This chapter addresses budget planning and evaluation in the larger context of strategic planning. Long range budget planning is challenging for any public institution of higher education, while reductions in state allocations and the early retirement incentive programs of recent years have put additional strain on the University. Planning for the less predictable reductions had to be done rapidly and required assistance from all departments. This was handled through the Budget Brainstorming Committee and the Committee on University Revenues and Expenditures (CURE) described below.

The Budget Brainstorming Committee, formed to address plans for the FY03 budget, and the Committee on University Revenues and Expenditures (CURE), formed for the FY04 budget, were co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance and the Provost. Each Committee developed revenue enhancement and cost reduction recommendations which were reviewed in "Town Meetings" before final decisions were made by the Chancellor and Executive Staff. The plans have been monitored through the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance and have contributed to the financial stability of the University. Indicators of financial stability can be found in the 2004 Performance Measurement Report.

Student Access and Retention

Student access is monitored through the UPMS, the submission of student and enrollment data to the Board of Higher Education, and the internal reports and studies produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP). OIRP publications such as "Fast Facts," the admissions and enrollment reports, and the Statistical Portrait are distributed among campus leaders and discussed in Chancellor's Executive Staff, Academic Council, and faculty governance meetings. Enrollment Management plays a key role in making sure that students representing our diverse communities continue to enroll at UMass Boston.

Several groups are engaged in ongoing planning and evaluation related to diversity including the Office of Affirmative Action and Multicultural Relations (OAAMR). In March 2000, this office coordinated the University's voluntary partnership with the US Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to assess the racial climate on campus. The OCR assessment was shared with a campus team of faculty and staff who developed recommendations for action. An additional study in 2000 investigated the concerns of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and queer (LGBTQ) students, faculty, and staff. This evaluation resulted in the formation of the Campus Life Resource Team, which was charged with identifying ways to improve campus climate and support services for LGBTQ employees and students.

In 2002, the Chancellor appointed a task force – The Council for the Promotion of a Diverse and Civil Community – to address the recommendations developed by the previous two committees. The Council is chaired by the director of OAAMR and includes the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, the Provost, and representatives of student groups, faculty, and staff. The Council has implemented several of the earlier committees' recommendations. These include a brochure on sexual harassment and resources for victims, a resource guide that identifies support programs and academic courses that pertain to diversity, and a set of recommendations for University endorsement of equal benefits for same-sex partners.

One of the indicators reported in the UPMS and one of the critical themes of the 2008 Strategic Plan is student retention. The University's freshmen retention rates are consistently lower than the average of our peers, and graduation rates for the most recent cohorts have been at 35% (1996 cohort) and 34% (1997 cohort) (See One Year Retention Rates for Fall Entrants and 2004 UPMS report indicators). The University is determined to change this pattern.

Student Outcomes Assessment

General Education revision was an important focus of the 1995 NEASC self-study and of the 2000 NEASC Five-Year Review. (The program itself will be discussed in more detail in Standard Four). The General Education program now in place is the result of a broad-based planning process. The Faculty Council's General Education Committee has general oversight responsibility for monitoring how the General Education requirements are implemented and the effectiveness of the different programs. Each College is responsible for managing its own requirements and assessments. Where possible, the General Education committee has built on initiatives that were already underway at different Colleges. (See the Report of the Faculty Council Committee on General Education Implementation, Academic Year 2002-2003.)

Another key area in the assessment of student achievement at UMass Boston is the Writing Proficiency Requirement (WPR). The WPR consists of successful completion of a timed essay examination or the submission of a portfolio of work based on assigned readings and questions. The WPR not only serves the purpose of student outcomes assessment, but is also used as a planning and evaluation tool to improve our curriculum and academic support.

Academic Program Planning and Evaluation

One of the central planning and evaluation tools for academic programs is the Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD) process. The University developed this process in 1999 as part of the University Performance Measurement System. AQUAD is an on-going multi-year activity which includes planning for and assessment of curriculum quality, faculty quality and productivity, student learning and resource allocation.

Each academic program, as part of the AQUAD process, develops a strategic plan in the first year, engages in an informal review of that plan for the next four years, conducts a self-study of the program in the sixth year, and invites in a team of external and internal reviewers to assess the program in the seventh year. The report by the reviewers is made to the program and to the dean (or deans) who then report to the Provost. The purpose of AQUAD is to enhance program quality by having each program develop a mission statement, goals, and objectives that are aligned with College and University strategic plans. Each program then engages in repeated cycles of planning and assessment in light of the goals and objectives set by the department. Copies of completed AQUAD self-studies are also available for others to use.

Each College submits to the Provost an annual report as an essential part of academic program planning. (See the most recent College annual reports: College of Liberal Arts, College of Management, College of Nursing and Health Sciences, College of Public and Community Service, College of Science and Mathematics, Graduate College of Education, McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies) Collegiate plans are aligned with the University's strategic plan, and are used to enhance existing programs and to plan for new program development. Colleges with professional programs and professional accrediting bodies have formal assessments

that inform academic program development. Collegiate accreditations include the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (College of Nursing and Health Sciences), National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (Graduate College of Education), and the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (College of Management). Some individual programs have disciplinary-based accreditations. Examples include the Clinical Psychology PhD program's accreditation by the American Psychological Association in 1993, the current accreditation of the Computer Science BA program by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), and the accreditation of the Family Therapy Program by the Commission on Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE) – the only New England program to achieve such recognition.

An example of intercollegiate planning is the Committee on International Programs appointed during 2003-04 by the Provost. The group, made up of faculty, administrators, and students, conducted a survey of international activities on campus, prepared an assessment of these activities, and submitted to the Provost a set of recommendations. Recently, a committee led by the Vice Chancellor for Student Life has reviewed services to students and has prepared recommendations for a new Center for International Students (similar to the Women's Center) in which existing services can be drawn together and expanded.

Appraisal:

Strategic Planning

The Strategic Planning process included a wide range of campus constituencies and offices. Efforts were made to include ongoing plans (e.g. General Education assessment, information technology, facilities) into the process as well as the thorough assessment and evaluation of prior planning efforts. The process was inclusive, if sometimes drawn out, and it resulted in a plan that includes clearly articulated targets, goals, and assigned responsibilities.

University Performance Measurement System

The UPMS indicators are reviewed periodically and evaluated against the goals of the UMass system. The most recent review in 2001 provided an opportunity for each campus to include measures reflecting their particular mission. The selection of national peer institutions is also evaluated periodically. The current UMass Boston peer group includes both comparable peers and aspirant peers and is used in many planning and evaluation processes, including many in this self-study. The UPMS has been a useful tool for the University because it focuses attention on key areas of performance and uses measurable outcomes for annual assessment internally and with the Board of Trustees.

Budget

The strategy used by UMass Boston for addressing short term budget planning has been broad-based and reasonably effective, but is not as useful in the long term. Budget planning in the long term is always a serious challenge for public institutions whose budgets are often unpredictable. (See Standard Nine for more details.)

Student Access and Retention

In data from the University's Fall 2003 CIRP Freshmen Survey, we confirmed findings from the 2000 Freshmen Retention survey, the National Survey of Student Engagement, and the graduating senior survey that a high proportion of UMass Boston students (between 35% and 40%) do not have English as their native language. We are still in the process of assessing the implications of such language diversity for our student support services. Preliminary analysis of our graduating senior survey suggests, for example, that while there are few differences in students' levels of satisfaction by race/ethnicity, there are differences between students who speak English at home and those who do not.

Low retention rates are a continuing problem for UMass Boston. Efforts to assess our retention figures have included joining the Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE) to obtain comparative retention and graduation data. These data have proved useful, particularly as we examine retention rates by race/ethnicity. At UMass Boston, the freshmen retention rates for students of color are typically better than those for white students. We particularly look forward to the work CSRDE has started on the retention and graduation rates of transfer students. These are the majority of our students but up to now there has been no national, comparable transfer student retention data against which we could assess our performance.

A telephone study of the Freshmen class of 2000 gave us some additional data on who leaves and who stays. This retention study reinforced our exploration of residential opportunities for students since a desire for residence life was a strong reason why some students left UMass Boston to complete degrees elsewhere.

Student Outcomes Assessment

Current General Education assessment is used for instructional design and planning and to increase faculty effectiveness. An example of curriculum assessment is the Seminar Assessment Committee's (SAC's) assessment process for First Year Seminars. These are required first semester courses for entering students who have fewer than 30 credits.

As a subcommittee of the Faculty Council's General Education Committee, the SAC reviews course syllabi and materials to insure that General Education capability requirements are being met. The SAC solicits information from students beyond the standard course evaluations, helping to assess what attention was paid to the development of the required capabilities and how helpful assignments and feedback were to students. (See Assessment of Spring 2001 First Year Seminars.) The SAC (with members of the Writing Proficiency Committee) read a randomly selected sample of student portfolios from the different Freshmen Seminar sections to provide feedback to faculty related to the structure of assignments, feedback given to students, and student paper revision requirements. (See Assessing Student Writing in the Spring 2001 First Year Seminars.) The information gathered is both immediately given to the faculty to guide their own practice and is also used to set the agenda for two end-of-semester faculty development "retreats" where faculty have a chance to debrief about their experiences. Subsequent workshops are conducted to improve areas identified as weak spots through the assessment.

Additional assessment processes that are already in place include Quantitative Reasoning Across the Curriculum (CPCS), Critical Learning Seminars (CPCS), Intermediate Seminars (College of Management), and the Writing Portfolio (CPCS).

Assessment of student learning outcomes is also a part of the AQUAD process. Programs have made concrete steps toward student learning outcomes assessment. Some examples are the survey of alumni of the Masters program in Applied Sociology, the results of which have been placed on the department's website. The Hispanic Studies Department uses the capstone or senior seminar to assess student learning outcomes and to make curricular changes. The required capstone courses are being used in this way by several departments. Computer Science is working towards ABET accreditation, and is implementing outcomes assessment as part of the process.

In addition, the Writing Proficiency Requirement Committee and staff are beginning a comparative assessment of student performance by major in meeting the WPR. Like the assessments underway for General Education, the assessment is meant to provide better information for integrating faculty development and student support around writing into the majors.

Additional planning and evaluation mechanisms to obtain data from students have been developed in the last few years through the Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP). OIRP has implemented a series of regular student surveys including the National Survey of Student Engagement (1999, 2000, 2002 and 2004), an annual graduating senior survey (2000 and following), and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshmen Survey (2003). These sources provide information for the University on student evaluation of services, offices, and campus community, and in the case of NSSE and CIRP also provide useful comparative data. The results of these surveys are shared with relevant groups in focused briefings (e.g., Faculty Council, Chancellor's Executive Staff, Academic Council, Council for the Development of a Diverse and Civil Community) and on the OIRP Web site.

Academic Program Planning and Evaluation

At this time, almost all academic programs have undergone an AQUAD review. Thus far, the AQUAD process has aided academic programs in revising their curricula. It has also facilitated choosing specific goals for program activities, such as grant applications. Most important it has aided departments in planning, given the relatively large number of faculty retirements that have taken place in the last two years. The AQUAD process for programs with undergraduate and graduate components has undergone recent clarification. The Dean of Graduate Studies participates fully with the collegiate dean in the review, including selection of and communication with reviewers.

Typically, the planning for academic programs is done at the departmental or collegiate level. Examination of the strategic planning process revealed that significant numbers of faculty and staff campus feel that academic planning needs to be better coordinated and continually framed within the context of the University's overall goals and strategic plan.

The recent University-wide review of services to international students conducted through the Provost's Office and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Life determined that the current services were scattered and thus hard for students to find. The report concludes that more needs to be done to integrate international students into campus life and activities.

Projection:

Strategic Planning

The current strategic plan, "The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation" is a web-based document that will undergo periodic review. Its implementation is monitored by the University Planning Council under the guidance of the Provost's Office which has responsibility for its development.

Residential housing is included in the 2008 Strategic Plan for the campus but is currently on hold while community concerns and funding issues are addressed. Additional facilities planning includes the development of the UMass Boston Environmental Science and Technology Park (BEST Park), the strategic plan for upgrading the information technology system throughout the campus, a new garage, and urgently needed maintenance for the existing garage. Planned replacement of aging equipment, deferred maintenance, and compliance are all part of capital expenditures. These are all incorporated in the 10 year capital plan (through 2014) for the campus. (See Standard 8 for more details.)

University Performance Measurement System

We expect that there will be a revision of the UPMS in AY 04/05. The revisions are an opportunity for the University to re-examine the selection of campus peers to be sure that the institution is making good comparisons for financial and student achievement and access measures. We do not anticipate that there will be any major changes in the performance measures.

Budget

Discussion is under way regarding future fund allocation strategies. Currently, the University follows a base-plus (incremental) approach. A performance-based approach may be considered for the allocation of funds in the future. It is expected that requests for additional funds be tied to the fulfillment of the 2008 Strategic Planning goals of retention, research, and reputation. Strategies for making these links stronger and clearer include creating a stronger link between the Capital Budget and Operating Budget. In addition, to mitigate the uncertainty associated with state appropriations, there is a deliberate effort on the part of the University to rely less on this source of funding in the future. More information can be found in Standard Nine.

Student Access and Retention

UMass Boston is committed to access and to continue to improve services to all students. As noted previously, there are a number of activities in place to enhance student access. These could be strengthened through additional coordination that links the planning efforts of the University-level Council for the Promotion of a Diverse and Civil Community with the work of collegiate-level diversity committees.

The reports on retention described above have been central in the development of retention strategies (see Retention at UMass Boston, August 2003) and in the University's aggressive efforts to enhance student life and the sense of campus community. The hiring in 2003 of a Vice Chancellor for Student Life and an increased emphasis on building campus community are partly the result of an analysis of NSSE data that showed UMass Boston students are

significantly less involved with campus life than those at other research-intensive universities. The specific goals set in the 2008 Strategic Plan for retention and related activities are based on our retention research and on the assessments of satisfaction with campus programs and services from the graduating senior survey. We anticipate improvements in retention rates over the next five years.

Student Outcomes Assessment

At present, the link between student learning assessment and resource allocation is through the AQUAD process. In order to strengthen its academic programs and support new initiatives that promote development in these areas, the University must find ways to more explicitly link curricular assessment to resource allocation. This strategy would support the continued development of rich assessment practices, inform pedagogy and support student learning, allow for replication of successful models, and strengthen weaker areas of performance.

The current General Education assessment process is focused on the components of the curriculum that were created as part of our 1997 General Education reform and for which the Faculty Council set up a standing committee to oversee and plan (e.g. first year seminars, intermediate seminars, and quantitative reasoning courses). The challenge is to expand this assessment model to distribution courses that do not have such coordinated oversight and planning but are an equally important part of the General Education curriculum. (For fuller descriptions of these assessment initiatives, see Report of Faculty Council Committee on General Education Implementation. Academic Year 2002-2003.)

The University is assessing the current WPR. Many composition specialists question whether timed essay examinations yield valid assessments, especially for a high-stakes evaluation like the WPR. We anticipate that the Writing Proficiency Sub-Committee of the Faculty Council will propose a revision in our mode of assessment such that we will expand the use of portfolio evaluations after January of 2005. Portfolio evaluation provides multiple examples of student work written in General Education courses over a two year period. The extension of the portfolio model would create both better assessment and stimulate writing instruction across the curriculum by using the General Education courses to generate the writing to be evaluated.

A longer-term goal – which also supports student writing proficiency – is to establish a University-wide Writing Center. This Center, serving all students graduate or undergraduate, would be an important support for faculty who want to integrate more writing into their courses.

Academic Program Planning and Evaluation

The AQUAD process will continue, but discussion has begun on an assessment of the AQUAD process itself, to look for ways to make the process more useful. The Provost will consider the appointment of a new faculty committee to assess the AQUAD process and to make recommendations for improvement following the completion of the first cycle of reviews under this system.

Academic programs rely on AQUAD reports and strategic planning documents to inform decisions about program development and curriculum change. Additional efforts are needed, however, to establish formal, ongoing processes for planning and assessment in the academic programs. AQUAD has not yet resulted in the institutionalization of ongoing planning in all academic programs. Planning and assessment need to extend beyond the AQUAD process (which

affects an academic program only once every seven years), and be infused into routine functioning each academic year.

Academic programs also need to strengthen feedback that keep programs constantly informed about student outcomes and external expectations such as professional licensing requirements and employer surveys. The Provost will communicate best practices for ongoing assessment and establish expectations for formal planning cycles at the collegiate and departmental levels that coincide with the University's five-year strategic planning cycle.

The Provost will continue to encourage new efforts toward accreditation (e.g., the Computer Science ABET review), as well as enhance efforts toward re-accreditation for those units that have recently become accredited (e.g., NCATE accreditation in GCE).

Intercollegiate planning will become increasingly important in achieving the University's mission, especially in the context of limited public resources. The Office of Economic Development, for example, draws on the efforts of faculty from several Colleges in its Environmental Business and Technology Center. Similarly, accreditation in teacher education has stimulated the creation of a new planning committee that includes faculty from all Colleges that prepare future teachers. More recently, as noted above, the intercollegiate Committee on International Programs produced a report that recommended the creation of a new Center for International Students.

The Provost will encourage additional intercollegiate planning efforts and assess their effectiveness. For example, the Provost and Deans will encourage joint planning among offices and centers that have responsibilities for faculty development and pedagogical improvement such as the Center for the Improvement of Teaching, the Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach, and units responsible for instructional technology.

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

Task Force members: Sherry Merrow (Chair), Varda Konstam, Kenneth Lemanski, Dirk Messelaar, Joyce Morgan, Linda Perrotto, Marietta Schwartz

Description:

The University of Massachusetts Boston is part of the University of Massachusetts five-campus system, along with campuses at Amherst, Dartmouth, Lowell and Worcester. UMass Boston opened in 1965. Boston State College (formerly Boston Teacher's College) was merged with UMass Boston in 1982. The campus is headed by a Chancellor, who is selected by the Board of Trustees and the President of the University of Massachusetts system. The campus has operational autonomy delegated from the Board and President to the Chancellor.

The University of Massachusetts is authorized by the Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 75, to provide public service, research, and undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education programs to the Commonwealth. The Board of Trustees has general authority to confer undergraduate and advanced degrees approved by the Board of Higher Education. The Trustees have complete authority over education programs subject only to the general authority of the Board of Higher Education. Admissions criteria and tuition are established by the campus in conjunction with the Trustees subject to approval by the Board of Higher Education.

The Board of Trustees has twenty-two members, seventeen appointed by the Governor of the Commonwealth and five elected by the students on the respective campuses with two student votes rotating among the five. Student trustee terms are for a period of one year; other Trustees can be appointed for a term of up to ten years. Each campus elects a nonvoting faculty representative to the Board of Trustees for a term of two years.

UMass Boston has a campus-wide representative body, the Faculty Council, and separate governance entities in each of the seven colleges or schools: College of Liberal Arts (CLA) Senate, College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) Senate, College of Management (CM) Assembly, College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) Senate, Graduate College of Education (GCE) Senate (GCE By-Laws), College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) Policy Board, and the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies. Each college or school has its own form of faculty governance that allows faculty a substantive voice in matters of curriculum and other areas of institutional policy. The McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies was formed in the fall of 2003 and is in the process of developing a faculty governance structure. The Professional Education Coordinating Council (PECC) is an interdisciplinary governance committee with representation from all programs that prepare teachers. PECC has an advisory role on curricular matters. Chart 1 depicts faculty involvement by committee at both the University and College level.

There is elected student governance on the undergraduate and graduate level (the Undergraduate Student Senate and the Graduate Student Assembly). From those bodies, student representatives are chosen to serve as nonvoting members of the Faculty Council. Student

governance has the opportunity to meet with and provide insight to the administration on issues and topics raised by both entities. Most collegiate governance bodies also have provision for student representation.

The faculty and librarians are represented by the Faculty Staff Union. Classified staff and professional staff are represented by SEIU Local 888. Graduate student employees are represented by the Graduate Employee Organization / UAW Local 1596. A representative of the Faculty Staff Union and a representative of the professional staff serve as nonvoting members of the Faculty Council. There is also provision for staff representation on most collegiate governance bodies.

As per the Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Boston, and Worcester (Trustee Document T76-081, the "Red Book"), each department and college has a personnel committee which gives faculty a substantive voice in personnel matters.

All off-campus, continuing education, distance education, international, and week-end programs at UMass Boston are administered through the Division of Corporate, Continuing, and Distance Education (CCDE). CCDE administers no evening programs on campus: academic departments extend their programs into the evening (called the Extended Day Program). UMass Boston manages all of the aforementioned programs using a model that is administratively centralized but academically decentralized. This translates into CCDE acting as an administrative vehicle for all the campus's Colleges: there are no credit-bearing CCDE programs managed outside of academic departments. Individual College deans and department chairs create, manage, evaluate, and control all aspects of credit-bearing courses and programs administered through CCDE. (See CCDE Annual Report 03-04.)

The academic dean who directs CCDE is a member of the Academic Council and the Dean's Council. The CCDE Director of Credit Programs and the CCDE Student and Faculty Services Workgroup are responsible for assuring the delivery of quality support services to all of our off-campus and distance education students and faculty.

Appraisal:

The system of faculty governance at UMass Boston works well. It is representative, and there are multiple opportunities for faculty to participate, having input to the decision-making process at the departmental, collegiate, and university level. This facilitates the accomplishment of the University's mission and purpose.

There have been informal reviews of governance initiated because of structural changes at the collegiate and department level. Organizational changes such as the creation of the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies and the splitting of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) into two colleges created opportunities to assess and revise governance at the collegiate level. In the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) an organizational change resulted in two departments where there previously were three, and thus forced a revision of the faculty governance bylaws. The College of Public and Community Service has also revised its constitution during the past year to reflect structural changes. However, there has been no systematic University-wide assessment of the governance structure.

Dividing CAS into two new colleges had two major impacts. The CAS committees that oversaw General Education are now centralized at the Faculty Council level, allowing for broader campus-wide input on a University-level requirement, which is widely viewed as positive. Establishing the new colleges and the McCormack Graduate School also led the Faculty Council to reapportion its twenty-nine seats as required by its constitution, and several smaller colleges each lost a seat. The Council constitution sets a college's number of seats in proportion to its faculty, but also prevents one college from holding more than fourteen of the twenty-nine Council seats. Despite this check and balance, the issue of fair representation for smaller colleges persists for some faculty.

In the course of the various interviews carried out by the members of this task force, some concerns relating to faculty governance were raised. It was pointed out that in some colleges and departments the current requirements for tenure encourage service for its own sake, leading to the appointment of many junior faculty to governance positions. While this gives the junior faculty valuable experience, it also puts them in the position of making difficult decisions without adequate knowledge of the institution or its history. Since many senior faculty have retired or will retire over the next few years, some people are also concerned about the loss of this valuable "institutional memory."

One committee that was singled out for comment was the Graduate Studies Committee of the Faculty Council. Some faculty are concerned that the roles and responsibilities of this committee are too demanding on committee members' time and/or expertise. The committee is asked to review major academic program changes, such as the recent creation of the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies, as well as minor academic matters such as changes in graduate course numbers and course descriptions. Committee members often do not have the time or the staff support to handle such a broad range of responsibilities, something that can be a problem in all the large Faculty Council committees. In addition, some faculty and administrators feel there is confusion and inefficiency in the delegation of responsibilities and decision-making among the Graduate Studies Committee, the Faculty Council as a whole, the Graduate Studies dean, and the collegiate deans.

As mentioned, students have the opportunity to participate in governance at a number of levels. There are seats on many departmental, collegiate, and university committees, as well as seats on collegiate senates and the Faculty Council. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to find student representatives to fill the seats. Many students work significant numbers of hours and do not feel they have the time to participate in committees. The President of the Graduate Student Assembly noted that there is no way for the average student to know about all the opportunities that exist for them to participate in the various governance bodies, even for those with the time and interest.

Roles for professional and classified staff exist on most collegiate governance bodies as well as Faculty Council. However, many staff members are not aware of the seats designated for them, and the consistency of participation and level of contribution are therefore mixed.

Upon the resignation of the previous Chancellor, an Interim Chancellor was appointed in August 2004. A national search for Chancellor is being conducted. The Interim Chancellor is viewed by faculty, staff, and students as being open and accessible as was the prior Chancellor. The Interim Chancellor meets regularly with the Faculty Council Executive Committee, attends and reports at every Faculty Council Meeting, and holds formal and informal meetings with students to discuss their concerns. There is a formal evaluation of the Chancellor every three years by the President's Office.

Projection:

Overall, the governance system at UMass Boston works well and should be maintained. In that spirit, the Chancellor and Provost will establish a procedure to review the system of governance every five years. This is particularly important given the organizational changes that have taken place over the past year.

The difficulties in finding student representatives to serve on the various governance bodies need to be addressed. We feel that student representation is important at all levels. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and the Student Life coordinator will take up this challenge. Departments and colleges need to make an effort to publicize the opportunities for both student and staff representation on governance bodies and committees.

The Provost and deans will encourage departments to fill a reasonable percentage of seats on collegiate governance bodies and committees with tenured faculty members. It is important for new faculty to gain a sense of the governance system, but it is equally important for experienced faculty to remain on these bodies and lend their expertise and mentoring abilities to the new faculty.

The smaller colleges were especially concerned about representation on the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council reported on this issue last year, but no member put forward any motion for change in the apportionment of seats among the colleges. A major effort is made to ensure that each college has a member on each standing committee which effectively gives near equal voice to the colleges regardless of size. During the course of this self-study, the Council increased the cap on standing committees from 9 to twelve to facilitate representation in light of the increased number of colleges but also to ensure relevant expertise, overlapping terms, and a junior/senior mix.

The governance of graduate programs will be rethought. The Provost in conjunction with the Faculty Council will conduct a review which will include the roles of deans, Faculty Council, faculty committees, and the possibility that graduate matters that involve only a single college be addressed at the collegiate level.

The Provost has recently appointed a committee to review the status of the Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education (CCDE), with a view toward "upgrading its quality, broadening its responsibilities, strengthening its accountability, and augmenting its contributions to the University and the Commonwealth." He has also asked this committee to consider whether it is advisable to establish a new college within which CCDE would operate.

Standard Four: Programs and Instruction

Task Force Members: Russell Schutt, Kathleen Teehan and Janet M. Wagner (Chairs), Pamela Annas, Jeffrey Burr, Caroline Coscia, Estelle Disch, Alicia Dowd, Lester Goodchild, Susan Haussler, Jeffrey Keisler, Joan Liem, Terry McLarney, Anna Madison, Erica Mena, Theresa A. Mortimer, Kevin B. Murphy, Mark Pawlak, Hannah Sevian, Susan Smith, Judith Zeitlin

Introduction

The University of Massachusetts Boston has as its primary mission the education of its students in an environment in which outstanding teaching is enriched by excellent research and effective service. Through its seven colleges, UMass Boston delivers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degree programs as well as certificates of advanced graduate study (CAGS) and a variety of other professional certificate programs to a population of approximately 12,500 undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education students. (See the Colleges' Annual Reports for detailed information on each College.)

The undergraduate programs are grounded in the liberal arts and sciences and structured to ensure that graduates achieve competence in expository writing, critical thinking, and quantitative reasoning; exposure to a range of disciplines; and in-depth study in a major. A newly launched General Education curriculum establishes general requirements designed to provide students with a foundation for lifelong learning. The programs offered at UMass Boston are typical of a comprehensive public university, yet also address the economic and workforce development needs of the metropolitan region.

At the graduate level, UMass Boston defines its role as a doctoral-granting, research university with a focus on master's programs that are both research- and practice-oriented, and doctoral programs that nurture both pure and applied research and contribute to the environment and well-being of citizens of the Commonwealth. Graduate programs require substantial course work beyond the undergraduate level and exhibit high standards for graduation, including a capstone requirement--a thesis, comprehensive exam, final project or paper at the master's level, and completion of a comprehensive exam and a dissertation at the doctoral level.

