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Provost Langley’s charge to the committee

The Academic Enrollment Planning Committee (AEP) is charged with making recommendations to the Strategic Planning Task Force about the appropriate enrollment and student mix for 2025 with an eye to how that mix will contribute to the vision of the university as a major public research university, its range and quality of programs, its research standing and reputation, and its ability to become a destination of first choice for students, faculty, and staff. Toward that end, we have been asked to suggest the steps that will need to be taken by 2015 and 2020 to get us to our desired goal in 2025. We have also been asked to prepare a preliminary report this spring that will inform the FY11 budget process of the resources needed to address the expected student growth of 4% for fall 2010. That growth, primarily in an increasing number of continuing students, is expected to result in approximately 596 additional students in the fall—approximately 74% undergraduate and 26% graduate if current enrollment trends continue. When the provost issued the charge to the committee he asked the committee to:

- Plan for 2025 in 5-year phases
- Focus on the student mix on campus including % undergraduate vs. graduate; % in-state vs. national and international; % freshmen vs. transfer students; % honors students.
- Consider how student mix will contribute to the overall vision of the university and its future research standing, ability to improve retention rates, and retention of tuition.
- Think about current developments in the state—namely increased federal funding for community colleges and state colleges becoming universities—and their implications for us.
- Think about how the student mix will contribute to the quality of our programs and how it will help the intellectual environment on campus by providing all students with exposure to broad intellectual diversity.

Overview of How the Committee Carried Out Its Charge

The AEP met seven times as a full group, posted its materials to its strategic planning wiki site, and engaged in additional communication electronically. It also created two work groups: a writing work group composed of Joan Liem, Kathy Teehan, Joan Becker, and Jennifer Brown;
and a space work group composed of Anita Miller, David Cesario, and Katherine Hope. Those work groups had additional meetings and email exchanges. The AEP solicited and discussed reports from various units on campus, collected and discussed data on our enrollment history and on peer institutions, and formulated two reports. The committee prepared a preliminary report that was submitted on May 3, 2010, regarding instructional resources and support resources needed in central academic support and enrollment management offices in order to address anticipated student growth in FY11. That report can be found in Appendix A. A PowerPoint presentation of that report was also made at the open budget hearings conducted in mid-May. That presentation can also be found in Appendix A. The committee then prepared this report, summarizing the data gathered and the discussions that went on at committee meetings, and setting forth its recommendations and identifying work that remains to be done during the implementation phase of the strategic planning process.

**Major Goals**

The provost’s charge to the committee resulted in three major goals:

- To repeat and improve on the work of last year’s Growth Committee to inform the FY11 budget process regarding the resources needed to support student growth on campus during the coming year.
- To make recommendations regarding student mix for 2025 that will contribute to the overall vision of the university, its range and quality of programs, its research standing and reputation, its ability to improve retention rates, and its retention of tuition.
- To make recommendations regarding resources needed to support the desired mix of students for 2025, including resources needed to improve the quality of academic programs and the full range of support services we provide students.

The committee has completed its first goal of preparing a report to inform the FY11 Budget process regarding the resources needed to support student growth on campus during the coming year. We therefore focus here on our other two major goals: 1) to make recommendations regarding student mix for 2025 that will contribute to the overall vision of the university; and 2) to make recommendations regarding resources to support the desired mix of students for 2025, including resources needed to improve the quality of academic programs and support services we currently provide students. We had several key objectives in carrying out our work toward these goals:

- To examine our enrollment history over the last five years and allow it to inform our projections for the future.
- To review data from peer and aspirant peer institutions and allow this review to inform our deliberations regarding UMass Boston enrollment projections and student mix goals.
• To review projections from Enrollment Management and the deans on known programmatic development plans and likely enrollment growth and decline on a college-by-college basis.
• To begin to devise formulas for the resources needed – faculty, staff, space, technology, and operating budgets – to achieve the desired growth in programs and students by 2025.

The report that follows summarizes our work to date on these goals and objectives. Before setting forth that summary, we would like to share several critical overarching recommendations that have emerged from committee deliberations. We recognize as a committee that the university must evolve and grow if it is to become a major public research university by 2025, but we also recognize that we are currently a university with enormous deficits in many core areas and we cannot continue to add new programs and new students without addressing these deficits. Therefore, going forward we recommend that:

• we attempt to balance commitments to appropriate growth with commitments to strengthening existing programs and the administrative and student support operations that they require;
• we prioritize retention of the students we have over seeking to admit each year an ever-increasing number of new students;
• we work to steadily improve the graduation rates of currently enrolled students\(^1\); and
• we grow selectively in those areas where we have a strong foundation on which to build.

Furthermore, to do these things:

• we must carefully assess and work to strengthen and improve existing academic and support programs for our students;
• we must establish as a top priority increasing both the number of tenure-stream faculty and their proportion of the total faculty, especially in those areas where the IFTE faculty-student ratio is highly problematic; and
• we need to do a very careful assessment of the faculty, staff, administrative structures, space, information technology, and operating budgets needed to support all students (existing and new) and provide them with the highest quality education.

**Goal 1. FY11 Resource Recommendations Associated with Student Growth**

The AEP submitted a report on May 3, 2020, that contains its recommendations regarding resources needed to address student growth in FY11. That report can be found in Appendix A and should be viewed as an integral part of this final report. The recommendations within that report are not repeated here.

**Goal 2. Recommendations Regarding Student Mix in 2025**

**Objective 1: To study our enrollment history over the last five years.**

\(^1\) The Retention Committee will be recommending a process by which the university *will* establish numerical targets for retention and graduation for 2015 and 2025.
Jennifer Brown prepared a report for the AEP on enrollment trends from 2005 to 2009. That report is available in Appendix B. In it she summarized our enrollment history, breaking down enrollments by undergraduate and graduate students, freshmen and transfer students, online and on-ground enrollments, and enrollments by colleges. In the broadest terms,

- Headcount Enrollment at UMass Boston has increased 26% since 2005 to 14,912 in fall 2009 and is expected to surpass 15,000 by fall 2010.
- Undergraduate enrollment has increased by 2,083 (23%). Graduate enrollment has increased by 976 (33%).
- Instructional Full Time Equivalent (IFTE) numbers (which are based upon credit activity) have increased at an even higher pace than enrollment. They have increased by 46% due to increased full-time attendance of our students.
- Undergraduate IFTE has increased 40%. Graduate IFTE has increased 68%.

**Instructional Resources and Enrollment Growth**

UMass Boston has been engaged in a very aggressive rate of growth since 2005 that was undertaken as a result of the last strategic plan that had as a goal reaching 15,000 students by fall 2010, a goal we have accomplished. Unfortunately, the growth in students has not been matched by similar growth in tenure-stream faculty, in support staff and administrative support structures, in space, in information technology systems, or in operating budgets necessary to address the increase in students effectively. Table 1 below shows the rapid pace of instructional demand over the last five years. While the undergraduate student IFTE has increased by 40%, over the same time period growth in tenure-stream faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) has increased only by 9%. Furthermore, if one considers FTE tenure-stream faculty as a percentage of total faculty, in fall 2005 we had 63% tenure-stream faculty. In fall 2009 that percentage had fallen to 56% and the ratio of IFTE students to tenure-stream faculty has increased steadily from 22.1:1 in fall 2005 to 28.0:1 in fall 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Changes in Instructional Resources Relative to Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Instructional Full Time Equivalent (IFTE)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount Full-Time Tenure-Stream Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of IFTE Students to Tenure-Stream Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount Full-Time Non-Tenure-Stream and Part-Time Faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, not all of the new tenure-stream faculty members hired in recent years have been added in the areas of most significant student growth. For example, some positions have been added to prepare for new programs where students are anticipated in the future but are not
currently enrolled, and some have been added as much to enhance the research mission of the university as its teaching mission. Too much of the new student instructional demand to date has been by necessity accommodated by adding large numbers of full- and part-time, non-tenure-track faculty and by increasing class size without providing adequate supports for large classes. The number of non-tenure-track faculty has grown from 451 in fall 2005 to 567 in fall 09, an increase of 116 or 26%. We cannot continue to add students without simultaneously adding tenure-stream faculty in those areas where we are experiencing the greatest growth without greatly diminishing the quality of the education we offer our students. In Table 2 we present IFTE tenure-stream faculty-to-student ratios by college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Headcount of student majors (including undeclared)</th>
<th>Student FTE (generated by students with majors within the college)</th>
<th>Student IFTE (generated by students receiving instructional credit within the college)</th>
<th>Tenure-stream faculty headcount/FTE</th>
<th>Full-time-equivalent faculty (includes part time faculty)</th>
<th>IFTE students to tenure-stream faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>5343</td>
<td>4227</td>
<td>5426</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>30:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSM</td>
<td>2077</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>2323</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>49:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPCS</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>10:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGS</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13383</td>
<td>10465</td>
<td>11116</td>
<td>393.0</td>
<td>676.3</td>
<td>28:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Additional faculty FTE are found in CCDE (22.6)
Academic support services and academic affairs (12.0)