UMass Boston administration and faculty work through the seven colleges in an established governance process to plan, manage, and review all programs. Proposals for new programs or changes in degrees and requirements are considered for approval by departments, individual college senates and deans, the graduate studies committee, Faculty Council, and the Provost. The University also has practices in place for ongoing evaluation of academic programs, teaching, and research through its tenure and Annual Faculty Review processes, Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR) of tenured faculty, and Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD). The approach to each is described in more detail in the sections on undergraduate and graduate programs.

A number of faculty committees have taken on the responsibility for regular review of the elements of the new General Education curriculum, including the General Education Committee, the Seminar Assessment Committee, the Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Committee, and the Distribution Committee. In addition, the University frequently involves students in service and satisfaction surveys and focus groups to ensure that students are engaged in the evaluation of their education and success.

Responsibility for determining credit, academic content, and mode of delivery of all academic programs and courses resides with the faculty at UMass Boston. Academic departments, individual colleges, or graduate studies sponsor the courses and programs offered for credit both in the state-supported courses and through the Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education (CCDE). This structure ensures that off-campus, weekend, and distance learning courses are equivalent to the state-supported courses in content, teaching, and learning outcomes, and in opportunities for students' access to each other and to faculty. Moreover, UMass Boston has introduced a rigorous review process for graduate distance education programs as outlined in the instruction section that follows.

The UMass Boston faculty is also the arbiter of all student grading, evaluation practices, and the awarding of credit. Evaluation of courses for transfer to UMass Boston is the responsibility of academic departments. The review process for undergraduate transfers is managed by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions. Allowable transfer credit at the graduate level is proposed by the academic departments and approved by the graduate dean. The College of Public and Community Service faculty assesses its enrolled students' experiences for the awarding of competencies for prior learning. The University Registrar manages and oversees the awarding and recording of all credit and competencies.

Undergraduate Degree Programs

Description:

Undergraduate education is a central component of the University's mission and occupies a substantial portion of its attention. In 2003, for example, 9,650 of the 12, 394 enrolled students, or 78%, were classified as undergraduates. In AY '02-'03, 53 undergraduate certificates and 1496 bachelor's degrees were awarded compared to approximately 700 graduate degrees and certificates.

The University offers 78 undergraduate degree programs. Bachelors of Arts degrees are offered by three colleges (CLA, CSM, and CPCS) and Bachelor's of Science degrees are offered by five colleges (CLA, CSM, CNHS, CPCS, and CM). UMass Boston does not award any Associate's Degrees. The colleges also offer 14 undergraduate certificates, which are issued upon completion of courses that in many cases prepare students for government or industry certification in a particular field. The Graduate College of Education does not offer any undergraduate degrees; however, it does work with the other colleges through the Teacher Education Program to prepare undergraduates for careers in education and assists students in being certified for teaching in Massachusetts.

The colleges offer their courses primarily on campus. The division of Corporate, Continuing, and Distance Education (CCDE) extends courses into the community by providing courses and programs off-site, through the on-line format, and by offering non-credit-bearing professional certificates and institutes both on and off-campus.

Of particular note since the last NEASC accreditation visit, the undergraduate General Education curriculum has been an area of active and sustained attention. In 1997-98 the University finalized a new General Education Plan which has since been implemented across all colleges offering undergraduate degrees. Building on aspects of the General Education plan already part of the UMass Boston curriculum (specifically Freshman English, the Diversity requirement, and the Writing Proficiency Requirement), faculty and administrators have expended considerable efforts during the last five years on General Education curriculum and implementation.

Undergraduate programs are reviewed periodically (normally on a seven- year cycle) as part of the AQUAD process. The AQUAD process, which includes both internal and external review, specifically includes considerations of (1) linking of program goals and objectives to the campus mission and strategic priorities, (2) ensuring a relevant, rigorous, current, and coherent curriculum, and (3) ensuring teaching/learning environments that facilitate student success. In addition, professionally oriented undergraduate programs are also encouraged to pursue specialized accreditation; this goal in particular is specifically mentioned as an initiative in the University's 2008 Strategic Plan (as part of "Reputation"). The undergraduate programs in the two undergraduate professional colleges (Nursing and Health Sciences and Management) are both nationally accredited (by CCNE and AACSB International, respectively), as well as the teacher education programs in the Graduate College of Education and the College of Nursing and Health Sciences (by NCATE). The University Honors Program won Commonwealth Honors Status in 2001 and is accredited by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. In addition, it is an active member of the National Collegiate Honors Council, thereby contributing to and keeping current with the latest innovations in Honors Program curricula across the nation.

All bachelor's degrees at UMass Boston require at least 120 credits, including 30 taken in residency. The degree structure for both B.A. and B.S. degrees for students in CLA, CSM, CNHS, and CM involve General Education requirements, major requirements, and electives. CPCS uses a competency-based system (40 competencies are required for graduation) involving 28 competencies in three levels of core knowledge and skills, a writing competency involving a portfolio, 10 competencies within a major (and/or in a major and a concentration), and a capstone project.

As previously mentioned, the General Education requirements (described more fully below) have been completely revised over the past five years. General Education requirements (including required first-year and intermediate seminars, courses/competencies in writing, quantitative reasoning, diversity, major domains of knowledge, and a capstone experience) now require a minimum of 14 courses (out of a minimum 40 for graduation, or at least 35%).

Major requirements, described in the catalog and on the University Web site, consist of at least 10 courses focused in a particular area. As an institution that advertises itself as having "small classes and flexible programs" there are many options available for minors and multiple majors. Programs of study are also available, which are groupings of courses that offer exposure to a particular area, often involving interdisciplinary study. These programs often can be taken in conjunction with or independent of a degree program and when completed are noted on University transcripts and/or by the receipt of a certificate of completion. An individual major option is also available for students whose interests and goals make it advisable for them to set up an individualized program of study that differs from programs with standard requirements, and is used by 10-20 students each year.

Appraisal:

Student satisfaction with their undergraduate experience is tracked by the Office of Institutional Research and Programs (OIRP) who administer a Graduating Senior Survey (GSS) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). OIRP also has information from a 2002 alumni survey conducted by the UMass President's Office. General measures of undergraduate student satisfaction from these surveys are quite high.

The 2002 Alumni survey, for example, found 97% of the respondents were satisfied with the quality of the undergraduate education received at UMass Boston, 88% were satisfied with how UMass Boston prepared them for their jobs, 91% were satisfied with how UMass Boston prepared them for further education, and 97% report being satisfied with the quality of their undergraduate major. These results general agree with the 2003 Graduating Student Survey results which showed mean satisfaction levels (on a scale where 1 was least satisfied and 7 most satisfied) of 5.7 for overall satisfaction with the major and 5.3 for satisfaction with the overall experience. In addition, there were statistically significant increases in 2003 from the 2002 results for two summary questions: 83% of GSS respondents would attend UMass Boston again (up from 76% in 2002) and 87% would recommend UMass Boston to friends or family (up from 83%).

Another survey that informs the development of undergraduate programs is UMass Boston's involvement in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). UMass Boston was part of the pilot study during the development of this national survey, and participated in NSSE 2000 and 2002 (in 2002 NSSE was used by 366 institutions across the country). NSSE focuses on educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development, such as student-faculty contact and active learning. Again these NSSE results support the claim of satisfied undergraduates. For example, UMass Boston students were as satisfied with student-faculty relationships as students at other doctoral intensive universities.

Another indication of the quality of undergraduate education is the pass rates of license exams. First time test-taker pass rates on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX) rose 14% in the past four years to 91% in 2003 (compared to the national average of 87%). The 2002/2003 pass rates on the Massachusetts teacher certification exam was 88% in 2002/2003 comparable to the state average of 91%.

Since the last NEASC report, undergraduate programs have seen steady development. As previously mentioned, the extensive revision of the General Education curriculum has touched every college with undergraduate programs. New minors have been added in art history and communication studies in CLA. There have been major reorganizations of the CNHS curricula in both Nursing and in Exercise Science and Physical Education. The College of Public and Community Service has undergone a complete reorganization of its majors, minors, and programs including adding new programs in Latino and Asian Studies. Two new BS/MS programs have been added in Computer Science and Chemistry (in CSM). The University Honors program has also seen major expansion, growing from 45 students in AY '93-'94 to 180 in AY '03-'04. At the start of AY '04-'05, enrollment stood at a little over 200. In the past five years, four Honors Program students have won prestigious national and international fellowships – one Marshall and four Fulbright scholarships. The post of Campus Fellowships Advisor was newly created in Fall, 2004 to expand this activity.

An area that has seen recent growth is student participation in internships and co-ops. These experiences, coordinated through the Career Services Office, can involve credit or non-credit experiences. In Spring 2003 the campus instituted a centralized data collection system for tracking for-credit internships (although it does not track internships that are integrated into majors). In Fall 2003, 658 students participated in for-credit internships (a large jump over previous years, at least partly due to better reporting).

Service learning opportunities have also been another revitalized focus for the University. Supporting the University mission of public service, the Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach (OSLCO) was established in 2000 to serve as a resource to community partners, faculty, students, and staff to enhance civic participation and promote community-based learning opportunities. This office helps faculty revise and develop academic courses and programs to include active participation in service projects within the community and to increase opportunities for civic engagement. They also facilitate volunteer opportunities for individuals and student groups, sponsor events, and provide links to external resources regarding service learning pedagogy and practice. In a recent survey of UMass Boston faculty by OSLCO, 40% reported they are using or are interested in using service learning in their classroom.

By far the most notable accomplishment regarding undergraduate programs has been the work done since the last NEASC report on the development of General Education. The General Education reform effort, which touched every undergraduate program, is an area in which UMass Boston has shown extensive and continual efforts and is an accomplishment of which the institution can be justifiably proud. The General Education Steering Committee report, parts of which are summarized below, provides a thorough appraisal of the General Education initiative.

The General Education program consists of first year seminars, intermediate seminars, capstone courses and distribution requirements. Some of these are University-wide and some are implemented at the college level. The General Education seminar program was fully implemented in Fall 2001, with over one thousand students per semester since then. Student course evaluations for the first year seminars (FYS) and intermediate seminars (IS) were exceptionally strong. The FYS was rated as outstanding or above average (and would be recommended to other students) by two-thirds of respondents, and were rated as "very effective" or "above average" for each of the seven General Education capabilities by at least 50% of the students in 2001. There was minor but consistent improvement between Fall 2001 and Fall 2003 – on the three capabilities of teamwork, information technology, and listening/speaking, the above average ratings increased from 55.2% to 62.7%. In Spring, 2001, 60% to 70% of students found the IS courses to be "very effective" or "above average" in improving their abilities as readers, critical thinkers, and effective writers. In Fall, 2003 this range had improved to 65%-75%. In the IS courses, 69%-71% of respondents rated them "outstanding" or "above average" in Spring 2001 and this increased to 74%-81% in Fall 2003.

Improvement in General Education teaching has been fostered through the efforts of the Seminar Assessment Committee (SAC). The SAC collects course-related data such as student surveys and portfolios of work and facilitates seminar development on an ongoing basis. The Quantitative Reasoning Assessment Committee (QUAC) conducts similar data-rich assessments, which have led to adjustments in course design and strengthened pedagogy. The QUAC also promotes faculty development through feedback and program-wide faculty retreats. A new distribution requirement was launched in fall 2002, and the distribution committee has reviewed and approved over 350 courses for inclusion in one of the four major disciplinary domains. These courses now more explicitly promote General Education capabilities. Assessments of distribution

courses were piloted in Spring 2003 and results are being analyzed. Capstone courses have been implemented but assessment has to this point been done only at the department level.

Colleges have also undertaken efforts to assess particular General Education courses and programs in addition to the overall monitoring done by the Faculty Council's General Education Committee. CM has evaluated student papers from its IS and Capstone course and based on the findings modified the IS and improved its course offerings in its writing program. CNHS is already heavily assessed as part of its accreditation and licensure processes, and has been using these findings to inform its efforts to balance general education goals with its other curricular goals. It is currently revising its Master Evaluation Plan. CPCS students are assessed individually throughout their undergraduate careers as they complete an assortment of competencies. FYS faculty meet regularly and other faculty curriculum groups are similarly engaged in collaborative interchange about educational goals and strategies. CPCS has several new initiatives to utilize student outcome data for program improvement. The competencies themselves are now subject to an external review process on a five-year cycle.

Projection:

The transition to a Carnegie classification doctoral-intensive university has been accomplished without reducing the small class sizes and focus on undergraduate education that have been the hallmark of UMass Boston since its inception. Strategic balancing of spending and investment to support both undergraduate and graduate programs simultaneously will continue to be carefully managed.

New undergraduate offerings can be expected to be developed in areas where the University is currently making investments. For example, the new Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics expects new undergraduate programs to be developed from a new focus on ocean, earth, and environmental sciences. The Graduate College of Education is planning to create minors in teacher education and early childhood education. The Information Technology (IT) Steering Committee is working on ways to extend IT offerings within existing programs as well as developing new ones. CCDE in conjunction with the academic colleges is also working to extend our nascent offerings using the on-line delivery modes leading to expected new on-line offerings in Information Technology (from CM and/or CSM), an RN-BS program in CNHS, and a Certificate in Communications Studies in CPCS. Undergraduate program changes can also be expected from changes in educational practice (such as increased attention to assessment of direct student outcomes and recognition of the need for more student engagement). Increased attention to the Honors Program, such as ensuring a dedicated annual budget for its courses and activities, is one example of the commitment to enhancing the quality of the undergraduate experience. The expansion of undergraduate research opportunities, and more internships and service learning opportunities are further examples of UMass Boston's engagement in improving the undergraduate experience.

Particularly within its undergraduate offerings, the institution will also continue to become "one university," one of the assumptions motivating the University's strategic plan. The recent split of CAS into CLA and CSM, the implementation of General Education across the University, and the expansion of the honors program to include the professional colleges all require intercollegiate cooperation. Appropriate administration, staffing, and operating models for integrating undergraduate programs and services will continue to evolve.

The March 2004 General Education Steering Committee report highlights the enormous accomplishments in the area of general education over the past five years and in its implementation and review across the colleges. This Committee plans to continue to work on the following issues:

1. Establishing appropriate instruments and procedures of assessment in the Distribution and Capstone portions of General Education. These instruments and procedures, like those implemented in the Gen Ed seminars and QR classes, should be designed in a manner that will facilitate longer term study of the General Education curriculum and its impact on student performance.

2. Increasing the equivalency among colleges in their program-specific interpretations of the General Education requirements. Areas already noted where such work is needed include QR and the Writing Proficiency Requirement.

3. Developing pedagogical standards and assessment protocols for online courses meeting General Education requirements.

4. Formulating measures to enhance the integration of the Initial Phase Gen Ed curriculum within the University, for example, considering mechanisms that might increase the involvement of full-time faculty with the First Year Seminars.

Finally, the Committee identifies a need for "more administrative support for program review, faculty hiring, and faculty development." Building on the strong record of past success, and with the integration of college level committees into the University-wide Faculty Council now essentially accomplished, there is every reason to expect a continuing record of accomplishment in realizing the goals that originally led to the revision of undergraduate general education at UMass Boston.

Graduate Degree Programs

Description:

Graduate programs and the research and scholarship that they nurture have become an increasingly important component of the University of Massachusetts Boston. According to our vision statement, the University is a doctoral-granting, research university that seeks to "nurture both pure and applied research to advance knowledge and to create a better society for all" and to "devote a high proportion of research and public service activities to the cultural, social, and economic development" of the state, region, and global communities.

The number and foci of the University's graduate programs reflect an increasing commitment to graduate level development. Every college offers graduate degrees. The total number of graduate degree and certificate programs has grown from 31 in 1994 to 64 in 2004, including 13 doctoral programs, 28 masters programs, three Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study, and twenty graduate certificate programs. The number of matriculated graduate students has increased from 1958 in 1993 to 2105 in 2003 representing 22% of the current campus enrollment.

Graduate programs at the University of Massachusetts Boston require substantial coursework and maintain high standards for graduation. PhD and EdD programs each require at least 60 credit hours of coursework and successful completion of a comprehensive examination and a dissertation supervised by an active faculty scholar. MA, MS, and MEd programs require at least 30 credit hours of coursework and completion of a capstone experience, most often a thesis, comprehensive exam, final project, or written paper. Students seeking both the MEd and Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies must complete between 66 and 78 credit hours in addition to a capstone project (the CAGS itself requires 36 credits). Graduate certificate programs require a minimum of 12 to 18 hours of graduate course credit. Each type of graduate program conforms to accepted practices in graduate education; several also must meet the requirements of professional accrediting bodies.

The relevance, viability, and quality of graduate programs are maintained with structures and processes that ensure careful examination of proposed and ongoing graduate programs at multiple institutional levels and from diverse disciplinary perspectives. New graduate programs proposed by faculty are submitted for approval to the University's Graduate Studies Committee, the Faculty Council, the deans of the participating colleges, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Chancellor, and the University's Board of Trustees and the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. When changes to existing programs are needed, they must be reviewed and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee, the Faculty Council, and the Provost. The Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) is a standing committee of the Faculty Council that reviews graduate program proposals, develops graduate policy recommendations, and advises the Dean of Graduate Studies and college deans on graduate programs.

Graduate level online instruction at the University must maintain the same level of excellence as on-campus courses. Special procedures have been developed to ensure this equivalence for online options and separate online tracks within existing programs, as well as for distinct all-online degree programs. When existing programs seek to offer fifty percent or more of their content in an online format, they must secure approval through the faculty governance process. Entirely new online programs must be reviewed by the collegiate Academic Affairs Committee, as are all new course proposals. The department proposing to offer a graduate program online must demonstrate to the graduate dean strategic planning and resource availability to assure program viability and equivalence of quality with on-campus programs. A training plan is required for faculty who must adapt course delivery from a face-to-face to an online format.

Through the AQUAD review process described in Standard 2, each graduate program participates in a process that is designed to achieve the goals of the NEASC accreditation process itself. Programs that are subject to professionally mandated accreditation reviews may use that review process instead of AQUAD, adding components as necessary to meet basic AQUAD expectations. Graduate program planning and review is also an important component of the annual reports and strategic plans submitted by college deans.

Appraisal:

The growth of graduate programs at the University is reflected in the 700 graduate degrees and certificates awarded in AY 2002-2003. Several graduate programs have achieved national prominence, including the Clinical Psychology PhD program, the Gerontology PhD program and the Environmental, Coastal, and Ocean Sciences track in the Environmental Sciences PhD Program. The new Green Chemistry track in the Environmental Sciences PhD is the first of its kind in the world and has been highlighted in national journals. The Gerontology

PhD program is the second oldest program of its kind in the world, has produced more graduates than any of the other eight programs in the U.S., and has been used as a model for many other programs.

Masters programs in education, counseling, school psychology and family therapy, dispute resolution, applied sociology, management, applied linguistics, and others train many practitioners for professional positions. A recent alumni survey in Dispute Resolution found that two-thirds of graduates use the skills they learned in the program in their jobs and more than half secured new positions due to their program experience. A survey in Applied Sociology found similar experiences among its graduates. Graduate certificate programs and Certificates of Advanced Graduate Study enable many professionals to upgrade their skills in areas ranging from school psychology and rehabilitation counseling to instructional technology and forensic services. Graduate assistants in many of these programs assist faculty in teaching and serve as role models for undergraduate students. Graduate programs have thus become a major, valued component of the University of Massachusetts Boston.

The process for approval and review of graduate programs and courses has ensured cohesive and comprehensive curricula that exceed requirements for undergraduate programs and that include rigorous graduation standards. All dissertation projects at the PhD level must be supervised by active faculty research scholars, while performance in capstone requirements at the master's level must be judged by multiple faculty members. Teaching faculty in research-oriented programs have active research records, while those in practice-oriented programs and mixed research/practice programs include experienced professionals.

At this time, faculty retirements, particularly those stimulated by two recent early retirement programs, have combined with budget constraints to increase pressure on faculty resources in some programs. Most graduate programs have been able to maintain sufficient faculty to continue offering their full range of courses and some, such as Computer Science, have been able to hire new faculty to make up for deficits identified in the AQUAD or other program review processes. Some graduate programs have also used creative means to lessen the impact of reduced faculty resources. Clinical Psychology, for example, has developed a systematic training program for teaching assistants to ensure more support to faculty. Combination of faculties in the three environmental sciences programs will allow more efficient use of faculty resources.

Moreover, when overall faculty resources are limited, departments are often reluctant to have their faculty teaching outside their own program. The Public Policy PhD Program has only two faculty dedicated to the program; faculty from other departments contribute on a part-time basis. The Critical and Thinking program had not been able to maintain its complete curriculum due to the loss of key faculty and the unavailability of cooperating faculty in other programs, until another faculty member was hired. It has also been difficult for the Environmental, Coastal and Ocean Sciences PhD Program to find new faculty who can offer an interdisciplinary perspective within the program.

Graduate assistantships (GAs) in teaching and research which provide an important source of financial support to many graduate students and the GAs themselves serve as good role models for undergraduates. Procedures for defining graduate assistantships have been formalized as a result of the new Graduate Employee Organization contract and levels of support have been increased. Open positions are now posted on a common web site and assistantship-offer letters to new students must adhere to a standard format. Partial remission of student fees has been added to full remission of tuition as components of the assistantship stipend. However, due to increased

costs, the number of funded assistantships fell by 13% in Fall 2002. It continues to be difficult to compete for research assistants with other universities due to our relatively low level of support.

Space and support services are also a concern in several programs. Laboratory space is limited relative to the needs of faculty in Clinical Psychology and Computer Science. There are no observation rooms for Counseling Psychology or for Teacher Education. Both Gerontology and Computer Science seek additional support staff. The lack of contiguous office space for the Environmental, Coastal and Ocean Sciences (ECOS) faculty limits collegial interaction.

The efficacy of graduate-level planning and review process is illustrated in the University's response to the burgeoning opportunities for online instructional delivery. There is no distinction allowed in quality between online options and the regular program. Any new program that is to be 50% or more online must demonstrate a commitment of full-time faculty to the online offerings and secure approval from faculty governance and the Graduate Dean. For example, the Graduate College of Education's on-line programs in Counseling and Mental Health are taught by full-time faculty as part of their regular teaching load.

The AQUAD process has been helpful in monitoring program functioning and charting new directions, although it has not consistently resulted in new resources to make up for deficits. For example, the AQUAD reviews of the Clinical Psychology PhD Program, the Applied Sociology MA Program, and the Computer Science PhD Program each identified these programs as functioning well but requiring additional faculty in selected areas in order to meet program expectations. In subsequent years, positions were allotted to these programs and new faculty hired to remedy these deficits. However, in some programs AQUAD reviews have identified shortages but have not resulted in new resources. The review of the Critical and Creative Thinking graduate program led to a short moratorium on new enrollments until additional faculty could be hired. Enrollments were also terminated in the Early Childhood program due to insufficient faculty, although recent agreements with local community colleges may lead to its restoration by 2006. A similar moratorium was declared for the Human Services program, although three years later, after the program was reorganized, the moratorium was lifted and a new cohort enrolled. When a moratorium has been declared the Office of Graduate Studies has ensured that students can complete the program within the next two years. When the Department of Biology dropped its Bio Technology program because new hospital policies foreclosed internship opportunities, students already enrolled in the program were able to finish with a Biology degree. In spite of these problems due to resource shortfalls, no programs have yet been dropped permanently—a step that currently requires approval by the Board of Trustees. Procedures for identifying under-enrolled programs outside of the AQUAD process and for dropping graduate programs are now under review.

Projection:

The University's 2008 Strategic Plan calls for increasing graduate student enrollment to 25% by 2008. The MBA program and the Clinical Psychology PhD program are both identified in the Plan as programs that should soon achieve national ranking. These ambitious plans for expansion of graduate student quantity and graduate program quality will be supported by several key organizational and programmatic changes.

Interdisciplinary and intercampus programming will increase at the graduate level due to the increasingly interdisciplinary character of research in many fields as well as the potential for more efficient use of faculty resources. Online instruction will continue to grow as an important

element in graduate instruction. The Graduate College of Education is considering on-line Family Therapy and School Psychology master's programs as well as an on-line program for Teachers of the Visually Impaired offered with the Institute for Community Inclusion. Inter-campus teaching with instructional television (ITV) and online instruction will be used increasingly to allow students to benefit from faculty expertise on different campuses.

Many space needs are being addressed through the space reallocation following opening of the new Campus Center. Additional laboratory facilities and teaching space are already planned. On the other hand, it is expected that the University's newly acquired service program, the Institute for Community Inclusion, will move to the campus, which would require additional space.

The separation of the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science and Mathematics provides an opportunity for more focused leadership and attention to issues specific to each college. At its AY2002 retreat, the Science faculty made plans to collaborate across departments and focus on building selected areas of research strength. Funding has already been secured to renovate laboratories and upgrade computer facilities.

New requirements for teacher certification will result in increased enrollment in several MA programs in liberal arts and sciences/mathematics, which will require additional faculty positions and greater coordination between CLA, CSM, and GCE, as well as more online options. A new funded program is being devised in ECOS to support graduate students who will work in the public schools. The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan also calls for increasing GCE internships in urban school and community settings. As outlined in the UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan, GCE will create a Weekend Teachers School to increase training for work in urban districts.

The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan reaffirms the mission and vision statements that have guided graduate program development, including a commitment to remaining a doctoral-intensive university, maintaining a superior faculty dedicated to undergraduate and graduate teaching, nurturing both pure and applied research, and contributing to the environment and well-being of citizens of the region. The Strategic Plan projects significant growth at the graduate level over the next five years. Graduate student enrollment is planned to increase from 22% to 25% of the campus enrollment, with particular programs targeted for growth in numbers and academic qualifications of new students and additional funds allotted for graduate assistantships.

Professional and practice-oriented programs will be expanded and refined. The Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education will increase the number of distance education certificate and degree programs for working professionals and will convene industry task forces to discuss workforce needs and develop corporate contracts. New online programs are planned in several professional training areas: Instructional Technology, Accounting, Applied Linguistics, International Relations, and Hispanic Studies. Dispute Resolution and Counseling are also developing more online programming, with additional resources.

These plans for significant program expansion require special efforts to maintain program and student quality. The Provost, collegiate deans, Dean of Graduate Studies, and Faculty Council will strengthen the emphasis on maintaining quality in the next year by reviewing procedures for changing existing programs and adding new graduate programs. They will determine the number of graduate programs that can be afforded, formulate a feasible planning process for determining which programs to expand, and review plans for developing a larger, richer applicant pool.

Improved graduate student services are also planned to support the expansion of graduate programs. A centralized source for information about housing and other community resources and a streamlined student communication system is being designed by the Graduate Dean and the Dean of Students. The new Campus Center provides much more space on campus, making it more feasible to add additional student services. The Graduate Dean is designing a graduate student retention study in order to identify changes in services to improve program retention.

Program expansion will obviously require new faculty positions. Early retirements have exacerbated the problem of inadequate faculty resources for some programs in the short run, but in the long run these retirements create opportunities for hiring new faculty who may contribute more to graduate research and interdisciplinary teaching.

Scholarship and Research

Description:

University of Massachusetts Boston faculty are active scholars and researchers. In 2001-2002, faculty in the College of Liberal Arts published 11 authored and 21 edited books, 68 journal articles and 93 book chapters or essays, and they produced 150 creative works and presented 315 conference papers or invited lectures. Every CLA department contributed to these numbers, and they do not include the work of 35 faculty who took early retirement. Also in 2001-2002, CLA faculty in 10 departments had a total of $1,061,866 in grant funds to support their ongoing research; $507,588 of this amount was for projects in graduate programs. Other scholarly and creative activities by faculty members included a weekly radio program, 14 public readings, 16 art exhibits, 63 music performances, four theatre performances, and six dance performances. In AY03, two CLA professors were chosen to be chief editors of prestigious journals in their fields: *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, and the Early Modern section of the *History Compass*. The College of Liberal Arts encourages and supports scholarship and research. All new junior faculty in AY 03 receive a new computer and research start-up funds to be used for such expenses as conference registration and travel, books, photocopying, and other directly research-related expenses. A Junior Faculty Colloquium Series begun in AY 03 also encourages and publicizes scholarship and supports an institutional climate that is conducive to research.

The College of Science and Mathematics had $11,198,327 in active grants as of June 2003, reflecting a 30% increase in AY 2003 compared to the previous year. One quarter of these funds supported research in education and/or undergraduate and graduate research training. A biology professor received a half million dollar grant to support Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, which funds six fellows for three years. The federally funded McNair post-baccalaureate program supports underprivileged students as they prepare for graduate work in science and mathematics by participating in research projects with faculty and graduate students. A new NSF grant in collaboration with GCE supports ten graduate students who are helping to develop watershed research projects for ten middle school science teachers. Undergraduate CSM students also participate in research. Two NSF-sponsored programs provide research and mentoring experiences for biology undergraduates.

The McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies includes the research and scholarship of the former McCormack Institute as well as its separate graduate programs. The McCormack Institute received $3 million in research funds in 2002-2003. In addition, its Center for Social

Policy published 15 research reports between February 2002 and January 2004 and received approximately $1.7 million in external research funds in both 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.

The Graduate College of Education faculty are also productive and innovative researchers. Faculty in its two doctoral programs conduct research on areas ranging from college financing and organizational climate to the history of teacher education, gender equity, and multicultural education. Although most programs in the Graduate College of Education are designed to train practitioners, GCE faculty are active researchers, with a total of $2.3 million in grants in AY 2003. The high quality of programs and instruction in the GCE is also apparent in the work of its four institutes and centers. A fifth new center, the Center of Science and Mathematics In Context (COSMIC), provides the administrative home for two major NSF grants, the new $12.5 million Math and Science program and the $3 million Community Science Program.

Since September, 2003, the College of Nursing and Health Sciences faculty nursing faculty have received five external awards worth $1,920,000, including an Agency for Health Care Research and Quality grant to study home healthcare nurses, a National Institute of Health grant to study issues in bone health, and a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services grant to recruit, enroll, and graduate minority or economically disadvantaged nursing students.

Since July 1999, faculty in the College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) have garnered $3,426,693 in external funds. Projects have included research on adapting to the new economy, support for a Vista program, a dispute resolution program, as well as evaluating a youth outreach program, a learning partnership, and a Haitian outreach program.

Recent and ongoing research involving faculty in the College of Management includes a study of the renewable energy industry, a survey of Greater Boston CEOs, and a study of factors influencing assimilation of Internet-based technologies by small manufacturing enterprises. Since 1999 the College has generated $2.4 million in external grants. The scholarship resulting from these and other efforts include approximately 107 scholarly works for AY 01.

Eight institutes and nine free-standing centers facilitate faculty research on issues of concern to local, state, and regional government. The institutes and centers offer fellowships and course buyouts to support faculty research and sponsor lectures, publications, and other means for reporting research results to the public. The departments of Anthropology and Sociology have hired assistant professors who have joint appointments (and funding) with the Gaston Institute for Latino Community Development and Public Policy. Faculty with these joint appointments engage in research on a half-time basis, although they retain tenure-track teaching positions in a college. Africana Studies and the Trotter Institute are seeking to develop a partnership with HistoryMakers, an organization that collects oral histories, in order to provide additional research and training opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Research policies and procedures are communicated to faculty by the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. ORSP helps faculty secure grant support (See Summary of Sponsored Program Activity) and also supports the University's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The IRB includes a cross-section of faculty as well as a community representative and meets monthly to review all research proposals involving human subjects. Policies and procedures are available on the ORSP Web site.

Appraisal:

The active record of scholarship and research in the College of Liberal Arts has helped bring local and national recognition to many faculty members. Faculty in Africana Studies, Anthropology, Philosophy, Sociology, and Psychology have also garnered substantial external grants for research. Psychology faculty have been especially successful, reflecting at least in part the presence of the Clinical Psychology PhD Program – the only Liberal Arts PhD program.

The College of Science and Mathematics has increased research productivity in recent years with strategic planning. In AY2001-2002, the faculty identified six interdisciplinary areas of strength in which further development was likely to be fruitful: coastal environmental sciences, conservation biology, green chemistry, environmental informatics, molecular environmental sciences, and science education. The faculty also maintained a strong commitment to the fields of Geographic Information Systems (GIS), database mining, and molecular biology and biotechnology. In 2000-2001, the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science split into two separate departments, allowing a stronger research focus in the PhD-granting computer science department. A state-of-the art, technology-enhanced teaching facility for engineering and physics was completed in 2002-2003.

The high level of scholarly achievement of CSM faculty is reflected in awards they have earned, ranging from Distinguished Chemist of the Year (New England Institute of Chemists, American Institute of Chemists), election as a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a Fulbright scholarship, a National Science Foundation Research Opportunity Award, and a UMass Boston Chancellor's Distinguished Scholarship Award. Several CSM graduate students also received awards to support their work or its presentation.

The College of Management has focused increasing attention on developing the scholarship of its faculty since its AACSB accreditation review in December 2000. CM has implemented a new database tracking system for the intellectual contributions of its faculty, has increased faculty development research allocations (from $39,000 in FY 1999 to $53,000 in FY2001), has focused attention on scholarly productivity in its annual reports, and has initiated three Dean's awards to recognize outstanding achievements. All CM faculty develop 3-year plans that focus on scholarship and research goals.

Projection:

The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan highlights the importance of improving faculty research and scholarly activity and outlines a plan for achieving the goal identified in the University's vision statement to "nurture both pure and applied research to advance knowledge and to create a better society for all." It identifies three areas of interdisciplinary excellence that will be the focus of development efforts and outlines plans for developing a more effective infrastructure for all faculty research, scholarship, and creative activity. By 2008, sponsored research is to increase from $30 million to $50 million and the number of RO-1 grants is to increase from three to 15. Five initiatives are already underway to achieve these goals: (1) The new McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies will improve the University's profile as a major center for policy research, while new University-wide initiatives led by the Provost are building faculty research groups in the areas of the environment and health disparities. (2) The Office for Research and Sponsored Projects is being reorganized and the first Vice Provost for Research has been hired. A more proactive approach with more types of support to faculty seeking grants is expected. (3) New research agendas have been developed for the Graduate College of Education and the College of Public and Community Service. (4) New research

facilities are being developed for environmental science and other programs in the sciences, including a new Geographic Information Systems facility and new laboratories. (5) New mentoring programs are being developed in the Graduate College of Education and Nursing and Health Sciences, and the Liberal Arts Junior Faculty Colloquium Series is being expanded.

The College of Liberal Arts is beginning a multi-year process to obtain grant and endowed funding for a Center for Urban Cultural History which will combine faculty strength in this area with issues of relevance to our urban setting.

The College of Science and Mathematics has also begun several other initiatives. In January 2001, a Vision Committee developed a long range plan for the UMass Boston Nantucket Field Station so that it will continue to advance the faculty research agenda on the environment and offer opportunities in research for both graduate and undergraduate students. This committee has met regularly during 2002-2004 to advise the Dean of CSM and the Director of the Field Station, as well as to plan improvements to the station and to seek funding for those improvements. The merger of the Earth and Geographic Sciences faculty with ECOS and ESP faculty is also expected to strengthen research capacity.

The College of Management has set a goal of increasing grant-funded research, supporting additional graduate assistants, stimulating collaborative research between undergraduate students and faculty, and reestablishing a working paper series. The CM dean expects to increase research support packages for prospective faculty in order to continue to recruit productive scholars.

The University is seeking to improve research opportunities by strengthening the collaboration between centers and institutes and across academic departments. The International Relations Track in the MSPA program was designed as a collaboration between the Political Science Department and the former McCormack Institute. Although three faculty retirements in AY03 decimated this program, it is being revitalized within the new McCormack Graduate School. Earth and Geographic Sciences has been a separate undergraduate department, but is now being integrated with the ECOS faculty in the Earth, Environment and Ocean Studies (EEOS) department. Faculty in the undergraduate Environmental Studies Program are also included in this expanded department. This integration will increase the breadth of substantive expertise available to graduate students in environmental studies, particularly beyond the ocean and marine sciences, as recommended in the department's AQUAD review. It will also allow undergraduate students to derive more benefit from the PhD program faculty. Future hiring is also to be targeted to increase the multidisciplinary character of the ECOS graduate programs.

Among the centers and institutes, the Trotter Institute is expecting to increase its scholarship and research with its new permanent director. The Gerontology Institute seeks to involve more faculty in additional units in its innovative funded projects. The Institute for Asian American Studies will continue involving scholars from in and outside of the University in its Research Fellows Program and Asian Americans in New England Research Initiative. The Institute for Community Inclusion, which recently moved onto the campus, is expected to make a substantial contribution to research activity in the next decade.

Graduate assistantships provide essential support for faculty researchers, but the number of FTE assistants has declined since the graduate student contract was implemented. Prior to the contract, UMass Boston supported 203 FTE (20 hours/week) graduate assistantships; after the contract was implemented, 163 FTE assistantships were supported. The Office of Graduate Studies now funds 6.5% of all graduate students on campus. A total of 16.4% of all graduate

students receive an assistantship from some source, while nationally the comparable figure at all graduate institutions in 1999 was 20%. Increasing funds to attract more graduate students is an important goal of Graduate Studies. In addition, there are no fellowships on campus. The University hopes to raise endowment funds to support graduate fellowships through Institutional Development. Additional funds will also be sought through research grants.

New initiatives are planned to extend the new models of stimulating faculty research and graduate student training that have been developed with the research centers and institutes. Further joint appointments of faculty to centers and institutes and academic departments will be attempted, following the model developed by the Gaston Institute.

Instruction

Description:

The first point in the campus vision statement states "The University of Massachusetts Boston will sustain a superior faculty dedicated to excellence in undergraduate and graduate teaching" so instruction can literally be said to be the first priority at UMass Boston

Teaching performance of faculty is assessed regularly and thoroughly within the academic units, and these assessments are used in personnel reviews. Use of end-of-semester, in-class teaching evaluations is virtually universal in UMass Boston classes, including specialized course evaluations in all online CCDE courses. Teaching activity is assessed at the departmental and collegiate level as part of the Annual Faculty Review process. The trustee document on Academic Personnel Policy, commonly known as the Red Book, requires that the tenure and promotion process include consideration of "qualifications and contributions in the area of teaching." The Periodic Multi-Year Review also calls for the assessment of teaching and the review of "all evaluations of the faculty member's teaching performance carried out during the previous six years." Outstanding teaching is recognized by collegiate awards and by an annual Chancellor's Distinguished Teaching Award presented each year at commencement.

The University also supports instructional development and excellence through two centers: the Center for the Improvement of Teaching (CIT) and the Instructional Technology Center (ITC). CIT is a faculty-governed organization that provides semester-long faculty development seminars and other shorter workshops involving faculty, staff, and students to promote high quality, inclusive education for our diverse student body. Between 1983 and 2002, over 230 faculty from every college in the University participated in the semester-long faculty development seminars, usually helped by courseload releases. ITC is a center with the mission to increase and enhance the use of instructional technology at UMass Boston. ITC provides a central clearinghouse for instructional technology-related professional development activities, distance learning support, media services, and faculty help and resources.

The learning experiences at UMass Boston are extensive and varied. In-class activities certainly rely on the traditional experiences of lectures and class discussions, but a review of course descriptions shows considerable use of other methods including group exercises, experiential exercises, case discussions, computer-based simulations, guest lecturers, multi-media presentations, as well as students research, presentations, and performances. In addition to traditional in-class coursework, the catalog also shows other credit-bearing experiences including internships, practica, honors work, independent studies, field work, and service learning.

Assessment of student learning, of course, happens in every classroom and results in student feedback, grades, and the award of credit and competencies. However, the national movement to focus educational assessment efforts more on output measures of quality (student learning outcomes) as opposed to input measures (faculty qualifications and number of books in the library) has captured the attention of UMass faculty and administrators. The revision of General Education was strongly influenced by this movement; the plan calls for a strong continuous process of assessment of the outcomes and effectiveness of the General Education efforts. The March 2004 Faculty Council General Education Steering Committee report includes a through reporting of a number of assessment efforts which have been performed by the colleges under the General Education umbrella. The AQUAD process and the accreditation processes of programs pursuing professional accreditation have also led to a number of formal assessment activities of student learning. Student learning assessment activities, and the program changes resulting from these activities, will be more fully discussed in the appraisal section.

Appraisal:

Interestingly, given the emphasis on instructional quality at UMass Boston, the results of the in-class course evaluations are not widely shared. In some colleges those results are kept only at the departmental level, whereas others have college-wide analyses. There is no place where course evaluations from all colleges are gathered or assessed. However, there is evidence from the Graduating Senior Survey about student opinions of instructional quality. In the 2004 study, covering 1408 graduates from December 2003 through August 2004, student satisfaction on items relating to instruction was high. In fact the items with the highest average satisfaction rating regarding satisfaction with the major were "quality of teaching," "availability of faculty to discuss course work," and "overall satisfaction with the major," all with a 5.6 mean response (ranked on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 is least satisfied and 7 is most satisfied). Also high were "frequent and prompt feedback," "student faculty interaction," and "faculty concern for academic progress" at 5.3, 5.2, and 5.0 respectively. Satisfaction was not as high for "course availability in the major" at 4.5. (See Standard Six for information on academic advising.)

Since the last NEASC report, there have been several developments of note regarding instruction. Probably the biggest new area is the efforts of the Instructional Technology Center (ITC) that have gone into supporting instructors as they move into using the on-line delivery mode for courses and programs. The ITC also helps meet the complimentary need for support for new instructional technologies in the traditional classroom. The centralization of these efforts in the ITC and the broad range of formal programs and informal activities it offers have created a significant new resource for faculty.

Another interesting development is the inclusion of part-time CCDE faculty in the Faculty Staff Union. The Dean of CCDE reports that part of the rationale behind this inclusion was a desire to provide faculty development opportunities and a better sense of integration for the part-time CCDE faculty. The professional colleges (CNHS and CM) report similar increases in attention being paid to clinical and professionally qualified faculty. Given the increase in the University's reliance on non-tenure track faculty due to budget constraints and early retirements, efforts to improve the quality of instruction provided by part-time faculty seem particularly appropriate.

Another important development in instruction is the wide attention paid to assessment of student learning beyond the classroom. At the undergraduate level, General Education was a

strong driver of these efforts. From the March 2004 General Education Faculty Steering Committee report:

> From the inception of the new GenEd program, college-based faculty groups have held fundamental responsibilities for curricular design, review of GenEd course proposals, and assessment of student learning outcomes and program quality. Some colleges came to this program with stronger institutional structures for many of these tasks than others. CPCS, with its competency-based pedagogy, always focused on individual learning outcomes. Professional schools like CM and CNHS, with their own professional accreditation processes and/or licensure examinations, had external assessment instruments driving program review. It is in the traditional liberal arts and sciences curriculum of the former CAS (now CLA and CSM), where existing structures for assessment were weakest, that the GenEd plan has had its most innovative developments.

As reported in this review, formal assessment activities are in place for first-year and intermediate seminars, quantitative reasoning and writing requirements, and for distribution courses. Many, if not all, individual colleges and departments have initiated assessment procedures for their capstone requirements as well. At the graduate level, the program review requirements of the AQUAD process, as well as the often more direct links to professional spheres, have also sparked formal assessment efforts.

Projection:

Efforts to improve classroom instruction, already a part of the fabric of UMass Boston, will continue. The University strategic plan specifically includes initiatives to "provide non-classroom learning experiences" and to "improve assessment of student learning."

Unfortunately, the goal of ensuring instructional quality will continue to be affected by the ongoing resource constraints facing the University. The fear of overuse of part-time faculty to provide General Education courses was specifically mentioned as a concern in the March 2004 Faculty Council General Education report, and the use of part-time faculty was mentioned as a concern in several of the Deans' interviews conducted for this self-study. Increased hiring of full-time faculty will help address these concerns. In addition, faculty development efforts for part-time faculty and integration of both full- and part-time faculty into University structures will need to continue. Both the regular academic units and CCDE need to be involved in these efforts.

Another area that will need attention is how to develop, deliver, assess, and improve instructional quality through on-line and other distance learning delivery modes. Overlapping with this goal are efforts to "embrace technology and its role in instruction," as stated in the strategic plan. CCDE, in conjunction with the Instructional Technology Center, has provided resources to develop and support the use of instructional technology for both face-to-face and distance learning. Efforts to provide faculty with both training and technology will continue.

Admissions and Retention

Description:

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions reports to the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management and the Office of Graduate Admissions reports to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Enrollment Management division has the primary responsibility for marketing and recruiting efforts in undergraduate enrollment. Enrollment staff works in conjunction with University Communications to develop and manage promotional strategies that encourage prospective students to apply to UMass Boston. Promotion of UMass Boston includes print, radio, and television advertising, as well as mailings to targeted groups. The staff develops and updates recruitment publications that provide information on UMass Boston programs and services and that help students apply.

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions manages the recruitment program of regularly scheduled visits to high schools and community colleges and attendance at local and regional college fairs. The focus is primarily on eastern Massachusetts with added attention to the Boston public schools, the metropolitan area around the city, and the five major community college feeder institutions. The admissions office also works closely with the University's pre-collegiate programs of Upward Bound, Urban Scholars, and Admission Guarantee. Inquiries both for freshmen and transfer students have increased by 29% over the last five years.

The expanded pool of prospective students has enabled the campus to enroll students with higher levels of academic preparation, as indicated by their high school grades and SAT scores. By implementing the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education (BHE) admission standards and establishing additional internal standards, UMass Boston has increased the freshman average high school GPA from 2.82 in 2001 to 3.03 in 2004 and the transfer GPA from 2.86 to 3.05. The increase in average GPA has been accompanied by an increase in average SAT for freshmen as well, from 1019 in 1998 to 1039 in 2004.

Even as the University has sought to enroll more academically-prepared students, the campus has maintained its commitment to less-traditional students, including those with GEDs, older students with work or extensive community and volunteer experience, and first-generation and immigrant students who require additional academic support. The campus continues to offer a summer pre-enrollment program, Directions for Student Potential (DSP), which helps promising students prepare for admission in September. Almost one-third of new freshmen enroll through this program, which was founded in 1978 and continues to provide access to students from a variety of backgrounds.

In addition, UMass Boston offers many applicants the opportunity to demonstrate their potential by enrolling as non-matriculated students in state-supported courses or in the Division of Corporate, Distance and Continuing Education. The University also works closely with its community college partners, referring students who need additional coursework to enroll there and complete the necessary courses to be eligible to reapply. When non-matriculated or community college students complete twelve or more transferable credits with a 2.5 or better GPA, they are offered admission to the University.

Two-thirds of UMass Boston's new undergraduate students are transfer students. The University has a standard and well-publicized set of transfer credit practices. The Office of Undergraduate Admissions manages the evaluation process with significant involvement from the academic departments.

At the graduate level as well, UMass Boston has been concentrating on recruiting and admitting more highly-prepared students. Although most of the recruiting is managed by

graduate program directors, Enrollment Management has expanded general marketing to include graduate education.

The campus is proud to claim increased academic qualifications along with increased diversity in its undergraduate population. In 2004 students of color represented 44% of freshmen, 34.5% of transfers, and 39% of new undergraduate students overall. The total undergraduate population is 39% students of color and the graduate population is 16% students of color.

The campus struggles with retention, however, particularly of undergraduates. The freshman first-year retention rate has been hovering around 70% and the six-year first-time, full-time freshman graduation rate is at 34%. Transfer retention rates are in the range of 61-65%, corresponding somewhat to how many credits students have when entering the University. (See One Year Retention Rates for Fall Entrants, 1997-2002 Cohorts, OIRP, 2004)

In 1997, the Chancellor appointed a new Retention Committee of faculty and staff and launched an undergraduate retention effort with a day-long conference. Following that event, the Retention Committee met on a regular basis through academic year 2002-03. The committee was instrumental in introducing and expanding a number of retention initiatives, including an early intervention program, outreach to stop-outs, and outreach to non-registered continuing students. The committee also supported the adoption of first year seminars and linked courses for new freshmen and intermediate seminars for new transfers, all of which are designed to encourage the kind of community at a commuter campus which improves retention.

Appraisal:

The plan at UMass Boston to recruit and enroll more academically prepared undergraduate students is defined primarily by the new higher minimum GPA for a student to qualify for undergraduate admission. Until fall 2001 applicants with a minimum 2.0 from high school or another college were considered for admission. The new minimum of 2.5 has resulted in stronger yet smaller entering classes over the last few semesters. These stronger students have more choices for higher education and UMass Boston is now competing with a different set of institutions for these talented students.

The change in admission standards was decided in a context of planned improvements to undergraduate education, expanded honors programming, improvements to the physical plant, enhancements to student life, and the future introduction of on and off-campus housing. The academic improvements are well underway and the University is making arrangements for off-campus housing. Work is in progress to improve the infrastructure and facilities and the new Campus Center is open and fully functioning. These and other amenities will help UMass Boston compete for higher caliber students. However, the most significant improvement that will enable the campus to compete, on-campus housing, is yet to be realized.

In addition to the increased standards for admission, implementation of the new PeopleSoft student database in recruiting and admissions and significant fee increases have had a negative impact on student enrollment at UMass Boston. Through AY 2002-2003, the PeopleSoft implementation affected application processing and delayed communication with prospective students. The decrease in state funding of over 30% required an increase in student fees that has doubled the total student cost over the last three years.

In 2003-04, the third year of applying the higher standards to undergraduate applicants, UMass Boston is seeing early evidence of a recovery in a level and better prepared applicant

pool. PeopleSoft transition problems have also been reduced so that admission processing rates are significantly higher than in the previous two years. With the opening of the Campus Center and expansion of off-campus housing opportunities, UMass Boston is also attracting and competing for better prepared students who seek a more traditional educational experience. In addition, as the fee increases have taken effect, the campus has increased financial aid to assist the students with the highest need. New graduate student enrollment continues to grow incrementally with the enhanced reputation of the University.

Retention remains a major concern. Institutional Research has conducted two retention studies during the last five years**,** *Retention and Persistence of the Entering Cohorts, 1984 to 1996* and An Analysis of One-Year Retention of the University of Massachusetts Boston Fall 2000 First Time Full Time Freshman Cohort both of which identified the challenge of finding and building community for students on campus. At the undergraduate level, in addition to introducing the First Year Seminar courses for freshmen, the campus has taken the step of linking seminar courses with Freshman English or Critical Reading and Writing courses. This move has groups of students scheduled together for at least six to seven hours per week. Faculty members are also encouraged to share assignments, readings, and out-of-class activities in the linked courses. (See A Strategic Approach to Freshmen Retention at UMass Boston.)

The Seminars Assessment Committee evaluated the linked course model in spring 2004. The majority of students appreciated the pairings and found both social and academic benefits ranging from working on group projects, studying together, eating and meeting together, and going to off-campus events together. The committee has recommended continued use of pairings and further collaboration between the faculty teaching the sets of linked courses. (See Experiences in Fall 2003 Paired Courses: Responses from Students and Faculty.)

Two Faculty Council committees have taken on some of the responsibility of ongoing retention programming, the General Education Committee and the Financial Aid, Admissions and Retention Committee (FAARC). These standing committees will be evaluating and recommending strategies for admission policies and General Education seminars as well as other retention initiatives.

Projection:

UMass Boston plans higher admission standards for undergraduates, continued growth in quality at the graduate level, and a focus on retention of all students. The higher standards at the undergraduate level will continue to bring to the University better-prepared students. The addition of amenities such as the new Campus Center and expanded student life programming, as well as the future development of on-campus housing opportunities, will make the University more competitive among the four-year institutions in greater Boston. The expanded services will complement the already strong academic experience, making a UMass Boston education more attractive to a broader range of students.

The strategic plan establishes goals for restoring enrollment to 13,500. In addition, the campus would like to shift the freshman/transfer mix from its current proportion of 30% freshmen to 50% freshmen. Recent high school graduates, particularly from the Boston area, are a population that is underserved by the University but an enhanced student life experience will enable UMass Boston to attract a larger portion of these students. Increasing enrollment overall and the freshman population in particular are realistic goals given the additional resources the University is committing to student life.

Enrollment Management will continue to expand our marketing efforts at the graduate level to support recruitment of the best and most qualified students. The campus also plans to bring the proportion of graduate students in the total enrollment to 25%. It is currently at 22%.

Maintaining a richly diverse student population will remain a top priority of UMass Boston. The multicultural experience is part of the fabric of UMass Boston and an important focus of the campus' mission. The University will continue to provide opportunities through sponsorship of K-12 programs in the public schools, pre-enrollment preparatory programs, and community college partnerships to students who might not otherwise have access to higher education.

The cost of a UMass Boston education will demand the attention of the University as tuition and fees continue to rise in response to the reduction of state funding. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors will pay heed to this issue, evaluating annually the increased burden on students and allocating funds for financial aid and scholarship programs as abundantly as possible.

Improved retention is one of the three major goals of the University's strategic plan and thus will be a major focus of the University in the next five years. The strategic plan has many retention initiatives based in improving student quality, expanding co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities, and improving student support services. Increased retention will provide enrollment stability and improve the financial outlook of the campus, both of which advance the reputation of UMass Boston. (See Retention at UMass Boston, August 2003.)

Standard Five: Faculty

Task Force Members: Winston Langley (Chair), Jane Adams, James Bennett, Kenneth L. Campbell, David Hunt, Emily McDermott, Linda Eisenmann, Arthur Goldsmith, Margaret Hart, Robert Nappier, R. Timothy Sieber, Greg Sun

Description:

UMass Boston takes pride in its highly qualified faculty of dedicated teachers and scholars. In fall 2003, the University employed 433 full-time faculty. Of these, 273 were tenured, 98 were on the tenure track, and 62 occupied non-tenure track positions. It also employed 398 part-time faculty, accounting for 132 full-time equivalents (FTE). The number of full-time faculty has decreased by 8.5% since 1993, while the part-time faculty headcount has increased by 8.7%. The reduction in full-time faculty members is a result of state budget cuts and early retirement incentive programs. In spite of financial constraints, however, the faculty continues to work at a high level in the classroom; in curricular development; in scholarly, research, and creative productivity; and in service to departments, colleges, the University, and the community at large.

The qualifications of the faculty are fully consonant with UMass Boston's mission as a doctoral-granting institution. Ninety-two percent of full-time faculty hold PhDs or the equivalent degree, granted by top-level universities. The most frequently cited doctoral institutions are Harvard University (60), Boston University (26), Columbia University (20), Brandeis University (15), University of California-Berkeley (14), University of Michigan (14), Brown University (13), Northeastern University (12), University of Chicago (12), Cornell University (11), University of Pennsylvania (11), Boston College (10), MIT (10), Princeton University (10), and Yale University (10). With rare exceptions, these professors hold appointments and teach in the fields where they received their graduate training.

The regular teaching load of full-time faculty is 9 credits (three sections) per semester. This load, as will be seen later in the narrative, is a heavy one, given the expected research and other responsibilities faculty members are expected to meet. External grants and contracts have grown from $15,692,488 in FY1996 to $34,408,890 in FY2004 – an overall increase of 119%. Faculty members have actively contributed their knowledge and applied their research in serving the university, the profession, and the community, especially concerning education, science and technology advancement, environmental studies, economic development, and public policy. UMass Boston's sponsored activity in Instruction and Public Service continues to grow rapidly, and has increased by 84% between FY1998 and FY2002, reflecting our commitment to training, education, and public service.

Categories of faculty are established and defined in the "Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Boston and Worcester," informally known on campus as the Red Book. This booklet was approved by the Board of Trustees as document T76-081. It spells out criteria for regular, full-time academic appointments at the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Special full-time academic appointments may also be made with the titles of lecturer and visiting professor; further rubrics are adjunct professor (non-salaried) and clinical professor. All are subject to a specified set of University-wide guidelines as put forth in 4.11 of the Red Book.

As noted above, UMass Boston employs 433 full-time and 398 part-time faculty (=132 FTE). A handful of part-time faculty are "regulars" who hold appointments of half-time or more, receive an appropriate fraction of a full-time salary, have responsibilities in the areas of scholarship and service as well as teaching, and normally hold one of the academic ranks. But the great majority of part-time faculty are hired on a per-course basis. Part-time faculty who teach five courses in three consecutive semesters (excluding summer school) are admitted to the faculty bargaining unit, thereby qualifying for contractual protection and higher levels of compensation. Part-time lines offer the University flexibility and cost-effectiveness. They also enable students to take specialized courses that otherwise might not be available.

Due to two consecutive early retirement incentive programs (ERIP), the University lost more than the usual number of experienced faculty to retirement. In addition to 20 anticipated faculty retirements in AY2001, 12 in AY2002, and 11 in AY2003, 75 faculty took advantage of the June 2002 ERIP and 21 faculty retired under the December 2003 ERIP. In addition, five librarians and more than 100 classified and professional staff also took advantage of the two ERIP options, further depleting the number of experienced academic and administrative support staff.

The chart below indicates the percentage of sections taught by part-time faculty, by college:

College	**Fall 02**	**Fall 03**
CLA	44%	38%
CSM	33%	30%
CM	15%	21%
CNHS	41%	50%
CPCS	34%	20%
GCE	33%	39%
MGSPS	N/A	28%
TOTAL	35%	35%

These figures compare to 25% of overall instruction done by part-time faculty in 1993.

Figures for Fall 2003 indicate that 14.3% of the full-time faculty (62 of the 433) are in non-tenure-track positions; the parallel figure for Fall 1993 was 8.5%. This increase, like the increase in part-time instruction, has been a result of pinched resources.

In accordance with the Graduate Employees Organization bargaining agreement, UMass Boston hires two types of graduate teaching assistants: TA I's, who provide instructional support of various types (including leading lab or discussion sections); and TA II's, who have independent responsibility for the teaching and grading of a lecture section of a course. On an FTE basis, the number of TA II's employed in AY 03-04 was 14, covering 28 sections. Over the next few years, the University plans to increase that number to between 25 and 30 FTE, covering 50-60 sections.

Departments are responsible for the selection, training, supervision and evaluation of teaching assistants. While methods for training TA II's vary from department to department, a common pattern on campus is to hire students as TA I's during their first year of study and ask them to participate in a seminar or other classes relevant to pedagogy. Successful participants in the first-year training program are then eligible to be hired as TA II's in the second year. While

serving as TA II's, students normally continue to meet with a supervisor and in support groups with their peers. In all cases, the performance of assistants with independent instructional responsibility is assessed through regular student course evaluations and is reviewed by a faculty advisor or a department member responsible for overseeing departmental teaching assistants.

Responsibility for out-of-classroom activities such as advising, academic planning and policy-making, course and curricular development, and institutional governance has historically rested on the full-time faculty. Currently, part-time faculty with bargaining unit status may be asked to participate in some of these functions.

Primary responsibility for recruitment and appointment of new faculty rests with the faculty, in accordance with guidelines in the Red Book. Every effort is made to attract top faculty in the field and affirmative action applicants are aggressively sought. A strong affirmative action profile and the high qualifications of the UMass Boston faculty attest to the continuing effectiveness of this process. Despite attrition and limited hiring, the percentage of minority full-time faculty was 22% in the fall of 2003. In 1993, the percentage of minority full-time faculty at UMass Boston was 15.8%, and it was 6.5% in 1985. Thus, our percentage of minority full-time faculty has continued to grow in the past two decades. There is a high degree of commitment among the faculty to affirmative action goals, but departments undertaking searches need help in identifying qualified minority candidates and guidance in meeting the requirements of the law. It is important that the affirmative action office aid in facilitating, informing, and collaborating searches from the outset.

The overall percentage of women on the full-time faculty is 43.8%. Among tenured faculty, 39.6% are women. The attached tables show a more specific breakdown of UMass Boston faculty with respect to ethnicity and gender.

Table 1. UMass Boston Full-Time Faculty

Full-time Teaching Faculty			New Hires Compared to Doctorates Awarded		
	UMass Boston Workforce 2003	USA Workforce Fall 1999	UMass Boston New Tenure/Tenure Track Hires		Doctorates Awarded All US 2000-01
			AY 01-02	AY 04-05	
African American	6.3%	4.9%	12.9%	16.7%	4.9%
Asian	9%	5.8%	16.1%	23.3%	5.8%
Latino	5%	2.8%	9.6%	10%	3.4%
Native American	0%	.4%	0	0	.3%
Total Minority	20%	13.9%	38.6%	50%	14.4%

(Source: Statistical Portrait, Table 38: Fall 2003, excluding CCDE and 2003-4 Almanac of Higher Education)

Table 2. Campus Faculty by Sex and Status of Appointment

	Female	Male	All	% Female
Part-time	214	176	390	55%
Full-time				
Non-tenure track	30	31	61	49%
Tenure-track, Non-tenure	51	47	98	52%
Total tenure	107	163	270	40%
Assistant	4	4	8	50%
Associate	65	73	138	47%
Full	38	86	124	31%

(Source: Statistical Portrait, Table 38: Fall 2003, excluding CCDE)

The Red Book commits the University to the preservation of academic freedom for all members of its professional staff "who perform teaching or research functions whether or not such persons occupy 'academic positions.'" It further establishes the standards and interpretations set forth in the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Academic personnel policies and procedural standards are fully and clearly set out in the Red Book. This document distinguishes the roles and responsibilities of faculty and each level of University administration in personnel matters; provides detailed procedures and criteria for personnel reviews, recommendations, and decisions; and defines both the rights of faculty members and their conditions of employment. Department heads/program directors, deans, and the provost are charged with ensuring that faculty members observe their obligations, as set out in §5.2. A policy on sexual harassment (Trustee document T82-037) and a set of sexual harassment procedures (Faculty Council document 019-85 as amended) apply to all constituencies at the University, including faculty, and help to ensure ethical behavior and the full discharge of responsibilities. (See Standard 11 for additional information on ethical standards.)

The principle of academic freedom continues to be central in policies regarding faculty review and accountability, for example, in the labor agreements with the Faculty Staff Union and also in the definition of protections for those senior faculty undergoing the Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR). Growing challenges to academic freedom are posed by the changing nature of the academic workforce. As more and more of those performing the University's research and teaching functions work on temporary or part-time contracts, more researchers and teachers do not have the protection of the tenure system to support their rights. All sectors of the University will be required to rethink what is required for the protection of academic freedom under these new conditions.

Faculty are accorded contractual security through the collective bargaining agreement signed between the Board of Trustees of the University of Massachusetts and the Faculty Staff Union, representing the faculty-librarian bargaining unit. These agreements cover salaries, standards of productivity, and performance. University bylaws permit faculty members to perform off-campus professional services, with or without compensation, upon securing permission from the department chair and dean. Faculty members are enjoined from accepting any employment that would conflict with the interests of the University. Part-time and continuing education faculty can qualify as bargaining unit members under terms outlined above. All matters pertaining to wages, hours, standards of productivity and performance, and other

terms and conditions of employment are collectively bargained between the union and the Board of Trustees and are secured by contract. The contract contains articles protecting affirmative action, academic freedom, and the primary responsibility of faculty in personnel and academic matters.

Included in the bargained faculty compensation packages are cost-of-living increases and a merit pay system wherein faculty members are rated by their departments for productivity reported each year in annual faculty reports. Merit decisions are based on productivity in the areas of scholarship, service, and teaching. Deans, as well as Provost and Chancellor, may also reward faculty through additional increments based on college or University-level service.

The average faculty salary at UMass Boston in 2003 was $86,200 for full professors, $69,700 for associate professors, and $56,800 for assistant professors, exceeding the median of a group of nine peer institutions across the country. This exceeding of the median of peer institutions should, however, be seen in the light of the cost of living in the Boston area – one of the highest in the country.

A faculty salary increase of 15% (cost-of-living plus merit) was negotiated to cover academic years 00-01, 01-02 and 02-03. It remained unfunded throughout the life of the contract, but the cumulative increases in base salary as of January 1, 2004, were funded by the Legislature in Spring 2004, except for retirees. Moreover, funds have not yet been allocated to cover the retroactive portions of the negotiated increase. During the contract period, fixed faculty costs associated with employment at the University also rose significantly. For example, faculty health insurance contributions rose 50% in summer 2003, from a 10% contribution of premiums to a 15% contribution. On-campus parking, which is essential for many faculty, rose 100%, from $3/day to $6/day in January 2004, with additional increases planned.

Current faculty benefit packages include: 85% coverage of health insurance, a dental plan, funding of a Commonwealth retirement program outside of the Social Security System which becomes vested at 10 years of employment (usually 90.2% state-funded, 9.8% faculty funded), and access to voluntary pre-tax programs such as 403b and 457 retirement plans, child/elderly care plans, and post-tax life/car/home and disability income insurance. Routine optical care is also available through two of the regular health plans.

The workload of faculty at UMass Boston consists of basic instructional duties; responsibilities in the area of scholarly, creative, and professional activity; and service both on and off campus. The pertinent document on faculty workload is the trustee document "University Guidelines on Faculty Workload" (T74-111), which establishes nine hours a week as an "average" instructional workload. While this document allows for aggregation of averages by department or other instructional units, it has generally been assumed on campus that the required faculty workload, barring course load reductions for specified purposes, is 3:3, that is, three 3-credit courses in each semester. The guidelines for instructional workload were established at a time when the University defined itself as an exclusively undergraduate institution. Over the years, its mission has expanded into doctoral development, moving the campus to the Carnegie classification of Doctoral/Research Universities - Intensive level. The change matches the institutional and Commonwealth objective for the campus, which is to become more self-sustaining and to provide training opportunities designed to educate a more highly skilled workforce within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As a result of these changes, questions have arisen about the proportional relation among the three areas of faculty responsibility, especially between instructional workload and scholarly activity.

In January 1992, a College of Arts and Sciences faculty workload committee issued a report (known as the "Liem report," after its chair) that recommended a gradual shift from a 3:3 to a 2:2 workload for the college's more productive scholars. To facilitate this shift, it recommended greater department autonomy in setting workloads, through agreements on aggregate instructional workloads negotiated between departments and the dean. Some progress was made toward this goal, with the psychology and economics departments serving as examples. In psychology, a number of faculty who have been actively involved in research and in directing dissertations and masters thesis have a 2:2 workload.

The Red Book spells out the procedures and criteria for appointing, re-appointing, promoting, and tenuring faculty members. The Collective Bargaining Agreement with the Faculty Staff Union supplements these documents. All personnel actions at the University entail careful peer evaluation, confidentiality, impartiality, due process, and the right of appeal. Special efforts are made by the colleges and by the central administration to familiarize newly hired faculty members with the schedule of review and to inform them about performance expectations.

University policy mandates that each faculty member be evaluated every year regarding his or her performance in the areas of teaching; research, creative, or professional activity; and service. The Provost's Office provides the Annual Faculty Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities form. These reports include sections on (1) research, scholarship, and creative activity; (2) teaching; and (3) service, both intramural and extramural. Student evaluations are also an important part of the process. To evaluate the annual reports and handle other personnel matters, each department establishes a personnel committee.

Major personnel reviews take place according to a multi-year timetable. In the tenure decision year, there is a rigorous examination of the faculty member's full dossier, including evaluation of the candidate's scholarship by a panel of external referees. Faculty members who receive tenure are re-evaluated every six years under the PMYR process. All major personnel actions involve multiple, substantive, and independent levels of review. The Red Book, supported by the collective bargaining agreement, provides detailed and clear procedures for evaluation of full-time faculty both as they proceed along the tenure track and after tenure. Criteria for initial appointment and all levels of reappointment are also well defined. The guidelines ensure judicious peer evaluation (normally both department and college-wide), confidentiality, non-discrimination, due process, and the right of appeal.

Professional development is a critical investment of the University to promote the development of junior faculty working toward entry into the senior ranks, and to promote renewal and continuing professional growth of senior faculty. UMass Boston continues with its long-standing policy of investing a percentage of its interest income, annual fund, and research trust fund in faculty and staff development and research. Start-up support for new faculty members, for example, has averaged more than $514,000 over the past five years. There are also long-standing faculty development award and travel grant programs administered by the colleges, using Research Trust Funds (RTF) to support travel to scholarly and professional meetings and to provide small grants as seed or supplementary funding for longer-term projects. Four additional internal grant competitions are administered by the Vice Provost for Research. Among these are the Healey Endowment Grants and the Public Service Grants, funded by the President's Office and open to faculty and professional staff. Healey Endowment Grants support research and scholarly work that enhance the quality of academic and intellectual life at the University. The Public Service Endowment Grant Program is intended to enhance the public service mission of the University by funding outreach and service projects that make the specialized knowledge and expertise of faculty and staff available to the community at large The Graduate Research

Assistance Program and the Faculty Proposal Development Support Program, funded from campus RTF, provide graduate assistantships in support of faculty scholarship and funds to support the development of high-quality research proposals to external funding agencies. Monies available to support these four grant programs in AY 04-05 include $36,000 from the President's Office and $52,000 of campus funds. But these funds can meet only a fraction of the need on campus.

As part of the merit awards, distributed in line with procedures outlined above, outstanding faculty efforts are also rewarded with special merit designations made at the college level. Merit is also recognized in the form of the Chancellor's annual Awards for Distinguished Scholarship, Teaching, and Service.

Another form of faculty development is the University's PMYR process. This specifies that once every seven years the work of each senior faculty member must be reviewed to assess work in progress and define goals for future improvement. Individual faculty are invited to submit a self-assessment, and departments and administrative levels also review and comment on the files. The PMYR review results in an individualized Development Plan for each faculty member, defining goals for continuing professional progress and contributions to the University. Senior faculty members are allocated modest financial resources to implement their development plan, whether it be a release from teaching in order to join a teaching improvement seminar or for coverage of research or training expenses.

The Center for the Improvement of Teaching (CIT) serves as a vehicle for faculty development work in the area of teaching. The Center has a small part-time staff funded through the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and runs teaching improvement seminars funded through the Provost and the college Deans. More than 230 faculty have participated in its semester-length seminars, where they are given an opportunity to reflect on teaching issues. These sessions are coordinated by a senior faculty mentor. CIT seminars are divided between those for junior and newly tenured faculty, on the one hand, and for senior faculty on the other. CIT also organizes teaching seminars as part of the University's PMYR process, for faculty who identify teaching as an area requiring a particular personal focus. Finally, CIT organizes an annual conference on teaching improvement, usually involving a well-attended series of 10-15 panels.

The University's Instructional Technology Center (ITC) also offers free to all faculty a wide variety of workshops and courses related to the use and application of information technology in teaching and research. (See Standard 4.)

The most important component of the University's efforts toward professional development is its sabbatical leave policy. The policy affords an opportunity for faculty with a "record of achievement, service, and contribution" to pursue projects in the areas of scholarship, teaching, or professional service.

Appraisal:

UMass Boston has been able to recruit and retain a talented and highly qualified faculty of committed teachers, productive scholars and researchers, and conscientious contributors to institutional and public service. Faculty members have received advanced training appropriate to the field of their teaching assignments from a variety of first-rate graduate institutions. They are

appropriately credentialed and sufficiently productive as teachers and scholars in their field to instruct and advise students at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

The UMass Boston faculty is in fact the University's number one point of pride. Surveys of current students and alumni consistently show excellence in teaching at the top of the list of students' evaluations of the University. In the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), UMass Boston first-year students rated their relationships with faculty significantly higher than did their counterparts at the other Doctoral Intensive Universities or at the schools comprising the Urban Consortium. On a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 = unavailable, unhelpful, and unsympathetic and 7 = available, helpful, and sympathetic, UMass Boston first-year students rated their relationships with faculty 5.65 compared to 5.32 for other Doctoral Intensives and 5.36 for the Urban Consortium. Seniors were also higher at 5.61 compared to 5.43 for the Doctoral Intensives and 5.48 for the Urban Consortium. In addition, in the 2004 Graduating Senior Satisfaction Survey (GSSS), the 'Quality of Teaching within the Major' question received the highest mean rating of any question in the survey, as it also did in the 2003 GSSS. This survey also used a scale of 1 to 7, and the graduation applicants rated the quality of teaching in the major as 5.6 in 2004 and 5.7 in 2003. The mean rating for all questions in the 2004 survey was 4.8.

The overall student-faculty ratio of 15 to 1 is laudable, but budget cuts and early retirements have resulted in a smaller faculty. While the Provost and Chancellor have worked hard to address this problem, we are still left with significant challenges. Chief among these are:

- An increase in the percentage of instruction by non-tenure-track faculty, with a accompanying increase in service responsibilities on tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- A decrease in support staff, with a resulting increase in the tasks faculty must assume.
- A degree of faculty anxiety, as increased pressures on workload have been accompanied by both delays in implementation of bargained salary increases and rising fixed faculty costs associated with employment at the University.

The use of part-time instruction provides the University with flexibility, curricular diversification, and cost-effectiveness. Nonetheless, a 10% increase in the campus's overall percentage of part-time instruction (from 25% in 1994 to 35% in 2004) – coupled with the fact that that figure rose to as high as 44% in CLA, its largest instructional unit, in Fall '02 – are causes for concern.

Payment of part of the negotiated salary increase has helped to ease the financial strain on faculty and to ameliorate morale problems aggravated by the unfunded contract. It has also improved faculty morale.

Despite budgetary difficulties, the quality of new faculty in the past few years has been outstanding. UMass Boston has won out over some major research universities, such as the University of North Carolina, University of Michigan, and the University of California Berkeley, in the recruiting of new faculty in some of our departments.

The campus affirmative action profile also provides grounds for satisfaction. The overall minority percentage of full-time faculty is 20% (2003), which compares very favorably both with the national norm (1999) of 13.9% and with UMass Boston's own percentage of 15.8% just preceding our last accreditation visit (1993). An effective commitment to affirmative action,

however, requires continual attention. We take it as a sign of our commitment that – despite this strong minority profile – we remain open to criticism about how to do a better job.

Faculty rights and responsibilities as delineated in a variety of documents and policies, most notably the Red Book, the faculty contract, and the policy and procedures on sexual harassment are generally sound. The tenure and promotion process on campus proceeds efficiently and fairly, along lines specified by the Red Book and in more informal sets of implementation guidelines circulated by deans.

The question of faculty workload is a important one on campuses across the country. Perceptions by the public that faculty are less than fully productive and the institution less than fully cost-effective clash with the faculty's own sense that a 3:3 teaching load detracts from their ability to reach full productivity in the scholarly and public service aspects of their work. This is a special problem when the University, as part of its strategic plan, is laying added stress on raising the institution's profile in scholarship and research. A degree of progress has been made in some colleges through implementation of the Liem report's recommendations for individual workloads set at departmental discretion, and for increased use of large classes, where pedagogically appropriate. However, the most central recommendation of the Liem report, that the University move gradually toward a 2:2 workload for its more productive faculty, cannot be implemented unless new resources are forthcoming.

The use of graduate students as instructors remains minimal on campus, with only 1.8% of instruction (as instructors in lecture sections of courses) allotted in AY 2003-04 to graduate teaching assistants (up from 1.0% in 1994). A modest increase in this percentage (to 3.6%) is planned for AY 04-05, in order both to provide graduate students with increased support through assistantships and to increase chairs' pools of qualified instructors. This is an especially appropriate direction for the campus to move in, as the Strategic Plan calls for an increase of 5% a year in the University's cadre of graduate students over the next five years. Planning for this increase has been accompanied by development of TA training programs (through cooperation of targeted graduate programs, collegiate deans and the Dean of Graduate Studies) that provide pedagogical instruction and mentoring for TAs.

Projection:

The University intends to continue its growth and development in all the areas previously discussed. With its outstanding faculty and an overall student-faculty ratio of 15:1—in spite of the already-mentioned budgetary and other challenges—it has fertile ground on which to pursue that development.

The Chancellor and Provost are aware of the impact of early retirement on the University and are fully committed to replacing full-time faculty over the next few years, as well as increasing academic support staff to prevent attrition, especially among junior faculty. Significant increases in external and internal grant funds will be pursued to help focus on the strongest possible professional development of the faculty.

As before indicated, UMass Boston has had an increase in its part-time faculty, and the administration is properly concerned about it. Over the next few years, a careful monitoring of the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty instruction will be a high priority of the Provost and Deans, in order to protect the integrity of academic programs and the capacity of the faculty to provide the non-instructional services needed to run the campus.

Payment of part of the negotiated salary increase has helped to ease the financial strain on the faculty and to moderate some of the morale issues that were caused by the unfunded contract. Full funding of the retroactive portion of the previous contract and the bargaining of a fair successor contract will be important steps for the University community. The University has begun the process of that bargaining and intends to work diligently to bring it to a successful conclusion.

In the area of Affirmative Action, the Provost is committed to continue to improve our commendable record. In the next decade, our goal is to have the percentage of minority faculty reflect that of our student body, with the attendant diversity of ideas, outlooks, cultural backgrounds, and intellectual experiences that such a reflection guarantees.

On the question of faculty workload, it will be important to pursue more vigorously the recommendations of the Liem Report, with an emphasis on making a distinction between highly selective Ph.D. programs, which might have a 2:2 or even 2:1 workload, and those programs which remain focused on undergraduate teaching. In the case of the latter programs, the workload of their faculty could, in some cases, remain 3:3.

Standard Six: Student Services

Task Force Members: J. Keith Motley (Chair), John Applebee, Milton L. Butts, Jr., Carol DeSouza, Christopher Hogan, Judy Keyes, Margaret McAllister, Michael M. Mahan, Marybeth Maneen, Maria Rocha-Tracy, Jillian Spooner, Raul Ybarra

Description

Student services at UMass Boston fall into three categories: 1. academic services which assist students in the classroom; 2. administrative services which assist students in enrollment and; 3. co-curricular services which provide learning opportunities outside the classroom.

Academic Services are offered through the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Support Services created in 1998 to consolidate and strengthen services to students.

The University Advising Center offers academic assessment, orientation, and advising services to undergraduate students in the Colleges of Liberal Arts, Mathematics and Science, and Management - over 90% of all undergraduate students. The Center advises approximately 2,100 undergraduates who have not declared majors or concentrations. Once students declare a major they receive advising through their academic departments. Undergraduate students must meet with their academic advisor in order to register for classes ensuring that they see an advisor at least twice a year. The Center averages over 30,000 advising contacts each year. Students accepted to the Colleges of Nursing and Health Sciences and Public and Community Service receive orientation and advising services directly from these units. Graduate students receive these services from the faculty in their programs.

The Advising Center also provides a number of specialized services. Through the Student Referral Program, faculty refer "at risk" students to staff in the Center. Each student receives counseling to determine needed support services. Each semester over 100 students are referred by faculty to this program; 232 were referred in 2003-04.

The Study Abroad Office assists students in finding study abroad opportunities and develops new programs through study abroad or student exchange. Currently UMass Boston offers its own study abroad/exchange programs and works with programs offered by other universities. Forty to 50 students study abroad each year. International Student Services advises over 800 international students on visa-related issues. The Office also ensures University and student compliance with Student and Exchange Visitor Information System requirements.

Students interested in going to medical school work closely with the pre-med advisor who advises students concerning medical school and assists with applications. This assistance has resulted in a good and improving acceptance rate for medical/dental/veterinary school for UMass Boston students – the acceptance rate has been above 40% since AY 2001 and was over 60% in AY 2003 as compared to the national acceptance rate for this period of 38%-50%.

The Office of Career Services is a full-service operation, providing services in five key areas: career counseling, career information, employment services, internships, and graduate school advising. Services are provided through individual appointments, workshops, career fairs, employer visits, use of the Career Resource Library and the career Web site. Resume assistance, interviewing support, and job search strategies are the focus of the counseling program. The Career Resource Library houses up-to-date information on careers and employment. Current students and alumni have access to web-based employment opportunities via MonsterTrak.

The on-campus interviewing program and career fairs are further avenues for student-employer interaction. Internships are a growing area of emphasis, both the quantity and quality of the offerings to students have increased as evidenced by a 67% increase in the number of students placed in credit and non-credit internships for AY 2004 over AY 2003 from 969 to 1,606 placements. Additionally Career Services is responsible for two programs which contribute to the academic and cultural life of students: the National Student Exchange Program and the University of Massachusetts Exchange Program. Over the last two years, Career Services has averaged over 14,000 contacts with students and over 700 with employers.

The Office of Academic Support Programs offers a comprehensive range of services designed to enable students to succeed in their studies, beginning with the pre-matriculation students through the Directions for Student Potential Program. Directions for Student Potential provides students who do not meet the admissions criteria but show the potential to succeed in university-level work with six weeks of intensive skill development and academic support to prepare them for matriculation.

Academic Support Programs assesses the writing of all entering ESL students and the critical analytic capabilities of all entering native English speakers. In addition, Academic Support Programs provides courses including Critical Reading and Writing, English as a Second Language, and Mathematics. These courses are carefully integrated into the General Education program to ensure that new students will attain the capabilities needed for success. Over 1,000 students enroll each year.

Academic Support Programs also offers tutorials for both new and continuing students in most areas of the undergraduate curriculum. Over 2,200 students take advantage of tutorial services each year. The recent creation of the Graduate Writing Center has begun to help graduate students through individual consultations and group workshops in scholarly writing and research skills.

Three programs housed in the department of Pre-Collegiate and Educational Support Programs provide academic services to specific populations of UMass Boston undergraduates. Student Support Services, a federally-funded program, provides advising, counseling, and educational support to 500 undergraduates with academic need who are first-generation college students, economically disadvantaged, and/or have disabilities. First year students participate in an eight-week program during their first semester to improve academic survival skills. Continuing students participate in workshops to prepare them for graduate school and the professional world. Scholarship support is provided to first and second year students with unmet financial need.

The Lillian Semper Ross Center for Disability Services coordinates services and accommodations for students with disabilities. The Ross Center provides help in four major areas (figures are from AY 2003): testing (502 tests administered), note-taking (provided this service in 51 courses), alternative formats (408 hours of staff time spent converting 11,698 pages of material), and sign language interpreting (1,076 hours). The Center works closely with the Adaptive Computer Lab and provides referrals for other services.

The Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program is a federally-funded program offering preparation for doctoral study in math and science fields to low-income individuals who are first generation college students and to students from groups under-represented in graduate education. Participants spend at least a year conducting a research project under the guidance of faculty mentors. McNair annually serves 25 students; to date, 88% of the participants have gone on to graduate study.

Administrative Services are offered through the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management.

In an effort to provide consolidated services and responses, the University created a "One Stop" student administrative service center in the Campus Center. Centrally located, this service area gives students the opportunity to address their registration, financial aid, and billing needs in one place. Computer kiosks located in the "One Stop" and also throughout campus give students a self-service option.

The Office of Financial Aid helps students finance their studies while maintaining fair and equitable standards for awarding state, federal and institutional aid. All U.S. citizens or permanent residents are encouraged to apply for financial aid regardless of family earned income. Approximately sixty-six percent (66%) of University of Massachusetts Boston students apply for financial aid and of this number eighty-eight (88%) demonstrate financial need. In addition to Federal financial aid funds, the Office administers six financial aid programs sponsored by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Over $51 million of aid was dispersed to 5218 students through the Office in AY 2004. The University also provides its own funding for students through Undergraduate Fee Grants. More than $1.66 million was awarded to 1500 students through this program. The University offers a substantial number of scholarship programs administered by the Office of Merit-Based Scholarships recognizing academic achievement and promise. In AY 2004, 594 students received assistance through these programs with over $1.4 million in aid being awarded.

A component of the Office of Financial Aid, the Office of Student Employment oversees student employment programs, including the Federal Work Study Program, Institutional Student Employment positions for University students on campus, and the Part-Time Jobs program, which lists positions by off-campus employers. Students may also search for job opportunities on line through MonsterTrak. In AY 2004, the Office of Student Employment received 356 new job listings that were accessed by 3113 new students. In total, 1709 students were employed through the three programs administered by this office.

Graduate students may finance their education through financial aid and by obtaining teaching, research or administrative assistantships offered through the Office of Graduate Studies and Research. In AY 2004 359 graduate students were employed through these assistantships that carry a waiver of tuition and often fees in addition to the stipend earned by the student.

The University Registrar's Office assists students in making timely progress to graduation. Over the last five years this office has moved aggressively to make more of its services available on-line. Students may register for courses, view their grades and course schedules, order transcripts, update their mailing addresses, access their financial aid and billing information, and check on their progress to graduation through the Degree Audit System.

Co-curricular Services are administered through the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs which provides a multitude of opportunities for students to become involved in campus life. Driven by a mission focused on the development of the whole student, Student Affairs strives to cultivate a vibrant campus life.

Policies and procedures relating to student behavior are outlined in the Code of Student Conduct that is developed and administered by the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. A complete statement of student rights and responsibilities appears in the Undergraduate Student Catalog, the Graduate

Studies Bulletin and the Student Handbook (See Standard 11). These resources are widely distributed and available on the University Web site.

The Office of Student Life provides opportunities for students which complement the academic mission, including development of leadership skills through participation in student organizations, such as undergraduate and graduate student governance and the nine permanent student centers which reflect the diversity of the campus. It is estimated that approximately 40% of the student body has some contact with the Office of Student Life. Students who participate in governance are fairly autonomous in refining and running their governance structures and have significant input over how the financial support (through a fee assessed to all undergraduate and graduate students) for student activities and student organizations is allocated. In 2003-2004, 49 undergraduate and 18 graduate Recognized Student Organizations (RSOs) were activated. Forty-five (45) students participated in student government. Students who participate in the centers and RSOs are responsible for programming their own events and governing themselves, with the support and oversight of faculty and staff advisors. Student publications including the yearbook (the *Beacon*), and the student literary magazine (*Watermark*) and independent student press (*The Mass Media*) are produced and managed by students. As students carry out these leadership responsibilities, the Office of Student Life acts as a facilitator and coach helping students succeed within the University's policies and financial guidelines. The Office of Student Life, in collaboration with the College of Public and Community Service and the Division of Student Affairs, also offers a for-credit, year-long course on leadership development called The Beacon Leadership Project.

In an effort to integrate student development with academic coursework, the University established the Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach which places interested students in service learning opportunities in community agencies and organizations. In AY 2004, over 300 students participated in service learning activities, and the office is developing a system to track student service hours to compare with national indicators.

Through the Department of Athletics, the University offers intercollegiate athletics, as well as intramural and recreational programs. As an NCAA Division III member, the Department sponsors 14 intercollegiate varsity teams. UMass Boston competes in the Little East Conference, ECAC Hockey East and is a member of the ECAC. During AY 2004, 195 student-athletes participated in the intercollegiate varsity program. Academic support services are provided to student athletes. Athletics is funded through a fee assessed to all matriculated students. Athletic and recreational facilities such as the ice rink, gymnasium, dance studio, softball and soccer/lacrosse fields, swimming pool and tennis courts are of excellent quality and accessible to the entire student body. The Beacon Fitness Center offers fitness and cardiovascular equipment as well as courts for racquetball, squash and handball, an aerobics room, and a lounge. In AY 2004 the University was honored with the Community Service Through Athletics Honor Roll Award as number one in the nation for the sixth consecutive year. We also received the highest award from the National Association of Division III Athletic Administrators and Jostens for the department's contributions to the community.

University Health Services address the physical and emotional needs of our students by offering services to students in three distinct areas:

General Medicine: Students who develop an episodic illness or incur an injury can go to the department to receive medical care without an appointment during hours of operation. In addition, primary preventative care is offered by appointment. Medical services include an onsite laboratory, which performs a variety of tests on site as well as coordinates and reports results that require an outside laboratory referral.

Counseling: The Counseling Center provides services to any and all registered students without regard to the status and type of medical insurance the student has. The Counseling Center staff promotes better functioning and growth opportunities for the student and helps manage a wide variety of personal difficulties and concerns that can interfere with the academic experience. Services are provided by an interdisciplinary clinical staff, and by graduate and doctoral trainees functioning under direct supervision of licensed faculty and staff.

Wellness: The Health Education and Wellness Department under University Health Services, provides nutrition education, alcohol and drug education; alcohol screening; women's health education; domestic violence education; stress management; time management; yoga; support for healthy lifestyle; HIV/AIDS education; and eating disorder education. The department also sponsors Wellness Health Fairs in fall and spring.

In AY 2004, the University Health Services had 12,894 student visits for general medicine services, and 2967 student visits in the Counseling Center.

The Interfaith Campus Ministry and the Interfaith Chapel exists for all students, faculty, and staff from any spiritual denomination.

The Office of Student Housing addresses the off-campus housing needs of our students. In 2003, UMass developed an agreement with the Harbor Point Housing Community to provide our students with housing, and currently over 200 of our students take advantage of this relationship.

To address child care needs, the Early Learning Center provides year-round licensed care for toddlers, preschoolers and kindergarten children ages 15 months to 6 years for the children of students, faculty and staff. The Center has spaces to accommodate sixty children.

Appraisal

The strength of the student services offered by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, and the Vice Provost for Academic Support Services reflects the University's commitment to students. Moreover, this strength has been enhanced by the opening of the Campus Center in April 2004. As the gateway to the academic life of the University, the Campus Center reflects the institution's founding principles of access, diversity, and excellence. Perhaps nowhere is the institution's commitment to improving student service more evident than in the creation of the "One Stop" student service center. In this significant office space, supported by state-of-the-art technology, students may receive almost all of the administrative support services (registration, financial aid and bursars services) that they need to transact business.

Regarding **academic services**, prior to 2003-04 orientation was the responsibility of the Advising Center, and consisted of assessment, General Education requirements and course registration, and an introduction to campus services. In fall 2003, through the efforts of the Advising Center and Student Affairs, a dual orientation format for freshmen and transfer students was developed. All students take assessments of their writing and mathematical skills. In addition to registration, the program for first year students also allows students to network with each other, learn about campus services, and make the transition to college life. Transfer sessions focus on practical concerns and are concluded by registering for classes on the Web. Orientation sessions are held throughout the summer to accommodate the varying schedules of our student population. Students rate the new format and content high in satisfaction surveys.

One challenge is orienting the many students who attend late orientations held the week before or during the first week of classes – almost 50% of the spring 2004 entrants and 24% of the fall 2004 class. These late sessions are conducted in larger groups to accommodate more students, making it difficult to maintain the smaller advising ratios for transfer students and the emphasis on student life for first-year students.

In an effort to identify ways to strengthen advising services, the Vice Provost conducted a survey of a representative group of 806 undergraduate students in fall 2002. The advising survey report focused on students' uses of and satisfaction with advising. Students rated faculty advising very highly and the majority felt that, overall, they had been well advised at the University. Students' overall satisfaction with advising at the University was strongly influenced by their satisfaction with University Advising Center advisors and that satisfaction was influenced by the availability of advising, the accuracy and consistency of information, and the student/advisor relationship.

Focus groups conducted in May, 2004, reinforced these findings and revealed the complexity of meeting students' advising needs. Students expect advising to be available when they need it and they want to form a relationship with an advisor. Students said they often had to wait to see an advisor and that this person was different every time. They also felt rushed and unnecessarily referred elsewhere, and that the advisors lacked patience. According to the survey, students seek advice infrequently and usually not about choosing a major and/or a career. Students seek advising once or twice a semester, usually to register for classes and to get information about degree requirements. As a result, over 2,100 students seek advising within a four week time frame, reducing the amount of time each advisor can spend with a student.

The assessment of advising revealed a clear need to improve transfer advising services. Students who entered the University with over thirty (30) credits were significantly less satisfied with their advising experience and with University Advising Center advisors than those who entered with fewer or no credits. Their dissatisfaction stems largely from difficulties with the alignment of the University's curriculum with that of the transfer institution, expectations regarding transferability of credits, timeliness of the credit evaluation process, and accuracy and consistency of information.

Another area needing improvement is the advising done by academic departments. Departments have differing policies on advising. In addition, the complexity of the current General Education requirements means that some faculty don't understand them. In the fall 2004 semester, the Deans of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Science and Mathematics designated advising contact persons in each department, a step that will allow staff in the University Advising Center to train faculty on General Education requirements.

A thorough self-study of Career Services was conducted in January 2004 and included a site visit from an external evaluation team of distinguished Career Service professionals. The resulting Career Services Consultation Report called for strengthening already sound practices by expanding the scope of services offered to our students. Significant expansion of opportunities for experiential education and implementation of an aggressive employer marketing campaign were recommended. The review team also recommended centralizing career services under a single reporting line to the Vice Provost for Academic Support Services, with career specialists assigned to the career-oriented colleges such as Management. This reorganization was approved by the Provost and implemented in fall 2004. Career Services was established as a separate department reporting to the Vice Provost, with the College of Management Career Specialist, while housed primarily in the college, reporting to the Director of Career Services. Funding was

also approved for an additional Career Specialist once a permanent director is hired to replace the director who retired in January 2004.

As discussed previously, to assess the reading and writing skills of new UMass Boston students, both native and non-native English speakers, students write an essay in response to a reading. Readers from Academic Support Programs evaluate the language skills and critical thinking in the students' writings and recommend that some students enroll in one of the General Education critical thinking courses or an ESL Center course. However, some of these students are reluctant to follow the placement recommendations, particularly ESL students, as these are non-credit courses. As a result, they enroll in courses for which they lack the requisite preparation, and then get poor grades or fail.

Currently the Subject Tutorial Program offers one-to-one and group tutoring, with varying degrees of faculty involvement in the supervision of peer tutors. There is a need to provide more support in group tutorials for students enrolled in the introductory science and elementary foreign language courses that are part of the General Education requirements. To this end, a stronger partnership is needed with biology, chemistry, and foreign language faculty. The Subject Tutorial Program has also improved its services by developing, in collaboration with the Graduate Software Engineering Program, an electronic web-based tutorial request/registration interface and database which facilitates the matching of tutors with students. This software has now been piloted for a year. Modified versions of this database need to be developed for the Reading, Writing, and Study Skills and Math Resource Centers so that the entire tutoring program is online.

While there are many services for students with disabilities, a number of issues continue to be of concern. First, there is a need to better inform students, faculty, and staff of the services the University provides and where to find them. There is also a need to better inform faculty of their responsibilities to these students. Second, there is a need to develop a protocol for dealing with out-of-class concerns, such as navigating the campus, medical or personal emergencies which may require assistance, issues of access to non-academic events, and the like. Finally, we need to understand more about the factors influencing the retention and graduation of students with disabilities.

Within **administrative services**, over the last five years the Registrar's Office has made great strides in providing students more self- service options through the University's Web site. One of the key self-service options available to students is the accessibility of the Degree Audit system – a computerized checklist of a student's degree requirements that is updated each semester. Allowing students to view their degree audits on-line has also been a major breakthrough in advising. Since the inception of this service in 2002, more students use their degree audits as a guide for course registration and their eventual graduation. Data collected by the Vice Provost for Academic Support Services in a 2002 survey on academic advising reveals that 75% of students use the degree audit system and are satisfied with it. The University Advising Center has also aggressively promoted the use of the degree audit among undeclared majors.

Ninety-eight percent (98%) of the students who demonstrate financial need receive financial aid. Although filing for financial aid (by submitting the FAFSA form) may seem a daunting process for some students, explanations of the procedures and support are readily available. Students are assigned a Financial Aid Advisor once they file a FAFSA form and are encouraged to make an appointment or communicate through email. Students may also obtain answers to their financial aid questions at the "One Stop" service center which is open every

business day of the year. The Office of Financial Aid works very hard to make sure students complete their files to comply with federal, state and institutional guidelines.

Equally important to the success of the financial aid process is the seamless communication between the Office of Financial Aid Services who verify eligibility of funds and the Bursar's Office who disburses the funds to the students. Although there has been improvement in the coordination between the Office of Financial Aid Services and the Bursars office additional improvement in the coordination of fund disbursement to students is needed.

In AY2000, Enrollment Management retained a faculty consultant to conduct focus group follow-ups to student surveys that indicated service problems in the Office of Financial Aid. The report pinpointed areas for improvement in dissemination of information, advising, and general attitude. As a result, the Office worked to provide better access on the telephone and in the office and to improve the materials and information disseminated to students.

The University fully meets the standards for the retention, safety and disposal of records. The recent move to the Campus Center by the major student service departments provided for renewed discussion and commitment to the proper handling of student records. Retaining confidentiality of records while providing greater access by students to their records online has been successfully dealt with through issuing Personal Identification Numbers to each student for access to web-based transactions.

Co-curricular services face the task of increasing student participation in programs and assisting students who do participate in the delicate balancing of academic, co-curricular and personal responsibilities. These challenges are inherent in serving a population of students who commute to the campus and who must work to finance their education. It is important to improve the visibility of student life programming in order to attract academically competitive students who expect a comprehensive university experience. Staff in the Office of Student Life are guided by the Council for the Advancement of Standards Professional Standards for Higher Education and have, as a group, many years of experience working in student affairs.

The University provides superb facilities for student recreational needs. The Beacon Fitness Center provides state-of-the-art workout equipment and is open every day of the week**.** Locker facilities are scheduled for an upgrade to be completed in 2005, and intramural programs in the Center are offered in response to student demand. The Student Game Room, recently improved when moved to the Campus Center, also offers extended hours.

The Department of Athletics provides academic advising and counseling about career opportunities, interpersonal relations, personal health, and sexual orientation. Athletics employs a professional staff member specifically to provide these services. The success of this advising is demonstrated by the induction of fifty-three student athletes into the "Brightest Beacons Club" for achieving GPA of 3.0 or higher. However, the success of Athletics may be limited by financial constraints. Despite fundraising, the burden for meeting increasing operating expenses from student fees is problematic. Athletics has a structural deficit that has been compounded over the past two years by shifting personnel back to the Athletic trust fund and the change in the method of collecting student fees.

The *Code of Student Conduct* provides step-by-step procedures and guidelines by which complaints are heard. Student misconduct and grievance complaints are adjudicated through the Vice Chancellor for Student affairs Office; academic dishonesty complaints are adjudicated through the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. It is noteworthy that the number of disputes that are resolved through the formal mechanisms is quite low for a campus the size of UMass

Boston. Cases involving student misconduct average about six per year. Academic dishonesty cases are also low according to the Office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs which is informed about each case. Formal student grievances are practically non-existent. In fact, not one graduate grievance has been heard in the last two years. Employment disputes average about 1-2 per year.

The Divisions of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management have used the results of the Senior Survey to further examine programming and services offered to students. Health Services participated in a major survey for students on health-related issues in the spring of 2004.

Projection

The direction student services will take in the future will be guided by the recently completed strategic plan. The Offices of the Vice Provost for Academic Support Services, Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management, and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs have clear visions for the improvement of services which are reflected in their strategic plans, many of which continue the strong collaborative relationship that exists among these offices.

Academic services will be strengthened through a number of initiatives. The University Advising Center will continue its collaboration with Enrollment Management and Student Affairs to build an effective orientation program for all students and to encourage all to participate in the process as early as possible. In addition, orientation activities need to be continued through the first week of classes (Welcome Week) to connect students to the campus community.

Transfer student satisfaction will be improved by refining transfer agreements with two-year feeder institutions and by giving transfer students access to information online through the Course Applicability System (CAS). This system will allow potential transfer students to view which of their current courses will satisfy UMass Boston requirements for General Education requirements and for the major.

The University Advising Center will work to reduce the number of undeclared majors it serves while working with faculty to improve faculty advising concerning the General Education requirements. The Advising Center will improve the relationship between students and advisors by increasing the number of advisors available to students during peak advising times and by providing more personalized services to undeclared majors.

The Vice Provost for Academic Support Services will work with the Career Services staff to implement the key recommendations of the Career Services Review Team, including increasing staffing and resources for career services, centralizing services, and implementing an aggressive marketing campaign with employers aimed at expanding placement and internship opportunities. Increasing both the numbers of internships available to students and the number of students who participate in internships is a campus priority. The goal is to provide an internship for any student who wishes one.

The Office of Academic Support Programs will develop better reporting rubrics for new student writing assessments. The goal is better compliance with placement recommendations and, as a result, greater student success.

To further improve tutorial services for students, Academic Support Programs will complete the implementation of the on-line tutorial registration service. In addition, staff will

train faculty and tutors to use the methods and pedagogy of Supplemental Instruction (SI) and apply these to foreign language and science tutorials. In addition, tutors will be trained to facilitate electronic peer-groups to promote cooperative group work through interactive problem-solving sessions and electronic communication.

To improve services to students with disabilities, the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs have established a University-wide committee to outline services and providers, to identify policy issues and establish a protocol for resolution, and to monitor implementation of policies. In addition, the Office of Pre-Collegiate and Educational Support Programs will conduct a study of the graduation and retention rates of students with disabilities. Baseline data for this population will be established and analyzed and surveys will be conducted with students to identify the factors that help or hinder their success.

Administrative services will also be strengthened. Enrollment Management will work with Student Affairs to create a Web portal for all students to provide easy access to a wide array of services and information and personalize services by creating a virtual online community for students. The Financial Aid Office will work to clarify its award packets to better assist students in completing the application process. The Office is also exploring a direct lending program to reduce paperwork and cut down on processing time. The Student Employment Office will work to create more academically-related work study jobs for incoming students to connect them to the campus.

With the significant increase in student fees as a result of decreases in state funding, financial aid has become an even more important element in ensuring access to a UMass Boston education. In fiscal years 2004 and 2005 the University allocated an additional $1,000,000 in aid to accommodate the fee increase for the neediest students. Enrollment Management will continue to monitor the impact of increasing costs on students and enrollment and advocate for adequate financial aid to support enrollment and retention.

One of the largest challenges the campus faces over the next few years will be the successful conversion to the Peoplesoft Student Administrative system. Conversion to Peoplesoft systems in other parts of the University has demonstrated it may take a long time to return service delivery to normal once a system has converted to Peoplesoft. Certainly there is a commitment on the part of all to minimize the disruption students will face.

Co-curricular services will be improved through a number of initiatives. As an overarching activity, the Division of Student Affairs will begin the process of conducting both internal and external reviews by having teams of seasoned professionals from the Student Affairs profession visit campus and evaluate our services. Both the Office of Student Life and Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach will develop and administer improved tools to measure and track the effectiveness of the programs they offer.

The Division is also committed to expanding the Beacon Leadership Project and creating residential life programming for the increasing number of our students who reside at the adjoining Harbor Point community. The UMass Boston student population is constantly evolving. Evening students and distance learning students are increasing. The Office of Student Life will develop strategies to reach out to all segments of our community and include the evening student in the activities it offers.

The Department of Athletics has set as its two strategic goals the enhancement of the intramural and recreation program and improving the competitiveness of the intercollegiate

program. The Department will strive towards challenging for the NCAA Division III SEARS Cup. The Department will need to work with campus leadership to correct its structural budget deficit and provide for future growth either through fundraising efforts or budget enhancements. (See the Department of Athletics Strategic Plan.)

The Office of Student Housing will explore housing availability to increase the portfolio of formal off-campus housing agreements to meet the needs of our diverse student body.

Standard Seven: Library and Information Resources

Task Force Members: Daniel Ortiz (Chair), Robert Caron, Reebee Garofalo, Martyne Hallgren, Jean-Pierre Kuilboer, Carlos Maynard, Mark A. Schlesinger, Woodruff Smith, Forrest Speck

Introduction

UMass Boston offers library and information services through the Joseph P. Healey Library and the Division of Information Technology (IT). The library reports to the Director of Libraries, and IT reports to the Chief Information Officer. This document describes the change in the library and technology services in the last years from two distinct areas to one integrated service.

Description:

Healey Library

The Joseph P. Healey Library supports research, teaching, and learning through the acquisition and dissemination of information in all formats. Although enormous changes in the information world have transformed the library into a collection of digital resources, its underlying mission remains the same: to serve as a gateway to information needed by the campus community as stated in the library's 2000-2004 Strategic Plan.

The library occupies the tallest building on campus with 213,319 square feet of library space and seating for 798 users. Floors 2 to 9 are dedicated library floors, with some other areas of the building occupied by non-library functions.

The Director of Libraries (DOL) reports to the Provost. The Associate Director of Libraries (ADOL), Head of Systems, and the Assistant Director for Content and Resource Management report to the DOL. The heads of Archives, Access Service, Reference, Curriculum Resource Center and Library Instruction report to the ADOL. With the exception of the Director and Associate Director of Libraries, professional librarians are members of the Faculty Staff Union. Professional non-librarian staffers and support staff members belong to the professional and classified staff unions, respectively. The library employs 33 FTE staff members, ten of whom are MLS librarians and four of whom are professional staff. During the academic year, 44 undergraduate and graduate students are hired to complement the staff and carry out basic library services. Staffing levels have been reduced due to early retirements and unfilled positions from 42 FTE in 1995 to 33 FTE positions as of September 2004. Reliance on student employment has increased to alleviate fulltime staffing shortages.

Healey Library is fortunate to offer access to thousands of information resources throughout the area. Healey Library is a member of the Boston Library Consortium, the Massachusetts Conference of Chief Librarians in Public Higher Education Institutions, and the Fenway Library Consortium. All UMass Boston constituents have free interlibrary loan service and borrowing privileges to these important collections. As a member of the Boston Regional Library System, Healey Library offers document delivery from other Massachusetts libraries in one to four days. Two public library networks and four of the UMass system campus libraries are accessible through the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners virtual catalog, a non-mediated universal resource locator offering interlibrary loans to any bona fide user. In addition, the library is a member of Nelinet, and it works with other regional networks, such as Palinet, to secure access to needed resources at competitive cost. Last July, the library administration created

the Information Delivery Services Unit, grouping interlibrary loan, document delivery, and virtual catalog services, thus facilitating resource sharing.

As of March 2004, Healey Library's collection included 600,000 volumes, 660 print journal subscriptions and serials, and over 25,000 electronic journal titles and 81 databases. The library still maintains over 800,000 microform units. During the fall of 2003, the library began managing a media collection consisting of over 2,500 DVDs, videos, and films.

In the fall of 2002, a faculty advisory committee was appointed to assist the Director of Libraries and librarians in identifying needed resources. This process yielded an impressive selection of new electronic journal subscriptions, e-journals, e-books, and new databases.

The stability of the library budget continues to be a concern. In AY2001 the budget line item for Educational Reference Materials (ERM), the primary source of funding for library materials for the state's 29 higher education institutions, was reduced from $14 million to $2.5 million. Healey Library's share was reduced from $1.364M to $488,796. This allocation was further reduced in AY2002 to $117,000 and in AY 2003 this line item was eliminated. In 2003 the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors funded the library to its AY2000 level allowing the renewal of subscriptions and the continuation of library collections and services in electronic format. Yet permanent and increasing allocations for the library are not currently guaranteed for future budgets. With the drastic reduction of support through the ERM and competing obligations across campus, the budgetary stability of the library is uncertain as illustrated by the slight decrease in funding between last year and this year. In AY2004 the library's budget was $3,305,178. $1.2M was spent on informational materials. This year's allocation is $3,209,331 with a projected expenditure in library materials of $1.3M.

To improve access to its collections, the library continued to develop its homepage, offering users one point of access to selected resources. The library also acquired an electronic reserves service for students and faculty, Docutek. This service benefits our distant learners as well as students and faculty on and off campus. In addition, Healey Library was an early adopter of both LivePerson and Ask 24/7, providing online reference consultations and extending assistance to users around the clock.

Healey Library has embarked on several technologically advanced initiatives in an effort to provide our students immediate access to information. The library has moved to the forefronts of information technology use by: 1) hosting and maintaining its own online integrated catalog, 2) hosting the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners Virtual Catalog, 3) significantly increasing the number of information resources available at the desk top, 4) offering more computers and laptops throughout the library, and 5) providing remote access to most services and electronic collections to bona fide constituents. The library has been a technology pioneer on campus, being one of the first units to create an online presence with a Web site; offering the first wireless network in our Center for Library Instruction; offering PDA ("personal digital assistant") loans to students and a laptop loan program. Finally, the library has developed a digital library. Collections stored in the Archives department are being made accessible via the Web. Projects such the Sully Photograph Collection, Boston Harbor Clean-Up Project Papers, and The Dorchester Pottery Collection will soon be available on the Web.

An example of the library collaborating with units on campus is evident in the PDA program. This program offers students and faculty in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences eight nursing databases and an Encyclopedia on PDAs that can be checked out. The library has also been working with the College of Education to offer services to their students and campus

constituents through the newly remodeled Curriculum Resource Center. Another collaboration and consolidation of services was the move of Film Services to the library. For the first time, the campus is able to offer four viewing stations to allow patrons to view films in VHS or DVD formats. To address the needs of our students for adaptive technology, the library has two workstations equipped with ZoomText and Jaws. A bookreader device is also attached to one of the workstations in the reference floor which allows a patron to enlarge the text of a book and read it on the monitor. The library will also be investing in the Kurzweil 3000 system to meet the needs of patrons with learning disabilities.

The library instruction program has undergone considerable changes over the last decade. A professional librarian for library instruction was hired to develop library instruction for the campus community, including writing a mission statement and a goals and objectives statement. The Association of College and Research Libraries published competencies for information literacy standards in 2000 and these were adopted by the Healey Library Instruction program. In 2002, the library developed a state-of-the-art teaching facility, the Center for Library Instruction (CLI), for interactive library instruction for 40 students.

A successful outreach initiative of library staff is the Gen Ed Faculty/Librarian Buddy Program. Developed four years ago, this program was designed to help the General Education program meet an information technology/information literacy requirement, provide a faculty support network, and meet the library instruction needs of a growing number of courses. The benefits of the buddy program continue to be increased collaboration with the faculty, increased visibility of the library, and improved library instruction sessions for students.

In addition to the Buddy program and CLI, the library participates in a two-semester library instruction project for the Taylor Scholars. Funded by the Globe Foundation, this collaboration has occurred for the last three years. Instruction librarians also developed an information literacy tutorial, elected as Tutorial for the Month by the Association of College and Research Libraries.

Division of Information Technology (IT)

The responsibility of IT is to provide information technology resources and strategies to incorporate new technological advances and the best possible technological infrastructure for research, learning, and teaching. The mission of IT is to deliver excellent information management using an innovative and fully functional infrastructure. Its services support and enhance the strategic initiatives of the University.

The Chief Information Officer reports to the Chancellor and is responsible for administrative and academic computing, telecommunications, campus networking, Web and media services, data administration including PeopleSoft, and other administrative computing applications, the computer help desk, and computer desktop support. The Directors for Networking and Telecommunications, Client Services and Web Development, Administrative Computing, the Instructional Technology Center (ITC), and the Learning Resource Center (Language Lab), report to the CIO. Ninety-nine employees and 40-50 student workers support IT users. The FY2005 budget for the unit is $11,305,694 with $4,231,430 in salaries. Additional funding of $10 million for capital improvements is available for projects that will extend through 2006.

IT maintains the communications infrastructure, campus data center, telecommunications, internal and external data networking, infrastructure applications such as

email, and the primary web site. It provides primary technical liaison to the University Information Technology Services managed by the President's office, which is responsible for the technical infrastructure supporting the core administrative applications. Key to its mission is enhancing service initiatives for the communications network that support our campus retention, research, and reputation strategic initiatives. All students, active and retired faculty, staff, and alumni are provided with network and email service. IT offers general access and teaching computer labs and facilities, specialized workstations, and access to an increasing number of computer kiosks. All labs offer access to the campus network, the Internet, and to office applications including multimedia and productivity software as well as Web publishing software. A computer lab dedicated to academic placement and tutoring is in the new Campus Center. Information kiosks have also been installed throughout the campus to provide convenient access to campus resources to students for registration, etc. In addition, the Campus Center also has both wireless networking and hot jacks for students to connect appropriate communication devices. Plans are being developed to expand access from any computer on campus and on the network to access the appropriate software needed for media production, Web publishing, and other academic resources needed by students and faculty.

IT has replaced over 200 computers in student labs and over 600 PCs for faculty and staff in the last two years. AY05 is the first year where faculty have received laptops as part of the computer "REPLACE" program for faculty and staff. In addition, continuous upgrades have expanded the network and system improving speed capability and handling of software and file management over the last few years.

The campus has 16 technology classrooms including auditorium/tiered classrooms and traditional classrooms in two basic configurations seating 25 to 80 students. In addition, faculty may check out a variety of equipment including laptop computers and projectors for use in their classrooms.

At present, approximately 17% of classes per semester are web-enhanced and utilize the Prometheus courseware. In the spring of 2004 WebCt was introduced to replace Prometheus. This will require retraining of faculty and staff to utilize this new courseware. Faculty may also use additional web-based tools to provide technology-enhancement capabilities for their courses. Furthermore, faculty members are provided with fifty megabytes of disk space for the creation of individual Web sites. Training on how to use these resources is offered by the Instructional Technology Center, Web Services, as well as the Graduate Resource Center. The ITC assists faculty in exploring and developing software and hardware tools to enhance instruction and in identifying new technologies in teaching and learning, including support for distance education. It also provides services and support for media production, post-production, and distribution of visual, audio, and Web content.

The campus is fully wired with network ports providing all faculty and staff members with network access. Many classrooms have at least one network connection and the library and campus center have wireless networks available. Wireless connections will be extended throughout campus in 2005 as part of IT's strategic plan. The campus community is also provided with remote access to the network.

In addition, many departments and units have computer lab facilities which require IT support. Institutional Advancement has migrated with IT's support from its legacy system to new software Millennium, which is designed to improve its alumni, prospect, and donor tracking.

IT recently upgraded the campus network and has initiated planning for an additional enhancement to the campus backbone. These improvements will ensure the reliability and functionality of the campus data network to provide UMass Boston with a modern, high-speed data network able to accommodate the University's networking needs for years to come. The replacement of the network electronics was the first phase of the campus network upgrade. Phase 2 will move the remaining buildings still on a flat network architecture to a fully routed configuration.

Final implementation plans are in development to upgrade campus wiring from existing category 3 infrastructure to category 6, which is necessary to realize the 100 MB switched capability across campus. A new data operations center will be constructed as a part of this project. In addition, the rewiring plan also incorporates upgrades to high-speed wireless for both data and cellular access across campus. Access to Internet2 is currently provided through the existing network; however, the capacity offered by the new infrastructure will greatly enhance and expand this service to faculty.

Appraisal:

Healey Library

In 2000, the library finalized its strategic plan which resulted in six strategic goals:

- Goal I: We will improve the learning environment.
- Goal II: We will improve collections to meet the needs of our constituencies and to support the University's Carnegie Research II goal.
- Goal III: We will link Healey Library to overall campus life by strengthening connections to existing programs and constituents, and by marketing Healey Library's value to our constituents.
- Goal IV: We will diversify and increase Healey Library's funding base.
- Goal V: We will provide a more attractive physical facility.
- Goal VI: We will continue to provide assistance and service to targeted urban populations.

Major strides have been made in each of these goals. The 2000-2004 Strategic Plan has continued to guide the development of library services and activities in the last few years. The plan was updated fall 2003. One major issue that needed further planning was technology in the library. A technology strategic plan was developed in 2003.

The library director has developed new signature initiatives for the library. This vision is being expanded as a center for academic information and technology. The library will continue to articulate its objectives and prioritize activities strengthening retention, research, and reputation strategic initiatives on campus along with the IT division. (See the 2004 Healey Library Annual Report for more details.)

The library-faculty liaison program was modified in winter 2003 to expand outreach. The Liaison program has four goals: 1) build better relationships between Healey Library and academic programs; 2) better inform academic programs about library services and resources; 3) raise more awareness of information and technology literacies; and 4) improve visibility of Healey Library on campus.

In July 2002, library administration started a separate assessment of library use and initiated a review of References, Current Periodicals and the Curriculum Resource Center. The Reference and Current Periodicals departments were consolidated in December 2003 on the 4th floor of the library. The Curriculum Resource Center (CRC) staff worked with the Instruction and Curriculum Department faculty from the College of Education to assess their needs and those of the College. As a result, CRC was moved to the 5th floor in January 2004. The Film Library, formerly reporting to the Instructional Technology Center and its Media Services unit, was relocated to Reserves on the 3rd floor. This is the first phase of a plan to develop a media center and production facility incorporating the language lab unit. Librarians also developed a web-based library instruction tutorial guiding students into learning or strengthening basic information literacy skills. Nine other academic libraries across America requested this tutorial for their instructional programs.

LibQUAL+ was a major initiative of the library assessment team in 2003. It is a survey developed by the Association of Research Libraries and Texas A&M University. Major findings at Healey Library include the following:

- The knowledge of library staff to answer questions was the most important factor for all respondents.
- Courtesy of library staff was also important.
- Library collections were the second most important service. Undergraduates were satisfied with the collection while graduate students and faculty were extremely unsatisfied.
- There are high expectations for independent use of library resources.
- The library Web site and electronic access to resources are essential to respondents.
- All library users expected the library to serve as a quiet space for individual activities and a getaway for study, learning or research.

Library administration is committed to administering LibQUAL+ biennially.

In March 2004 library administration also committed to an Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) collection assessment with Boise State University and other institutions. Additional ongoing assessment activities include: a satisfaction survey for users of Information Delivers Services (IDS), a survey of liaison activities, information on e-resources use, library instruction evaluation, a collection inventory and weeding project, and an evaluation of the library Web site. The library administration is committed to continued assessment and evaluation for effective planning and development of library services, instruction, outreach, and collections.

The reduction of staff in recent years has caused problems. The first is that we have to do much more with fewer staff. After two early retirement programs, and one unfilled position, the library is left with 33 FTE positions from 42 in 1997. The most recent Early Retirement Incentive left major gaps in technical and public services staffing. Despite dedicated staff willing to assume dual or triple roles, many staff members and library services are over-extended. Another implication of reduced staffing is that the addition of new services, such as performance measures, metrics, and copyright compliance, overburden existing staff. These are important areas that need attention as soon as possible.

An additional implication of reduced staffing is pressure to restructure and reorganize library workflow and operations. The library management team consists of the Director of Libraries, the Associate Director, the Assistant Director for Systems, Resources and Content Management, and the Assistant Director for Access and Public Services. Over the last two years,

library administration has made changes to reorganize services and staffing to maximize resources and deal with the staffing shortage. During Fall 2003, the reference and the current periodicals departments were consolidated. In Spring 2004, several key vacant positions were filled temporarily with existing library staff. In July 2003, three different services were consolidated: interlibrary loan, document delivery, and virtual catalog, a change which improves access and delivery time of journal articles and books. The success of this consolidation has been excellent and faculty and students are happy to see these improvements in service and efficacy. In response to a 2004 survey question "How satisfied were you with the time it took to receive your response(s)?" 111 respondents replied very satisfied, followed by 100 who were extremely satisfied and 35 who were satisfied. Just 10 respondents were not very satisfied and only 3 replied not at all. (See Information Delivery Services survey summary.)

Division of Information Technology

In 2002, the Chancellor commissioned a campus IT strategic plan, Moving IT Forward. This plan recommended substantial changes in information technology management. Key to this plan was the creation of the Division of Information Technology under the leadership of the Chief Information Officer. In 2003, the CIO was hired and the reorganization of IT commenced, incorporating Computing Services, Telecommunications, the Instructional Technology Center (ITC), Web Services, and PeopleSoft administration. A primary goal of the initial reorganization was to combine information management responsibilities and activities under the CIO to evaluate how to better deploy existing staff and resources to enhance services and increase efficiency.

The CIO recently reviewed information technology campus statistics of media equipment checked out by faculty, calls to helpdesk, and other data such as the findings from senior surveys gathered to better understand how technology is being used on campus. Additionally, the CIO uses external data sources for comparison, including the COSTS Project and the Educause Core Data Survey to evaluate the organizational structure of information technology support. These data are complemented with multiple service and technology assessments completed over the past several years that have highlighted various deficiencies in IT. For example, an assessment of the help desk and desktop support was done in 2001 with a follow-up in 2002. Findings included a positive assessment of the staff and their efforts to serve the campus community, but a shortage of staff and the consequent need to impose constraints on service were identified as major problems. In 2002, a campus taskforce report recommended the creation of a central media center. The findings of that report were reconfirmed in 2004.

In 2003, the campus participated in a system-wide evaluation of network services and a security audit. The entire network was evaluated and several issues were noted as action items. Audit recommendations included the implementation of appropriate security throughout the campus, the hiring of a security analyst, the development of consistent policies for identification and authentication, the reduction of vulnerabilities at the departmental and local level, and the creation of a risk management strategy.

Over the past several years the Teaching with Technology program offered by ITC has trained over 200 faculty members in methods for incorporating technology into the classroom. However, recent use statistics of ITC faculty support services have shown that use is infrequent and that various departments in IT offer an overlapping array of services to faculty and students, generating some confusion among users.

Most business operations have been changed from legacy systems to PeopleSoft. Along with this change, newer technologies have been incorporated offering more capable and reliable systems on each desk top on campus as well as remotely.

Resource 25 software has been implemented in conjunction with the PeopleSoft implementation of student registration to make the scheduling of classrooms more efficient and to place courses that require special facilities in the proper rooms. However, event management and overall space management on the campus continue to be fragmented.

Projection:

Healey Library

The Director of Libraries and staff will continue to redesign the library's workflow and reviewing services, as well as staff needs. This work will continue this year along with the organizational changes mentioned earlier and in forthcoming changes needed in circulation and reserves in the library. The director and his team will also work to assess the library vis-à-vis users' needs. The next three to five years will be critical in the development of library and IT services. As indicated earlier, faculty are relying more on IT for instruction and learning. The Director of Libraries and the CIO will work with the Provost to assemble various working committees with faculty to assess copyright compliance in the electronic environment; assess the need for a central repository of digital images; review reliance on media and IT to match resources with programmatic demands; and stimulate the use of IT in teaching and learning.

A 2003 survey of 867 syllabi suggests that 25% of courses have media requirements such as Web pages, e-portfolios, etc. These demands require the library to offer these services to students who use the library on site and remotely. However, it will be increasingly difficult to offer more services with fewer staff, especially since the library is developing new collections and a new learning environment that will require improved staffing levels. More staff is needed to provide not only the essential traditional and new library services, but also to embark on assessment, marketing, outreach, and new services needed in the proposed learning commons being developed by the DOL and CIO.

Currently the library is a primary location on campus for a quiet study place with various information and technology resources at hand. Increasingly courses are requiring collaborative projects and teamwork best done in group study rooms. The space reallocation launched by the construction of the new Campus Center will free areas in the library building to develop a media center, learning commons, group study rooms, student carrels, classrooms, and other IT-enabled facilities. In addition, the director will work with the Facilities Department and the CIO to develop facilities that foster research, student and faculty interaction, and allow for improved training of students in computer and information literacy skills as part of the proposed learning commons and media center. To make the library more attractive and inviting, a cyber-café is under construction at the main entrance of the library where Internet and library resources are combined.

Last year the library homepage was visited one million times, and its on-site resources circulated 66,762 times, by 20,604 users. This year the Healey Library's home page was accessed by an average of 12,000 users a month, with an average use of 49,000 hits to the homepage and an average use of pages in the site of 1.2M per month. Electronic learning facilities and environments are a growing necessity that Healey Library is positioning itself to provide in the next five years. Despite this astronomical growth in use of the library, many students and faculty

are unaware of the resources at their disposal. The Director, the Outreach Librarian, and staff from Enrollments Services, and Students Services will explore marketing the library and IT services to students and faculty. The Director will devote resources to improve the library's homepage. In addition, reference librarians will work with the Systems Librarian, the Collection Development Librarian, and the Assistant Director of Resources and Contents Management to launch LinkFinderPlus and Encompass in the spring and fall of 2005, respectively. This will facilitate access to the many resources the library has in one basic search step. Reference librarians will continue to offer workshops on RefWorks as well as on datasets and databases to be acquired.

Past cuts in state support forced Healey Library to assess its collections, evaluate resources, and develop a digital library that has received kudos from faculty and graduate students. The Chancellor and Provost have made enormous efforts to restore library funding from campus sources. The challenge remains to have a fine-tuned collection that serves the campus. In July 2002, the library launched a fund-raising campaign that is in the beginning its second year. Currently the library has raised close to $140,000. External funding has been sought in the past and the Director will continue with his staff to explore grant funding, gifts, and other external funding.

Healey Library cannot aspire to be our only source for journals, books, media, etc.; hence it will continue to cooperate with the Boston Library Consortium as well as other consortia to insure expeditious access to needed resources. The Information Delivery Services unit and its head will continue to provide support to campus users by improving is turnaround time delivery of resources the library does not have. An improvement in turnaround time of 25% is expected in the next three years.

The Director is working with the Archivist to digitize more resources in Archives and Special Collections. The Archivist will be charged with developing a ten-year plan. Over the next three years electronic reserves should be approximately 80% of reserve holdings. Digital space and learning in a digital environment will remain a singular challenge to the library as well as IT.

Division of Information Technology

As shown in the appraisal section, we have substantially changed our information technology environment over the last years. Some of the changes are complex requiring adjustments for each member of the campus community both in business practices and the ways in which instruction, learning, and research are conducted

The CIO will improve communication and increase participation of faculty and students in IT decision-making processes on campus. To facilitate the building of a shared vision across the campus, the CIO is developing an IT governance structure to enhance constituents' participation. The CIO, Provost, and other executive staff will assist in the oversight of administrative computing, Web, and information architecture. This group will also work with Faculty Council to guide academic computing. Technical representatives from departments have been invited to participate in a Technology Advisory Committee. The CIO is also working with Student Affairs to include students in several capacities to advise IT.

Additionally, in partnership with Student Affairs and the Library, IT is planning web-based surveys of students and faculty and focus groups regarding IT services over the next five years. IT must also align with the campus strategic goals, the 3Rs. IT and other information

technology partners on campus are currently evaluating their service models to develop new ones. The CIO will lead the consolidation and centralization of IT services as well as the establishment of policies and standards. The changes will increase technology support to academic programs and address student and faculty expectations and is a response to funding challenges at a time when service requests increase.

The CIO will reallocate current resources to critical functions, identify and prioritize IT initiatives within the University's strategic context, and work toward expanding the technical staff. The CIO will initiate a restructuring of existing staff to combine significant skills and to (re) establish service standards and boundaries. Working with the IT Executive Council, campus priorities will be identified. Human Resources will continue to evaluate and promote competitive salaries, based on current market studies in the Metro area. The addition of technical staff will need to be supported by a salary structure that will attract candidates of quality. The CIO is initiating new proposals to assure a consistent cycle of investment in hardware, software, and associated capital investments needs to be planned for three, five, and ten year horizons.

Campus space reallocation will provide IT with the opportunity to relocate some of its functions, giving back to the campus valuable space for labs and classrooms. Creating the academic testing computer lab with Academic Support in the Campus Center has already made space available for classrooms in fall 2004.

The network and system infrastructure upgrades in the past and in the next 24 months must continue to keep pace with the demands for technology. IT will partner with Administration and Finance to deliver electronic service models to support business activities. As part of the PeopleSoft project, the campus has been using the PeopleSoft Recruiting and Admissions modules for the past two years. Near the end of the fall 2004 semester, DARS, the current mainframe-based degree audit reporting system, will be upgraded to its latest web-based version, DARwin in close partnership with the Registrar. DARwin will support the degree audit, student advising and transfer credit articulation functions.

The CIO will work closely with Administration and Finance to develop cost studies of existing services and new funding sources. In these cases, careful consideration will have to be given to ongoing support costs after initial funding has ended. Included in this evaluation are the technology fees and course-specific fees. In addition, IT will investigate opportunities to develop new external funding, such as rooftop services to cellular vendors or community broadband partnerships.

The CIO will implement an open process to assure participation by executive staff, deans, and faculty in the decision-making process as well as the commitment of time and resources. This process will help the CIO, IT directors, and Executive Staff formulate an IT strategic plan for the campus consonant with the 3 R's. In addition, an IT services Web site, created as a single virtual service entry point, is being planned in partnership with the Library.

Annual assessments will provide IT with data to evaluate its performance. In December 2003 the top issues from our campus survey included: IT funding strategies; administrative systems and information systems; security and identity management; maintaining and upgrading network and IT/infrastructure; faculty development, support, and training; IT strategic planning; Web services; distributed learning and teaching and learning strategies; enterprise-wide portals; and online student services. IT has active initiatives in each area and will use this framework for ongoing assessment to gauge both successes and failures.

Standard Eight: Physical Resources

Task Force Members: Luis Aponte-Pares (Chair), Robert B. Beattie, Stephan Chait, Kathleen Golden McAndrew, Anita J. Miller, Ellen O'Connor, John Warner

Introduction:

The University of Massachusetts Boston has made significant improvements in physical resources since the last NEASC Report of 1995, but we are still faced with major problems which must be addressed within ten years to allow the continued full use of our buildings**.**

Description:

UMass Boston is located three miles from downtown Boston on the Columbia Point peninsula which also contains the John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and the Massachusetts State Archives and Commonwealth Museum. The 175 acre campus has 2.5 million gross square feet and 1.3 million net square feet with 96 classrooms and 17 teaching labs. The campus opened in 1974 with five buildings (Quinn Administration Building, Healey Library, McCormack Hall, Science Center, and Wheatley Hall), which were built as a megastructure. In 1982 the Clark Athletic Center was constructed and the total gross square footage of the campus was increased to approximately 2.2 million gross square feet, adding an ice rink, gymnasium, exercise rooms, swimming pool, and administrative spaces. The new Campus Center, which became operational in the spring of 2004, adds 331,000 gross square feet. Enrollment, student services, academic support services, the bookstore, and dining and conference facilities are included in this new space. External facilities include athletic practice and playing fields, eight tennis courts, a six lane track, and a boat dock with space for recreational and research vessels. There are 2470 designated parking spaces on campus and 1590 of these are in structured garage parking. The University also maintains a research field station that is located on Nantucket Island.

Instructional spaces total approximately 59,000 net square feet of classrooms, 18,000 net square feet of conference rooms, 147,000 net square feet of laboratory and laboratory- support spaces, and 248,000 net square feet of office space of all types (administrative and academic). The Healey library building contains the University's main library collection and also provides space that is used for research, conference, and instructional purposes.

The McCormack, Wheatley, and Science buildings contain a total of 96 classrooms, used for regular classroom teaching as well as by the community and for grant-funded programs on a space-available basis. All classrooms have been wired so that faculty may bring in instructional technology and gain access to the internet. Sixteen rooms hold installed computer and audiovisual equipment to serve as technology-enhanced classrooms (TECS). More than half of the classrooms have capacities of 30 persons or fewer, and only eight classrooms hold more than 80 persons.

The majority of research laboratories and lab support spaces are operated and maintained by the College of Science and Mathematics. The college's seven departments and two programs operate a total of 162 laboratories. Of these, 41 laboratories are also used for instructional purposes. In the College of Liberal Arts, the Psychology department operates 19 research laboratories, three computer labs, and an animal colony that is shared with the Biology department. The Music department manages 16 music labs and the College of Liberal Arts operates one central language lab for language instruction. The Instructional Technology Center, located in the Healey Library, houses six labs that are used for both classroom teaching and staff

development. The library is also home to the University's nine computing labs, which provide computers for student use, and also space for classes that require computer-based instruction.

Capital investments over the last ten years have addressed the following aspects of the physical structure:

- Roof repairs: Replaced five major roofs at a cost of $3 M.
- Library Brick Replacement: Entire building envelop replaced at a cost of $12.5 M.
- Campus Center: Opened in 2004 after 16 years of planning at a cost of $75 M.
- Upper and Lower Structure (Garage): Replaced expansion joints and repaired beams and columns at a cost of $1.4 M in 2001.
- Support of Research and Instructional Space: Improvements to laboratories and classrooms at a cost of $3 M over the last three years.

Appraisal:

We are delighted to have the Campus Center in operation and providing our students with a consolidation of student services, a wonderful physical environment for developing a sense of greater community, and a new gateway for the Campus. UMass Boston now presents a brand new face to the public, far more impressive and welcoming than ever before.

With the opening of the Center, approximately 75,000 square feet of space is available to be reassigned. Campus-wide discussions have assisted in defining needs and translating these into space programs and renovation budgets. One of our current highest priorities is to improve the classrooms on campus. Educational opportunities have been constrained by lack of space for expansion of programs and lack of current technology. Because of limited state and capital funding, the University has increasingly relied on external grants and gifts to finance the limited renovations that have taken place in research laboratories, classrooms, and conference rooms. Fortunately, the Campus Center provides new conference space for academic meetings, development functions, and student activities, addressing some of the pressing space issues of the 1990's.

Nevertheless, instructional space continues to be scarce, but attempts to standardize classroom scheduling are under way. New software, Resource 25, was first used in Spring 2004 to enable better assignments of classrooms and it has provided immediate improvements in our utilization of existing space. According to the R25 "placement analysis" (a summary report created after classes were assigned to rooms), the average room utilization for Spring 2004 was 77%. In comparison, a previous utilization study reported that the Fall 1999 average room utilization was 56% during the day and 67% during the evening (there is no combined average available). Because the software uses enrollment capacities instead of actual enrollment to make room assignments, the figures reflect the amount of time that the total available classroom space is utilized, not the number of students in the classrooms.

There are nearly 2000 courses offered each semester and the Registrar assigns about 1500 of them to the 96 available classrooms. The rest are held in labs or department conference rooms, which the Registrar does not schedule. Clearly, the physical facilities are heavily scheduled and additional space will be needed if flexibility in programming is to be achieved.

Because the campus infrastructure is now thirty years old, there are several maintenance issues that need to be addressed. Compliance with applicable health and safety standards is a programmatic priority. To achieve that end, generally-accepted standards of care, which include applicable federal and state regulations, nationally-recognized codes, and established professional practices are integrated into all campus programs. Strict adherence to these regulations and codes is demonstrated by the careful scrutiny of key environmental health and safety programs, including indoor air quality, asbestos abatement, laser safety, fire and life safety, and chemical use, storage, and disposal. The chief benefits are elimination of costly laboratory and fire-related emergency services and establishment of a collaborative relationship with federal and state environmental protection agencies, rather than a compliance-driven, inspection-based relationship. The positive results are twofold: a reduction in potential liability for the University and a reduction in the potential of federal or state compliance inspections which typically result in fines when non-compliance is found.

Progress has also been achieved on many environmental health and safety issues. Some of the major causes of water penetration into University buildings have been eliminated. The roofs have been replaced on three academic buildings and the library. In addition, the brick facing was replaced on two sides of the library and the catwalk was repaired. Two academic buildings have had new and/or upgraded fire alarm/protection systems installed. New fire alarm and sprinkler systems have been installed in the McCormack building; the alarm system was expanded in the Science building with audio and visual alarms installed in all labs along with a new control panel.

In 1999, the University signed an agreement with EPA and DEP to pilot a new approach to regulating hazardous waste in laboratories. The initial program was set to run from September 1999 to September 2003. Currently, EPA is in the process of extending the pilot through 2006. The program is site-specific and tests an environmental management system approach to handling hazardous waste in laboratories.

An aggressive indoor air quality program was implemented for the rapid investigation and resolution of complaints. Sophisticated analytical instrumentation is employed as well as more conventional information-gathering techniques. An aggressive program was developed for the critical evaluation of spaces damaged by water. An epidemiological EPA BASE study survey was employed to identify areas of greater concern with the campus buildings. This evaluation of "sick" and normal buildings was an effort to study disease prevalence. No significant differences were found.

UMass Boston continues to work on compliance with ADA regulations to improve our facilities. This includes remodeling and adding ramps and curb cuts to facilitate transportation, especially for persons in wheelchairs. Some upgrades of existing facilities include the purchase of two portable handicapped ramps for special invents, installing handicapped emergency shower and eye washers in laboratories (still on-going), and upgrading elevators and replacing all controls to be in compliance with ADA regulations. Attention to the needs of ADA regulations also has been a part of the Campus Center design process.

The repair of the Lower Level and Upper Level structure and the Plaza is both the largest deferred maintenance project and the greatest matter of urgency. The recent forensic study completed by Walker Parking Consultants describes the condition of this structure as poor, and requiring immediate attention. Based on Walker's analysis the project was estimated to cost $42 million in April of 2003. There is also the need to repair the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) systems in these levels of the campus at an additional cost. The Walker structural report updated in August of 2004 states that: "Based on our limited reevaluation we see the increasing demand and recommend that UMass Boston pursue a comprehensive rehabilitation program on the structure while salvagability exists. In the interim while the complex waits for development and funding of a long range plan, maintenance inspections and repairs geared toward risk reduction must be given serious consideration to reduce risks at UMass Boston."

A vital element of the current strategic plan is the provision of the necessary infrastructure to support quality instruction and so far we have been able to do that. Any visitor to the Boston Campus will also observe our continuing efforts to address our deferred maintenance problems, to improve our public face and solve our space issues, and to move forward creatively to solve our budgetary and infrastructure problems. Obviously more work needs to be done. We have been successful in utilizing state resources and borrowing wisely. We expect to continue this progress, and to add significant private funding in the next decade.

Projection:

The Office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance has developed a facilities action plan with four major components: a short term plan for reusing the spaces vacated by the move to the Campus Center; on-going maintenance; critical repairs to the upper- and lower-level megastructure that supports most of the campus, coordinated with the construction of a new parking facility; and a long-term capital plan.

The activities that moved to the Campus Center vacated approximately 75,000 net square feet of space in four buildings. Planning for this space is under way and preliminary cost estimates for renovations have been developed. The Chancellor, Provost, and Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance have selected the following three projects as short-term priorities because of their importance to the strategic plan: a new state-of-the-art geographic information systems (GIS) lab ($835,853), new Nursing labs ($1,564,001), and new back-of-the-house space for the McCormack Theater ($1,453,310). Re-use of other vacated spaces will be done through a space reallocation process currently being developed. Another short-term improvement is the continued upgrading of instructional space to be done this year through improved furniture and lighting, technology enhancements, and the painting of 15 to 20 classrooms.

Air quality issues are also being addressed. Engineering staff is cleaning all major air handling coils and replacing existing filters with treated filters to improve air quality. The University will be hiring a company to evaluate all classroom areas on the amount of air provided and make proper adjustments as required.

In the early 1990's, following the passage of ADA, the campus implemented procedures for review and sign-off on all plans of construction and reconstruction by the ADA Compliance Officer, but these practices are not always followed. Administration and Finance needs to assure compliance in all construction. Also, our older rooms are in need of ADA evaluations for upgrades. Space reallocation will trigger many of the ADA compliance issues in these areas. In

addition, the Nantucket research facilities are old and currently not accessible to all physically handicapped people, but a task force is evaluating the issue.

Currently plans are being developed for the rewiring of the Campus to update the wiring plant and provide for wireless access across the Campus. There is also a need to provide for the Information Technology infrastructure. We have a project of $10.7 million to update all of our buildings to fiber optics, and the project has started with the wiring of the new Campus Center. Our expectation is that campus telephone recharges should reasonably cover the debt service. There is also the need to replace elevators since repairs are no longer cost effective and spare parts are becoming increasingly difficult to obtain.

Working with the University Building Authority, UMass Boston is studying the feasibility of a new garage and how this will relate to the repair of the existing parking facilities. Given the deplorable condition of the structure as presented in the forensic study, UMass Boston is working to assemble both state and other funds for the repair of the megastructure upon which the campus is built. The critical repairs to the upper- and lower-level structure received the support of the University of Massachusetts President's Office in August, 2004. A site visit in November 2004 by officials of the state agency in charge of all capital construction, The Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM), familiarized top officials with the extremely poor condition of this infrastructure. The cost of the repair is estimated at $50 million, and the Chancellor and Executive Staff have made funding this project the number one priority on campus. Since the megastructure is also used as a parking facility, a new parking facility needs to be constructed in order to do the extensive and urgent repair that is necessary. A feasibility study for this structure is underway, with the estimated cost of a 1,500 space garage being $40 million, money which has already been borrowed by the campus. The development of a comprehensive infrastructure and parking strategy gives us the opportunity to imagine better use of the campus plaza and current upper- and lower-level structures.

A capital plan through fiscal year 2014 totaling $265,699,444 has been submitted to the Board of Trustees. This plan includes projects in the following categories:

Building Rehabilitation	$48,050,000
Health & Safety Compliance	$21,800,000
Deferred Maintenance	$102,320,000
Equipment	$12,000,000
Information Technology	$10,700,000
New Construction	$64,579,444
Planned Replacement	$ 4,000,000
Master Plan	$ 1,250,000

The University is committed to a Master Planning process to determine the adequacy of existing resources and address a number of additional issues. These include plans for the development

and use of the land parcel north of the main campus plus a wetland delineation and environmental review, relocation of the Boston Water and Sewer Commission's dewatering operations, the possibility of expansion of the JFK Library, and discussions about a new Center for Senatorial Studies. Plans for the use of the Calf Pasture Pump Station building and development of the Boston Environmental Science and Technology (BEST) Park are also part of the capital planning process.

Standard Nine: Financial Resources

Task Force Members: Steven Schwartz (Chair), Thomas Fencil, Burton Holmes, Neil Rosenburg, David Terkla

Description:

The University of Massachusetts Boston is currently financially stable. This status has been achieved despite a loss over the last three fiscal years of $22.8 million, or 27.4 percent, of Commonwealth funding via the University's base maintenance appropriation. In addition, we have had to absorb $1.4 million of reduced Commonwealth funding for library reference materials. The total real rate of reduction since 2001 approximates an enormous loss of 34 percent.

The University has been able to sustain itself during this period of reduced support by (i) increasing student fees, (ii) participating in two early retirement programs; (iii) implementing a series of cost-reduction and reallocation efforts, (iv) drawing upon reserves, and (v) shifting much of the cost of part-time adjunct faculty to the Division of Corporate, Continuing and Distance Education ("CCDE"). These five measures have kept financial resources sufficient to sustain the University's educational goals.

UMass Boston's total annual operating budget approximates $180 million. Though it has adopted various Governmental Accounting Standards Board requirements ("GASB") and combines revenues, expenses, changes in net assets, and cash flows for external reporting purposes, the campus continues to budget and manage monies using fund accounting, i.e., segregating monies so as to ensure their appropriate use per legal, trustee, regulatory, or other requirements. Within the total operating budget there are three broad funds:

1. Restricted ($40 million) Fund monies are restricted as to use per agreement with an entity or governing body external to the University. These are largely federal and Commonwealth financial aid, grants and contracts, and restricted endowments.

2. Designated ($30 million) Fund activities generate revenues that are internally designated in support of specific programs or services; for example, the Health Services fee supports Health Services, while the amount charged to park on campus is retained by the Department of Parking and Transportation. The University has over forty designated funds. Many of these trust funds, most notably CCDE, support staff salaries and related expenses. These trust funds are intended to be self-sufficient and, on the whole, have generated surplus balances that have benefited the University by absorbing a reallocation of staff who had previously been paid by the Commonwealth. These trust funds also are assessed a general overhead charge, known as the Trust Fund Administration ("TFA") charge, currently set at 9% of expenses (17% for CCDE). The TFA assessments, collected by the UMass Boston Budget Office, support central administrative and general expenses.

3. General Operating (GO) ($110 million) Fund monies are available for the general operations of the campus, and the campus has broad flexibility in the allocation of these monies. The state appropriation comprises 55% of the GO budget, while the Educational Operations Fee ("EOF") revenue – the primary mandatory student fee – comprises 36%. The remaining 9% is primarily comprised of tuition retained and applied as tuition waivers, indirect cost recovery, and interest income. The state appropriation and EOF revenue stream are the primary focus of the campus' budgeting process; appropriations primarily support staff

salaries and EOF revenue supports general operating expenses. Allocations are made based upon approved spending plans.

In FY89, Commonwealth support comprised approximately 95% of UMass Boston's general operations ("GO") budget; by 1992, after three consecutive years of cuts, its share had declined to 77%; twelve years later, in FY04, after another three consecutive years of reductions, state appropriations comprised 55% of the GO budget and 34% of the total funds budget. Sharp increases in the EOF have historically followed significant downturns in Commonwealth funding, in effect shifting more of the burden of supporting the University to the students. During the mid-1990s increased EOF revenue allowed the University to recoup the purchasing power it had lost in the earlier recession. Since 2001, however, despite significant fee increases, the University has lost ground; in deflated dollars, the University today has less purchasing power than it did in FY89.

In the three fiscal years since 2001, UMass Boston has increased mandatory fees for a full-time Massachusetts resident undergraduate by 14, 23 and 50 percent, respectively; the increase was $1,750 in academic year 2003-2004. Though the University remains lower-cost relative to its local private competitors, the recent fee increases have undoubtedly been a hardship for many students. Approximately half of our undergraduates receive financial aid. In academic year 2002-2003, undergraduates received financial aid packages that met approximately 93% of their full need. In fiscal year 2004 (academic year 2003-04), the University allocated an additional $625,000 for need-based financial aid and approximately $800,000 for graduate student assistantships and fee waivers. (See Standard Six for more financial aid information.)

In fiscal year 2002 and again in fiscal year 2004, the Commonwealth adopted early retirement incentive programs ("ERIP") as part of the overall strategy to address the budget shortfalls. A total of 134 employees, including 60 faculty, participated in the ERIP in FY02; in FY04, the number of participants was 70, including 19 faculty. In a message to the University community, dated March 29, 2002, the Chancellor made a commitment to refill up to 80% of the positions vacated by faculty who participated in the first ERIP.

UMass Boston submitted its original FY02 operating budget to the University of Massachusetts President's Office on October 25, 2001. As directed by the President's Office, the budget assumed a 1.3% increase in the state appropriation. However, it was not until December that the campus learned that this appropriation had been cut by $3.9 million (4.7%) and our library appropriation had been reduced by $878,720 (64%) due to falling state revenue and a weak economy. In January 2002, we suffered an additional $606,102 reversion of appropriations, for a total reduction of $5.4 million. To close the gap in FY02, we increased the EOF by $350 and implemented a series of reallocations, including moving $1 million of state-funded salaries to trust funds, reverting $1.4 million of budgetary units' EOF carry-forward balances for central use, and transferring $400,000 from the overhead on external grants which comprise the Research Trust Fund (RTF) to support the Library.

Recognizing that FY03 was going to be a difficult budgetary year as well, in December 2002 the Chancellor established an ad hoc faculty-administrator Committee on Budget Reallocations ("CBR"), co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance ("VCAF") and the Provost. The charge to the CBR was to recommend expense-reduction initiatives that would not adversely affect our core functions. The CBR presented to the Chancellor a wide range of recommendations, many of which were implemented over the course of fiscal year 2003, helping to address that year's deficit.

One significant reallocation involved reassigning part-time faculty and their academic course work to CCDE since the state appropriation had become insufficient to cover part-time faculty salaries. With this initiative, the charges assessed for the courses taught by part-time faculty would be retained by CCDE and used to pay related salaries and benefits. These courses were termed "hybrid" courses. This initiative shifted approximately $1.3 million of part-time faculty expense from the maintenance appropriation to CCDE.

In anticipation of a continued decline in Commonwealth funding in FY04, on February 20, 2003, the Chancellor again convened another ad hoc faculty-administrator committee, this one known as the Committee on University Revenue and Expenses ("CURE") with a charge similar to the one given the CBR. The CURE committee's work ended in the summer and culminated in a June report to the Chancellor who then called a Town Meeting, held July 9, 2003, to allow broad community comment upon the CURE committee's recommendations; many of the CURE recommendations were authorized for implementation and have helped address the 2004 budget deficit.

Beginning in Fiscal year 1995, Boston and the other UMass campuses began preparing for the Board of Trustees an annual report on a series of financial indicators. These indicators (operating margin, financial cushion, debt service as a percentage of expenditures, and others) are generated using the audited financial statements and are intended to give the Trustees a sense of the campuses' financial conditions. UMass Boston compared favorably in FY02 with its peer group with respect to operating margin (-5.35% vs. –5.43%) and debt service as a percentage of operating expense (2.17% vs. 3.08%); since FY01, however, our financial cushion has fallen along with our state appropriation; as a result, UMass Boston's 4.48% cushion ratio in FY02 fell below the 7.10% recorded by our peer group.

Debt service for the campus has grown significantly in recent years, as we have ventured into the capital markets for resources to meet the demand for major capital repairs, infrastructure improvements, modernization of research- and science-related equipment, information technology upgrades (including PeopleSoft), and the construction and furnishing of the Campus Center, the first new building on campus in over twenty years. The assumption of debt is controlled by the budget processes (campus Operating Budget and Capital Plan) and coordinated with the President, the Treasurer, and the Board of Trustees.

The impact of the budget cuts in the early 1990's led to a 9 percent reduction in the number of faculty (primarily part-timers) and 15 percent fewer class sections. In contrast, the dramatic reduction in Commonwealth funding since fall 2000, has resulted in a 2.7 percent decline in faculty and a 4.7 percent reduction in class sections. This was made possible by transferring the source of the remuneration for nearly all part-time instructors to the new "hybrid" revenue stream mentioned above. Through this mechanism, the tuition portion of the total tuition and fees paid by students to enroll in "hybrid" sections is retained and used to cover these part-time faculty's salaries. In addition, the University has been able to maintain its per-headcount spending on academic support and student services, which compares quite favorably with that of its peer institutions.

The institution ensures the integrity of its finances through prudent financial management and organization, a well-organized budget process, appropriate control mechanisms, and timely financial reporting. The University's fiscal year, like that of the Commonwealth, is from July 1 through June 30. The University's annual Commonwealth appropriation is determined in the Commonwealth's annual budget process. This process begins approximately one year in advance of each fiscal year. UMass Boston takes part in a pro forma development of a consolidated

university system budget request that is sent to the Governor and the House and Senate Committees on Ways and Means by the President's Office. A copy of the University's request is also forwarded to the Board of Higher Education ("BHE"), which incorporates the request in whole or in part into its Commonwealth budget request for the entire public higher education system. The Governor makes funding recommendations to the Legislature. The Legislature in turn appropriates funds to the University Board of Trustees which distributes the funds to the five campuses.

Development of the general operating budget is largely a collaborative process that over the past three years has increasingly involved consultation with relevant constituencies, such as the Faculty Council through its Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee. For fiscal year 2004, the budget process also incorporated a "Town Meeting," during which the broader University community provided input on the matter of addressing the 18.6 percent cut in Commonwealth appropriations.

The UMass Boston budget process primarily focuses upon the allocation of the state appropriation and EOF revenue. In the late fall and early winter annual spending plans are developed by the major budgetary units, as guided by parameters promulgated by the Chancellor and the executive staff. Requests for new funding initiatives are expected to clearly address the goals as presented in the campus' Strategic Plan. Budget hearings are held during which deans, vice chancellors and directors of larger administrative units present their spending plans to the Chancellor. In the early fall, after UMass Boston has been notified of its share of the system maintenance appropriation, final allocations are made by the Chancellor, the VCAF, and the Provost and communicated to the units. At this point the campus' operating budget is finalized and forwarded to the President's Office.

UMass Boston develops a Mid-Year Report each February on the current financial situation of the University. The report includes a review of expenditures, identification and analysis of potential problem areas, and a forecasting of year-end actual results. The report is prepared on a cash basis to allow comparison with the University's operating budget. The report is available to the Board and executive staff as a useful tool in the development of mid-year corrective action plans.

The campus carefully monitors and controls expenditures in an attempt to insure that budgets are not exceeded, that deficits are avoided unless planned, and that spending authority is always governed by the availability of sufficient financial resources. UMass Boston utilizes a variety of tools to control budgets, including standard monthly reports generated by the PeopleSoft financial system, available on-line to all departments, which show budgeted and actual revenues, budget vs. actual expenditures, encumbrances, and balances remaining. The Budget Office also produces monthly variance reports for each vice chancellor's unit, and produces other standard and ad hoc reports to monitor spending.

All authorized positions, whether filled or vacant, are reviewed as part of the budget process, and all personnel actions appointing regular, permanent (benefited) employees undergo a "Test for Funds Availability" in PeopleSoft. In addition, UMass Boston utilizes a Personnel Budget, known as the "Green Book," to manage staffing and payroll. The Green Book includes all Commonwealth-funded and trust-funded personnel along with their associated dollar cost; it is regularly updated and monitored by the Budget Office. At the start of a fiscal year, the Green Book reflects the staffing plan as shaped by the budget process.

Since the 1995 NEASC review, the University has replaced several major administrative systems to take advantage of new technologies. The Boston campus replaced its former financial aid system in fiscal year 2001. More recently, the University replaced its human resources and financial information systems, and work is underway to implement a new student billing system. The major systems currently in use are:

- Financial System (PeopleSoft general ledger, purchasing & accounts payable)
- Student Billing and Receivables System (BRS)
- Human Resources System (PeopleSoft benefits, payroll and time & labor)
- Student Financial Aid system (Powerfaids)

All five campuses of the university system have moved to common PeopleSoft software. The human resources segment has been operational since March 15, 2002, the finance segment since June 30, 2002, and implementation of a student component is in progress and expected to be operational in March 2005. Over fiscal years 2000-2003, UMass Boston incurred $22.6 million as its share of system-wide design and implementation costs. The campus supported approximately one-third of the cost incurred with tax-exempt financing.

UMass Boston employs a comprehensive system of internal controls and our financial resources and transactions are audited annually by an external auditor in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards for colleges and universities, as adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. UMass Boston produces audited financial statements in combination with the other system campuses. In addition, UMass Boston is subject to financial and compliance audits from a variety of entities, including the external auditor, the Commonwealth's auditor, internal audit staff located at the University of Massachusetts President's office, and various other program and agency auditors.

In managing the assets under its control, the University is subject to policies developed at both campus and system levels and approved by the Board of Trustees. The policies are available via the President's Office Web site and widely distributed to offices on campus.

UMass Boston completed its first-ever capital campaign, *UMass Boston First*, in June 30, 2001. The campaign, a 5-year effort conducted under the Council for Advancement and Support of Education ("CASE") guidelines, exceeded its initial goal of $50 million, with a total of over $51 million of pledges, cash receipts, matching grants, and gifts-in-kind. Unfortunately, due to a variety of circumstances including the downturn in the stock market following September 11, 2001, much of the above did not come to fruition. One significant achievement, however, was the establishment of the campus's first four endowed professorships and its first charitable remainder trust.

The University hired a new Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement in December 2002. During the latter half of fiscal year 2003 and through much of fiscal year 2004, the office experienced a turnover in personnel, most recently with the Vice Chancellor again stepping down. The University will be searching for a new Vice Chancellor once again this year. The University recently allocated $200,000 to finance an upgrade to the office's fundraising management software, which should enhance efficiency.

Endowment assets are administered by the University of Massachusetts Foundation whose board membership includes members of the University's Board of Trustees. The Foundation is an independent non-profit corporation that secures private gifts and grants which

benefit the University and provides fundraising support services to the five-campus university system. As of June 30, 2003, the market value of the UMass system endowment funds was $146.5 million and, in fiscal year 2003, the UMass Foundation funded $5.2 million in teaching, research and public service initiatives. The market value of UMass Boston endowment funds managed by the UMass Foundation was $18,695,790 as of June 30, 2003; in fiscal year 2003, UMass Boston received approximately $727,000 of income from its endowment assets to finance numerous campus initiatives.

The University Treasurer's Office is responsible for risk management and insurance throughout the university system. The Treasurer has obtained general liability, directors and officers, automobile (for leased vehicles), and comprehensive crime coverage. The system is self-insured for vehicles it owns, meaning that it must pay from general funds agreed-upon amounts to settle claims of property damage involving University vehicles. The University and its employees are protected against tort claims through sovereign immunity under Chapter 258 of the Massachusetts General Laws. The University, as an agency of the Commonwealth, with certain exceptions, is required to be self-insured for property loss exposure. Property losses at the University are typically absorbed by the department which owns the property.

Appraisal:

As indicated in the description above, UMass Boston has demonstrated the ability to adapt to large cuts in state allocations while maintaining its mission and purpose. Despite the necessary fee increases, tuition and fees still remain at a fraction (1/3 to 1/4) of such charges at most private institutions in the Commonwealth. The continued commitment to meeting 90+% of assessed financial need has enabled the University to remain accessible to its target populations (families and students of modest means). However, the continued shift in aid from grants (e.g. Pell and Commonwealth grants) to interest-bearing loans may have already affected enrollment and is a concern for accessibility in the future.

The University has also been able to maintain the quality and diversity of its academic offerings despite the loss of financial resources. Virtually all major academic programs have been maintained and the numbers of classes offered has declined only slightly. While there has been a significant shift toward more part-time instructors in the last few years there is no evidence that the quality of the offerings have suffered. Furthermore the administration has embarked on a process of replacing many of the full-time faculty who retired in recent years due to the early retirement incentive program.

While the University still depends greatly on the annual State allocation, the Board of Trustees retains autonomy in all budget and financial planning matters. The Board, President's Office, and Chancellor at each campus are responsible for how resources are allocated. Such operational budgets are ultimately approved by the Board but originate at the campus level.

As indicated previously the University budget process involves appropriate consultation with relevant constituencies. Various levels of administration and faculty governance are involved in the year-long process. All fiscal polices are clearly stated in trustee and other documents and are implemented in compliance with ethical and sound financial practices. Appropriate control mechanisms, mid-year checks, and constant monitoring permit addressing issues raised by any operating deficit. Thus, for example in recent years significant cuts were made in non-essential areas and the reserves that had been built up have been tapped.

The institution directs its fund-raising efforts toward the fulfillment of institutional purposes and conducts them in accordance with policies that stipulate the conditions and terms under which gifts are solicited and accepted. The institution accurately represents itself to prospective donors and accurately portrays the impact that their gifts can reasonably be expected to have. Gifts are promptly used according to donors' intentions.

As a public university with a very shallow donor base of 5,000 and a limited base of 65,000 alumni, the office of Institutional Advancement has in recent years been able to attain only modest results. In fiscal years 2002 and 2003, fundraising (exclusive of private grants and contracts) has equaled $2.4 million and $1 million, respectively. Fiscal year 2004 has been a year of transition and, after undertaking planning exercises with the Chancellor and the executive staff, Institutional Advancement is poised to pursue fund-raising objectives in a number of prioritized areas in support of the broad initiatives outlined in the UMass Boston strategic plan. These areas of emphasis will include the Healey Library; student scholarships; facilities and campus aesthetic enhancements; and science and technology equipment and related infrastructure.

The performance of the UMass Foundation, which manages the University's foundation assets, has not attained the return on investments reflected in the broader equities market, recording a -0.50% return on invested assets during the five years ending June 30, 2003, versus the Dow Jones Index's 1.94%. The University will remain vigilant in monitoring the investment and distribution policies of the UMass Foundation.

The University employs a comprehensive system of internal controls to assure effective stewardship of funds. The control environment provides for proper segregation of duties and responsibilities, well-established policies and procedures, and regular reviews of fiscal practices. Having separate departments of accounts payable, budgeting, bursar, financial aid, payroll, purchasing, and property assures that transactions will be initiated and then reviewed for availability of funds and appropriateness of expenditure in accordance with policy and other requirements. (See University fiscal and general administrative policies.)

Projection:

Historically the financial support provided by the Commonwealth for public higher education has fluctuated in cycles with the state's economy. Since this appears once again to be in recovery it was expected that the University budget would not suffer the cuts faced in recent years and might anticipate modest increases in the immediate future. However, this year's Legislative appropriation to the University is expected to be level with the amount provided (including the $10 million dollar supplemental) in fiscal year 2004. In addition, the appropriation is likely to include the annualized cost of the wage increases that were adopted on a half-year basis in fiscal year 2004.

At the same time, operating costs have gone up and are projected to continue to rise. Contributing to these increasing costs are:

1. The salaries of new full-time faculty who will be recruited disproportionately in areas that demand significantly higher starting salaries (i.e. computer science, bio-statistics, accounting)
2. The operating costs of a significantly larger and in most cases older physical plant.
3. The need to invest in Capital Improvement, including the megastructure which provides the structural support for the original buildings, a new garage, and new research and teaching laboratories necessary for a comprehensive research university.
4. The cost of significant expansion in technology for teaching and research.

5. The significant increase in the proportion of operating expenses that will be needed to fund our debt service.

The University is cognizant of these rising costs and therefore has embarked on a number of initiatives to maintain and enhance its strengths. We address these challenges by supplementing the yearly state allocation with alternative sources of funds, while focusing our efforts in selected areas identified in the University's Strategic Plan. These efforts fall into categories as follows:

1. Steadily increased annual giving to the University on the part of alumni, faculty and staff, private corporations, and foundations. This will provide increasing discretionary funds that can provide a "margin of excellence**."**
2. We will continue to pursue growth in our endowments which will include seeking endowed chairs and naming opportunities for designated campus facilities.
3. Increased income from rental of University space in the Campus Center and elsewhere. Revenue from the rental of Campus Center space is budgeted at $450,000 in fiscal year 2005.
4. Significantly increased income on overhead on external grants and contracts. FY 04 produced an increase in both total income from grants and contracts and overhead. Both funding and overhead recovery should grow by 10-15 percent per year over the next few years with new faculty, the appointment of our first Associate Provost for Research, and a restructuring of the Office for Research and Sponsored Projects**.**
5. Income from sale of certain University services (e.g. the Software Engineering Research Laboratory – SERL) to businesses and pubic entities. Among the possibilities are neutral site hosting of cellular telecommunication towers on the Healey Library; expansion of the number of summer camps, including offerings in the areas of technology and mathematics; development of an exclusive marketing relationship with a provider of broadband access services that would be directly marketed to the UMass Boston community, including its alumni; development of exclusive marketing relationships in a wide range of other areas using the services of a broker; revamping the alumni travel service; and expanding the Marine Operations marina, bringing in rental income for much-in-demand boat slips and providing more on-the-water educational programming for the K-12 community.
6. Continued increases in income from continuing education and distance learning initiatives. We project a $4.1 million return to the University in FY05 and continued 5-8% percent annual increases in University support based on overall projected revenue increases of 8-12% annually. These projections primarily reflect anticipated increased enrollment in CCDE distance learning offerings and programming by CCDE's new China Program Center.
7. Modest increases in tuition and fees generally pegged to the rate of inflation in the Northeast, as was the case for academic year 2004-2005.

As previously indicated expenditures will be more closely monitored with respect to goals set forth in our University strategic plan. In addition we will continue to seek and implement efficiencies in physical plant operations, and also seek savings from system-wide efficiencies (i.e. common purchasing vendors and other administrative centralizations).

Given the record of the University over the past decade in continuing to provide high quality education, research, and service in the face of the largest cuts in public higher education in the nation, we are confident that the University will have the financial resources to fulfill its mission and implement the initiatives outlined in its strategic plan.

Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

Task Force Members: Virginia Smith Harvey (Chair), Dianne Cleary, Jon Hutton, Jeffrey Mitchell, Joseph Peters

Description:

The University of Massachusetts Boston provides public information by three methods: person-to-person, print, and electronic. In the first place, academic departments, the registrar, financial aid, admissions, advising, and other offices provide information to current and prospective students directly. University admissions staff attend off-campus information sessions almost daily in September and October and twice per week during the spring semester. On-campus sessions include an annual meeting with high school guidance counselors, an annual open house, and an annual welcome day. University-wide orientation sessions occur twice monthly in June, July, and August as well as in special sessions during drop/add. At the graduate level, departments and programs provide multiple information sessions for prospective students and annual orientation sessions for admitted students. The Enrollment Information Services Office responds to queries from prospective students and provides a "communication stream" to incoming graduate and undergraduate students. In spring, 2003 Enrollment Services responded to 15,792 inquiries that resulted in 4,005 applications; in fall, 2003, 60,739 inquiries resulted in 14,182 applications; and in spring, 2004, 13,663 inquiries resulted in 3,163 applications. Programs and departments provide person-to-person information to current students in advising sessions.

Second, the University of Massachusetts Boston has two catalogs – the *Undergraduate Catalog* and the *Graduate Bulletin* – that describe the academic programs and courses leading to degrees and certificates. Both of the catalogs include the mission statement of the University as well as information on admissions, attendance, academic honesty, and ample detail about academic opportunities and requirements. The *Catalog* and *Bulletin* appear in alternate years. The University editors, academic deans, chairs, and graduate program directors collaborate to revise the catalogs every two years.

The *Schedule of Courses* appears every semester and includes descriptions of academic requirements as well as courses offered and registration procedures. When academic requirements change, new information may appear in this publication before it appears in the *Undergraduate Catalog* or *Graduate Bulletin.* The University also publishes this information electronically on the Web. Additionally, the University publishes the *Division of Corporate and Continuing Education Bulletin* three times per year, which describes courses that can be applied toward degrees as well as non-degree program offerings.

The University also publishes the *Student Handbook*, available to all students, yearly. It expands on the information provided in the *Undergraduate Catalog* and *Graduate Bulletin* regarding student conduct and academic policies. Further, many individual academic units also publish fact sheets, program handbooks, and brochures.

Within the past ten years the University has launched several periodicals and publications to improve communication with students, alumni, legislators, state and local governmental offices, media, and the business community. These include the *UMass Boston Magazine,* an alumni magazine issued three times per year, and the *Research Bulletin: Working for Boston and the Commonwealth,* a bi-monthly bulletin focusing on research. Additional recent publications

include *UMass Boston Research*; *UMass Boston Outreach; Building, Fueling, and Shaping the Bay State Economy;* and *Celebrating Excellence: Significant Achievements in 2002-2004.* All of these publications are intended to strengthen the University's position with its constituents, which bears directly upon the reputation and financial health of the institution.

The University also provides information about our programs in *U.S. News & World Report*, *Peterson's Guides*, and local print, billboard, radio, and television advertisements. The University makes print information available in alternate format to individuals with visual disabilities on request. There are about 20 such requests every year: materials are provided either in large print or electronically, ready to be converted into computer speech via adaptive software.

Third, electronic communication has significantly expanded the University of Massachusetts Boston's means of communicating with students. The University uses several electronic methods to disseminate information. A major method is the campus Web site which contains both programmatic information and course offerings. This site averages about 26,000 "hits" per day. Annual "uptime" for the server averages better than 99.9 percent. The main Web site strives to comply with the standards of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), which ensures that content is readable across all qualified Web browsers. We also comply with requirements of Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which, through a 2001 amendment, sets criteria for accessibility of Web sites.

Students can use the UMass WISE (Web Information Systems for Everyone) system for online registration and financial aid information in addition to telephone registration, both from home and from campus. Web-based kiosks around campus give students ready access to information in a timely manner.

In 2004, a CD-ROM, entitled *Welcome to UMass Boston*, was developed for prospective undergraduates to replace the student view book. This CD-ROM is based chiefly on information from the *Undergraduate Catalog* and the *Schedule of Courses*.

Finally, the University grants free e-mail accounts to students. The electronic Community Front Page (e-mailed to all students, faculty, and staff) and video monitors at various sites across campus also communicate campus events, daily news, and academically important business such as degree application deadlines.

Appraisal:

UMass Boston strives to ensure that all forms of communication are consistent with catalog content and fairly portray the institution. With new initiatives, these forms of dissemination are becoming better coordinated. However, as yet there is no comprehensive policy for all Web material representing the University.

The *Undergraduate Catalog, Graduate Bulletin, Schedule of Courses,* and *Student Handbook*, and the campus Web site are the major publications containing information regarding the institution's mission, objectives, and expected educational outcomes; requirements, procedures, and policies related to admissions and the transfer of credit; student fees, charges, and refund policies; rules and regulations for student conduct; other items related to attending or withdrawing from the institution; academic programs, courses currently offered, and other available educational opportunities; and academic policies and procedures and the requirements for degrees and certificates.

The *Undergraduate Catalog*, *Graduate Bulletin,* program handbooks, and Web site include a list of faculty, showing degrees held and the institutions granting them. These publications also list the names of administrative officers with their positions, and the names of members of the Board of Trustees.

At the request of the University editor, every other year department chairs and graduate program directors correct the copy of the *Undergraduate Catalog* and *Graduate Bulletin* and indicate those programs, courses, and services not available for the next two years. They also remove any courses not taught for two consecutive years which will not be taught during the third consecutive year.

The University publishes and makes readily available descriptions of the size and characteristics of the student body, the campus setting, those institutional learning and physical resources from which a student can reasonably be expected to benefit, and the range of co-curricular and non-academic opportunities available to students through the following vehicles: the *Undergraduate Catalog*, the *Graduate Bulletin,* the UMass Boston Web site, *Peterson's Guide,* and the *US News & World Report*.

The institution has readily available valid documentation for any statements and promises regarding such matters as program excellence, learning outcomes, success in placement, and achievements of graduates or faculty. These include accreditation reports and AQUAD reviews.

The Enrollment Information Service makes publications available to inquirers. The office of the Vice Chancellor for University Communications and Community Relations responds to requests for information about the University from the media, legislators, and the general public on a daily basis. Information regarding the institution's most recent audited financial statement is available in the office of the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance. The institution's statements about its current accredited status are accurate and clear. The accreditation statements are reviewed before printing, and appear in the *Undergraduate Catalog* and *Graduate Bulletin.*

The University ensures that its publications are accurate and current by systematically checking the *Undergraduate Catalog*, *Graduate Bulletin*, *Schedule of Courses,* and *Student Handbook* before printing. The Office of Institutional Research and Planning carefully monitors the accuracy of information regarding the University's offerings in *U.S. News & World Report*, *Peterson's Guides,* and IPEDS. The University's print publications and released public information including media kits and event information are clearly written and of high quality. The editing of publications is accurate and timely. The University Communications Style Guide provides guidelines for print publications and electronic communications.

Campus-wide, a primary area of strength is the information provided to individual students by department, registrar, financial aid, admissions, advising, and other offices. The new Student Service Center provides one-stop, personal student services for the Financial Aid, Registrar's and Bursar's offices and thereby maximizes students' access to information.

Ten years ago, the University was proud of a recently implemented telephone communications system, a modest improvement compared to the enormous changes since then. Currently, the University has e-mail addresses for faculty, students, and staff, as well as Web sites for departments, programs, colleges, and faculty. Yet, these increased methods of communication are difficult to coordinate. Furthermore, budgetary constraints have severely taxed resources, and

the scattered quality of a commuting population limits communication opportunities often available on a residential campus. These difficulties can result in inconsistencies in information, both in print and on the Web. The University is meeting these challenges by implementing new initiatives, described below.

Projection:

The University of Massachusetts Boston has a clear vision of appropriate methods to address concerns and enhance strengths regarding public disclosure.

The University began several new initiatives in fall, 2004 to improve the coordination of published information. The Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management is reviewing the sources of official information (both print and electronic) to identify inconsistencies and inaccuracies. After compiling this information, she will be forming a committee composed of faculty, administrators, and staff to develop and establish clear and concise communication polices and procedures that:

1) Determine the variety of audiences and targeted messages;
2) Suggest templates so information provided in brochures, in the catalog, and on the Web is accurate and consistent across colleges, departments, and programs;
3) Detail the process for reviewing and publishing this information; and
4) Work to prevent inaccuracies.

This committee will distribute communication policies and procedures to all employees, review the policies and procedures regularly, and monitor their implementation. It will also ensure that communications are accessible to all, including those with disabilities. In addition, the committee will evaluate requests for communication projects and explore methods to reduce waste and ensure a coherent University marketing effort.

The Registrar and Provost's Office have also begun to develop an electronic data base of official academic information for print, electronic, and person-to-person communications. This database will ease the coordination between print and electronic documentation and clarify the approval process for program and course additions and changes for the *Undergraduate Catalog*, the *Graduate Bulletin*, program handbooks, and electronic communication, while simultaneously considering marketing and communication realities.

The Chief Information Officer reconvened the BIT (Boston Information Technology) Council in 2004 to better coordinate electronic information and implemented the August 1999 Board of Trustees' Web policy and communication policies relating to the handling of electronic data and e-mail communications. In addition, the Chief Information Officer has begun to develop student Web portals to give students better access to information.

The Provost's office, Chief Information Officer, and University Web master have collaborated to develop procedures, including a calendar, for regularly updating the Web site and removing no-longer-accurate material (archiving what should be preserved, such as descriptions of academic requirements that continue to apply to students who enrolled in earlier periods).

In addition, the following actions are projected:

1) Under the direction of the Provost's Office**,** the University will develop a more detailed electronic database of information that includes syllabi, grants, and faculty publications

and conference presentations. It is anticipated that this will begin with electronic submissions of annual reports and that the database will be linked to the Web.

(2) The University will continue to make available printed bulletins and catalogues as well as documentation on the Web. Whether the course schedule should continue to be available in print as well as on the Web is under study by the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management**.**

(3) To speed up the academic approval process, the Provost's Office and Faculty Council will be considering the following: the development of an expedited review process for minor program changes, the use of default dates to move material on to the next level, and the development of a "preview" notification to announce that a change is pending.

(4) The Chief Information Officer, in conjunction with the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management**,** will be exploring methods to increase student use of U Mass Boston e-mail accounts.

Standard Eleven: Integrity

Task Force Members: Asgedet Stefanos (Chair), Elsa Auerbach, Reyes Coll-Tellechea, Angeline Ellison, Mark Preble, Madison Thompson, Philip L. Quaglieri

Description:

The University of Massachusetts Boston strives to adhere to the highest ethical standards in the conduct of all its affairs. As a public institution of higher education in Massachusetts, UMass Boston is governed by standards of performance that derive fundamentally from the laws of the Commonwealth, including the act of 1964 of the Massachusetts General Court (legislation, Chap. 75, Section 1 of the General Law of Massachusetts) which established the UMass Boston campus under the authority and responsibility of the Board of Trustees (section 20 of chapter 15). The principles and values of UMass Boston's mission and vision statement form the backdrop against which the ethical standards of the University can be assessed.

The ethical standards, codes, and procedures that members of the University community are expected to follow are articulated in a variety of documents and publications. These include Board of Trustees and President's Office documents, undergraduate and graduate handbooks, the Academic Personnel Policy Handbook (known as the Red Book), faculty and staff union contracts, and numerous memoranda. UMass Boston's commitment to integrity also encompasses fairness and protection rights, free academic inquiry, integrity in personnel policies and practice, nondiscrimination in education and employment, financial probity, proper public disclosure, integrity in relation to external constituencies, and honesty and integrity in the accreditation self-study process.

Students are recognized as adults and therefore should receive the respect and assume the responsibilities that come with this status. UMass Boston is committed to the principle of free expression and exploration of ideas in an atmosphere of civility and mutual respect. Although the nature of an academic community is to provide a milieu for the expression of the widest range of opinions, it does not provide a license for bigotry in the form of demeaning, discriminatory speech or actions (See the Resolution in support of pluralism and Policy against intolerance, *Undergraduate Student Handbook*). Beyond the issues traditionally addressed by affirmative action, UMass Boston has a broad set of diversity initiatives in recruitment and admission. Academic honesty is demanded throughout the institution, and students are required to provide full attribution for all work.

UMass Boston recognizes its responsibility to provide students with clear and accurate information about what is expected of them and what their rights are as students. This information is set forth in the Code of Student Conduct. Regarding student privacy rights, FERPA prohibits release of information to outside agencies without written consent.

UMass Boston asserts firmly its adherence to the tradition of academic freedom to teach and study any given field. It recognizes faculty rights in the areas of research, publications, class discussion, political belief and/or affiliation, and the selection of textbooks and other teaching materials (See Red Book, Article II, Section 2). The MTA/FSU contract sets out procedures to insure fairness in relation to faculty and protections of academic freedom, including the freedom to teach and study a given field. One recent feature of this contract is the Periodic Multi-Year Review Policy (PMYR). By evaluating the performance of tenured faculty on a regular basis,

this policy insures compliance with the commitment to academic excellence; at the same time, it spells out a procedure for protecting faculty rights in this process and insuring that faculty will be treated with fairness.

UMass Boston subscribes to the University of Massachusetts Intellectual Property Policy which defines policy and procedure regarding such matters as contractual obligations, copyrightable work, commercialization of intellectual property, and distribution of revenue derived from commercialization.

UMass Boston's ethical personnel and management policies are found in its human resource by-laws, affirmative action codes, collective bargaining contract, guidelines for distance learning delivery, and disability protection. As a public university, UMass Boston is governed by the general principles set forth in the state conflict of interest law, Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L.) c.268A. That law prohibits public employees from engaging in certain conduct such as accepting incompatible employment or using an official position to secure unwarranted benefits. The law also contains a broad "appearance of conflict" provision including an anti-nepotism provision. To inform members of the UMass Boston community of the requirements of the state ethics law, the University issues annual explanatory memoranda.

As a public university, The University of Massachusetts Boston adheres to all federal and state regulations requiring non-discrimination in education and employment. Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its subsequent amendments, there shall be no discrimination in employment based upon race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. In support of that effort, guidelines for recruitment committees are published and distributed as needed. Additionally, the Director of Affirmative Action meets with each recruitment committee chairperson to discuss efforts to ensure a diverse pool of applicants and then reviews and approves each pool of candidates.

In the case of internal complaints of discrimination, grievance and hearing procedures are enforced. The Director of Affirmative Action meets with the complainant to determine if there are grounds for a formal investigation. If such a determination is made, there is first an attempt to resolve the issues on an informal basis. If this is not possible then a determination is made as to whether there has been a violation of the governing policies and procedures. If a violation is found to have taken place, it is the responsibility of the involved department and administrators along with Human Resources to decide the appropriate form of redress.

In the case of alleged sexual harassment, every effort is made to first ensure the safety of the alleged victim both immediately and in any subsequent interactions with the alleged violator. Actions taken can include immediate dismissal or expulsion.

The collective bargaining agreements outline grievance procedures for faculty, librarians, and staff at UMass Boston. (See Collective Bargaining Agreements.)

As for academic integrity, all the principles and standards that sustain it are just as applicable in the online environment as they are in the classroom. Given the ease with which information flows across the Internet, it is particularly important that every student understand and respect the rules governing academic honesty. The Distance Learning program operates on the assumption that students in class are thoroughly familiar with the UMass Boston Code of Student Conduct. Distance Learning policy and bylaws are presented in program brochures.

UMass Boston has complied with all the NEASC Commission on Higher Education's policies and guidelines regarding the self-study and accreditation process to assure it has been conducted openly and honestly.

Appraisal:

In order to protect the rights and motivate students to fully accept their responsibilities the University endeavors to adhere to published policies and to apply them equally to all students. Students' rights are protected federally and within the University system. If students feel they have not been treated fairly, they report the information to Student Affairs, which in turn investigates the charges. The Chief Judicial Officer on campus is responsible for administering the Code of Student Conduct. Cases are handled in a timely and professional manner. Data on grievances, complaints, and violations are kept at the offices of Student Affairs, Affirmative Action, and Human Resources.

Our policies are clearly stated and are publicized widely; however, the University runs into instances where faculty and/or students are unaware of the procedures to follow when confronted with a violation. The staff of Student Affairs makes an effort to educate the University community by attending various administrative, faculty, and student meetings to go over current policies. Because of the importance of continual assessment of the policies and practices that affect students, the Code of Student Conduct is currently undergoing revision. The Office of Student Affairs admits that it faces a challenge in that not all information gets conveyed to all faculty. Judging by student comments, articles in the student newspaper, and the participation of students and faculty in various governance structures and forums, students enjoy substantial freedom to speak, study, and learn.

The University takes its ethical responsibilities seriously and has declined employment to highly qualified faculty and administrators who have requested employment for spouses. The University also initiated an ethics investigation when two employees accepted a vendor-sponsored trip. State Ethics Commission rules require the confidentiality of the outcome of the investigation. However, realizing that the employees had likely accepted the trip because they were unaware of the prohibition, the University immediately arranged for mandatory ethics training for all administration employees. In 2003, the University also discharged a high-level administrator after learning that credentials had been falsified. However, although the University's responses to the above incidents were appropriate, they were reactive, rather than proactive. The University needs to continue its efforts to train all employees about their ethical responsibilities and should develop a system of background checks for candidates for employment.

Human Resources could improve its annual employee appraisal system for professional and classified employees. To fulfill the fundamental promises contained in the Policy on Principles of Employee Conduct (T96-136), the University must ensure that employees fully understand their ethical responsibilities and the degree to which they have met them.

Although nearly every employee on campus is covered by a collective bargaining agreement that contains a grievance procedure, very few grievances are filed. The contractual grievance procedure is the preferred method for resolving disputes and should be encouraged. It may be there are few causes for grievance on our campus. On the other hand, people may fear retaliation and thus do nothing or resort to alternative means. The University is considering a volunteer ombudsman program, where employees are trained to assist peers in resolving disputes that do not fall under other dispute resolution procedures.

The Affirmative Action Office works closely with Human Resources and all Vice Chancellors to ensure the requirements of the search process are observed and that all Affirmative Action goals are considered. Despite recent retirements of senior minority staff and faculty, our percentage of minority staff and faculty remains essentially unchanged. While there was not an opportunity to hire on a one-for-one basis, extra care has been given to ensure consideration of minority candidates in the applicant pools and we expect that this will improve our overall statistics.

Grievance and sexual harassment procedures are made available to each complainant when they report their grievance to the Affirmative Action Officer. There are postings on bulletin boards and materials are included in new employee orientation packets as well as in new student orientation packets advising people of their rights and where to seek assistance. Additionally, the Chancellor has instituted the Council for the Promotion of a Diverse and Civil Community (DivCiv Council), which has the charge of addressing issues of intolerance on campus. Current projects include the development of a Diversity Resource Guide for UMass Boston, a poster advertising the DivCiv Council, and an official anti-intolerance statement. A task force is also under development to address the issue of retention of faculty of color. UMass Boston is participating in a volunteer partnership with the Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights to address the needs of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered members of our community as well as other minority communities.

In terms of financial integrity, UMass Boston employs a comprehensive system of internal controls of its finance, reporting, and auditing policies to assure effective stewardship of funds. Financial resources and transactions are audited annually by an external auditor in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards for colleges and universities, as adopted by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Since the 1995 review, the University has replaced several major administrative systems to take advantage of new technologies. For example, we replaced our former financial aid system in fiscal year 2001, and more recently, we replaced our human resources and financial information systems. Work is also underway to implement a new student billing system.

In its relations with outside agencies and the general public, the University consolidated all of its community relations and outreach activities into one office, the Office of Communications and Community Relations, in 2001. This consolidation allows for consistent procedures and policies for all external relations. In addition, it allows for all outreach, community relations, legislative affairs, publications, and public and media relations to be coordinated within one office. The Office is currently developing a document with guidelines for these activities.

The University aims to make its policies and activities clear and accessible through the publication of pamphlets and flyers distributed to the general public. These documents articulate the ways in which the University enacts its mission, highlighting research, outreach, and communications activities (e.g., *Office of Community Relations @ UMass Boston Fact Sheet*; *UMass Boston Research*; *UMass Boston Outreach*)**.** Further evidence of UMass Boston's commitment to its urban mission can be found in the Office of Community Relations documents outlining its Dorchester and South Boston outreach activities (*UMass Boston Partners with Dorchester 2001-2003; South Boston Outreach Activities*) which list 29 partnerships/ initiatives and 7 partnerships, respectively.

Further evidence of UMass Boston's attempts to adhere to ethical standards in its relations with outside constituencies can be found in the Annual Report of the Office of University Communications and Community Relations which lists key goals for community relations including maintaining good relations with surrounding neighborhoods and supporting the use of space and facilities for the University's external communities. An example of the University's commitment to ensuring ethical interactions with outside constituencies is the establishment of a Community Advisory Committee consisting of both internal and external people to review any new piece of outdoor art on campus grounds**.** When the issue of residence halls on campus arose (with some community concern about their impact), the University hired a third party to do a community impact study; this firm worked with the immediately surrounding neighborhood to identify issues and develop the scope of the study.

In terms of media policies, the University strives to be responsive to media requests within guidelines mandated by federal statute (e.g. FERPA guidelines). No student information or personnel matter is discussed with the press.

UMass Boston is in good standing and in compliance with NEASC's guidelines. The campus Institutional Liaison Officer, the Associate Provost, has responded to all NEASC's requests, attended its annual meetings, and participated in workshops and other activities which have fostered an open relationship with the Association.

Projection:

The Office of Student Affairs, along with relevant constituencies is currently engaged in reviewing and revising our Code of Student Conduct. Once the Code is revised the Office will develop a strategy to disseminate the new Code to the University community.

As far as the Student Grievance Procedure on Academic Matters is concerned, the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs will support efforts to develop new models and to develop dialogue around those models. Proposals for change, however, can only be affirmed through the governance structure. The Office of Student Affairs seeks to develop a more systematized approach to this process in order to assure that revision and new regulations and policies are widely disseminated.

Although the disciplinary and grievance procedures for students appear to work well for most students, the Student Affairs office is planning to review and possibly standardize its approach to grievance procedures for academic disputes. Colleges often follow different procedures. Moreover, the procedures are not always clearly stated in department, college, or University materials. The Office of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs limits its involvement in these issues to violations of a student's due process. Other suggested efforts to clarify procedures include conducting annual meetings with faculty/staff and creating a brochure to disseminate information across the campus.

Although the Board of Trustees has established procedures for dealing with charges of misconduct in research and scholarly activities for the Amherst campus, no corresponding policy is specified for UMass Boston in Trustee documents. The Provost's Office is working with the Faculty Council to extend this Board of Trustees' policy to the UMass Boston campus, including a clear and explicit organizational structure to investigate all complaints of ethical violations, to assess and evaluate patterns of misconduct, and to uphold or reverse findings.

UMass Boston should strengthen its efforts to retain and promote junior minority staff and faculty. Further, it should create more avenues for minority staff, faculty, and students to register concerns. It also should finalize the Diversity Resource Guide for current and prospective students, staff, and faculty and hold more diversity-related programming for the University community as a whole. While UMass Boston has good minority representation in its student body, with increased resources it could offer more training for supervisors and managers as well as more workshops for student leaders to fight intolerance. Additionally, training for all supervisors and managers on ethical responsibilities in the hiring and treatment of employees and students would strengthen knowledge of and compliance with existing policies and procedures.

As we strive to enhance the integrity and honesty of our management operations, we have committed ourselves to a path of continual improvement. In the future, we will consider new models and practices that will enable us to do more, and to do better, in achieving the best practices in administration and management. The Chancellor will consider the appointment of a campus ombudsman to provide additional oversight on our (non-contractual) relationships within our community.

Financial management procedures generally require multiple levels of review and "sign offs," and as such, situations involving abuse or intentional dishonesty rarely occur. As the University strives to be more entrepreneurial, or as new issues arise (e.g., changes in patent and copyright laws or funding requirements of agencies), the University must learn to move quickly in adopting policies that are consistent with our prevailing standards for ethical behavior. The University has already shown its ability to do so with the implementation of the new financial aid system in 2001 and its current adoption of the PeopleSoft system.

UMass Boston should continue to build strong collaborative relations with neighboring institutions and organizations. We will monitor the impact of any new physical or institutional changes which may affect surrounding communities.

Given that integrity is a core value of any institution of higher education, it behooves UMass Boston to develop concrete, centralized, and transparent processes, organizational procedures, and guidelines to enable access to and implementation of policies and standards. To this end, the Chancellor will consider establishing an institutional entity which oversees all matters related to integrity and creating a guidebook which centralizes information on policies and procedures for addressing integrity issues.

Appendix: Bibliographic Materials Linked to the Self-study Sections

Overview

The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation

Standard One: Mission and Purposes

Main Dates in UMass Boston's History
UMass Boston Mission and Vision Statements
The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation
Letter from Provost Announcing Strategic Plan
AQUAD: Academic Quality Assessment and Development
Statistical Portrait
Common Data Set
National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
University Performance Measurement System (UPMS)
2002 NSSE survey
Diversity at the University of Massachusetts Boston
Languages Spoken by UMass Boston Students
President's Office Alumni Survey
2003 Common Data Set
2004 UPMS Report
Summary of Sponsored Program Activity
AQUAD procedures
University Planning Council
Committee on University Revenues and Expenditures (CURE)
1995 NEASC review
2002 Retention study
Freshmen Retention Presentation
Urban Universities Portfolio Project
Title III Proposal
Urban Mission Coordinating Committee
Urban Mission Key Working Principles
June 9, 2004 Special Faculty Council meeting with President Wilson

Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Appraisal and Review of the Previous Strategic Plan
1995 NEASC Reaccreditation Self-Study
2000 NEASC Fifth-Year Interim Report
2000 NEASC Report Data Tables
The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation
University Performance Measurement System (UPMS)
UMass Boston's Peer Institutions
Committee on University Revenues and Expenditures (CURE)
2004 UPMS Indicators
Fast Facts

Statistical Portrait
One Year Retention Rates for Fall Entrants
General Education program
2003 Faculty Council General Education Committee Report
Writing Proficiency Requirement (WPR)
Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD)
College of Liberal Arts 2004 Annual Report
College of Management 2004 Annual Report
College of Nursing and Health Sciences 2004 Annual Report
College of Public and Community Service 2004 Annual Report
College of Science and Mathematics 2004 Annual Report
Graduate College of Education 2004 Annual Report
McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies 2004 Annual Report
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business
Consortium for Student Retention Data Exchange (CSRDE)
2002 Retention Study
Assessment of Spring 2001 First Year Seminars
Assessing Student Writing in the Spring 2001 First Year Seminars
Sociology M.A. Program Assessment
OIRP Web site
Retention Planning, August 2003

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

Board of Trustees
University of Massachusetts system
Formal Authorization of UMass Boston - Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 75
Faculty Council
College of Liberal Arts (CLA) Senate
College of Science and Mathematics (CSM) Senate
College of Management (CM) Assembly
College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) Senate
Graduate College of Education (GCE) Senate and (GCE By-Laws)
College of Public and Community Service (CPCS) Policy Board
Chart of Faculty Committee Involvement
Undergraduate Student Senate
Graduate Student Assembly
Faculty Staff Union
SEIU Local 888
Graduate Employee Organization / UAW Local 1596
Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Boston, and Worcester
Division of Corporate, Continuing, and Distance Education (CCDE)
CCDE Annual Report 03-04

Standard Four: Programs and Instruction

Annual Faculty Report
Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR)
Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD)
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education
AACSB International
NCATE
Commonwealth Honors Programs
National Collegiate Honors Council
CPCS Undergraduate Competency-based Curriculum
Office of Institutional Research and Programs (OIRP)
2004 Graduating Senior Survey (GSS)
2002 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Results
2002 Alumni survey
2003 Graduating Student Survey
NCLEX Examination
Massachusetts Teacher Certification Exam
University Honors program
Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach (OSLCO)
2004 Faculty Council General Education Committee report
Fast Facts - Campus Enrollment
Graduate Degree Requirements
The UMass Boston 2008 Strategic Plan: Retention, Research, Reputation
UMass Boston Institutes and Centers
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Summary of Sponsored Program Activity
Nantucket Field Station
Trotter Institute
Gerontology Institute
Institute for Asian American Studies
Gaston Institute
Annual Faculty Review
Academic Personnel Policy
Periodic Multi-Year Review
Center for the Improvement of Teaching (CIT)
Instructional Technology Center (ITC)
Office of Undergraduate Admissions
Massachusetts Board of Higher Education (BHE) Admission Standards
Directions for Student Potential (DSP)
One Year Retention Rates for Fall Entrants, 1997-2002 Cohorts
An Analysis of One-Year Retention of the University of Massachusetts Boston Fall 2000 First Time Full Time Freshman Cohort
A Strategic Approach to Freshmen Retention at UMass Boston
Experiences in Fall 2003 Paired Courses: Responses from Students and Faculty
Retention Planning, August 2003

Standard Five: Faculty

Academic Personnel Policy of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, Boston, and Worcester
Graduate Employees Organization Bargaining Agreement
Statistical Portrait, Table 38: Fall 2003
A.A.U.P. Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure
Sexual Harassment Policy - Trustee document T82-037
Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR)
FSU Collective Bargaining Agreement
University Guidelines on Faculty Workload (T74-111)
Carnegie classification
Annual Faculty Report and Evaluation of Professional Activities
Internal Grant Competitions
Center for the Improvement of Teaching (CIT
Instructional Technology Center (ITC)
Sabbatical Leave Policy

Standard Six: Student Services

University Advising Center
Study Abroad Office
International Student Services
Office of Career Services
The Office of Academic Support Programs
Pre-Collegiate and Educational Support Programs
Lillian Semper Ross Center for Disability Services
Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement Program
Office of Financial Aid
Office of Merit-Based Scholarships
Office of Student Employment
University Registrar's Office
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
Code of Student Conduct
Office of Student Life
The Beacon Leadership Project
Office of Service Learning and Community Outreach
Department of Athletics
University Health Services
Interfaith Campus Ministry and the Interfaith Chapel
Office of Student Housing
Early Learning Center
October 2003 Advising Survey Report
Career Services Consultation Report
Council for the Advancement of Standards
Department of Athletics Strategic Plan

Standard Seven: Library and Information Resources

Joseph P. Healey Library
Healey Library 2000-2004 Strategic Plan
Boston Library Consortium
Massachusetts Conference of Chief Librarians in Public Higher Education Institutions
Fenway Library Consortium
Boston Regional Library System
Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Nelinet
Library E-journals Portal
Library Databases
Library Electronic Reserves Service
Association of College and Research Libraries
Center for Library Instruction (CLI)
Taylor Scholars
Library Technology Plan
Library Signature Initiatives
2004 Healey Library Annual Report
Curriculum Resource Center (CRC)
LibQUAL+
Online Computer Library Center (OCLC)
Information Delivery Services survey summary
IT Strategic Plan - Moving IT Forward
Instructional Technology Center (ITC)
COSTS Project
Educause Core Data Survey
Archives and Special Collections

Standard Eight: Physical Resources

Campus Center
Nantucket Field Station
2003 Walker Parking Consultants Report Executive Summary
2004 Walker Parking Consultants Report Update
Capital Plan FY2005-FY2014
Summary of Capital Projects

Standard Nine: Financial Resources

CURE Recommendations
University of Massachusetts Foundation
University System Fiscal and General Administrative Policies
Software Engineering Research Laboratory – SERL

Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

UMass Boston Web Home Page
Rehabilitation Act - Section 508
WISE (Web Information Systems for Everyone)
Community Front Page
University Communications Style Guide

Standard Eleven: Integrity

UMass Boston Mission and Vision Statement
Academic Personnel Policy - Red Book
Resolution in support of pluralism
Policy against intolerance
Code of Student Conduct
Periodic Multi-Year Review Policy (PMYR)
University of Massachusetts Intellectual Property Policy
Conflict of Interest Law - Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L.) c.268A
Collective Bargaining Agreements
Policy on Principles of Employee Conduct (T96-136)
UMass Amherst Research Misconduct Policy