It is clear from Table 2 that there exist significant disparities in these ratios among the colleges. These disparities must be addressed if we are to reach our vision and enrollment goals for 2025. The AEP recommendations making hiring tenure-stream faculty and addressing the disparities in tenure-stream faculty-to-student ratios among the colleges a very high priority within the strategic plan. It is a priority upon which virtually all other priorities rest. Discussion of a hiring plan for tenure-stream faculty can be found in the Academic Affairs Subcommittee report. As the Academic Affairs Committee notes, we need to attend not only to how many tenure-stream faculty we add in the next 15 years, but to hiring research faculty consistent with our vision of becoming a major public research university and to providing those faculty with teaching loads supportive of our research expectations of them.
Enrollment Projections for 2025

In Table 3 below we modeled three patterns of enrollment growth going forward. The first would continue our pattern of aggressive enrollment growth over the last five years (20% over five years) and would have us at over 25,000 students by 2025. The second reflects more modest growth (10% every five years) and moves us to almost 20,000 students by 2025. The third reflects very modest growth (5% every five years), and has us approaching 18,000 students by 2025. The AEP’s position on overall enrollment growth is that our enrollment goals for 2015, 2020, and 2025 must depend on the resources available to the institution to accommodate student growth adequately. We further note that enrollment growth can be brought about in a variety of ways including: doing a better job of retaining the students we currently have; enabling more of those students to take full- rather than part-time course loads; adding more students in existing programs; increasing online enrollments; and adding new programs and students. The AEP recommends making improving the retention of current students a high priority for the next five years and looks forward to the recommendations of the Retention Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning Task Force on how we might strive to do this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Models of Enrollment Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current: 5% per year; 20% over 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest Growth: 10% every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Modest Growth: 5% every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate HC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 2: Reviewing Data from Peer and Aspirant Peer Institutions.

Two Tables in Appendix C summarize data from peer and aspirant peer institutions. We have reviewed these data and offer the following observations.

Size of the Student Body:

The total headcount at the peer institutions we have been looking at varies from approximately 12,500 to over 36,000 students. UMass Boston is at the low end of the group. Only UMBC, UML, and UMKC have lower headcount enrollments than we do. UMass Boston and UMass Lowell also have the lowest percentage of faculty to student headcount of any of the peer institutions. Discussions have been underway in the Strategic Planning Task Force about a 20,000-student head count by 2025, the modest growth model in Table 3 above. We strongly recommend, however, that we only grow to 20,000 as we have the faculty, the staff, the space, and the operating budgets to accommodate that growth effectively.
Mix of Graduate and Undergraduate Students:

The percentage of graduate students at the peer institutions we have been studying ranges from 17% to 39%, putting us right in the middle at 26%. Four schools have a higher percentage of graduate students than we do, but most if not all of those have medical and/or law schools. Six schools have a lower percentage of graduate students than we do, and three have 26% as we do. It thus seems unlikely that we should be thinking about changing the percentage of graduate to undergraduate students dramatically, though we could change it some if we have the resources to do so. In doing so we would need to realize that graduate students, especially doctoral students, are more expensive than undergraduates, in that graduate students require smaller classes, more intense faculty research mentoring, and more stipend support. At the same time, PhD students add to faculty productivity and success in gaining extramural funding and therefore significantly help advance our vision of becoming a major public research university by 2025.

Data from a national biannual survey by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA indicate that the graduate school aspirations of American college freshmen have increased steadily between 1974 and 2009. In fall 1974, 30.4% of respondents indicated that they expected to earn a master’s degree. In 2009, 42.4% indicated they planned to do so. A similar increase has occurred for the doctoral degree. While 11.1% of freshmen in 1974 had plans to earn a doctorate, 18.2% of freshmen in 2009 planned to do so. These numbers suggest that we should expect to see an increase in students applying for graduate admission, a trend we have noted in recent years. For example, last year graduate applications were up by 10%; currently fall 2010 graduate applications are up by 4.5%. These numbers reflect in part the current economic situation in the country and the state, and are likely to fluctuate with changes in the economy.

Increases in advanced-degree aspirations must also be viewed in concert with information about college graduation rates. Among full-time, first-time college students entering four-year institutions in 2001, the six-year graduation rate among degree-seeking students was only 57%. While 60.6% of freshmen entering college now say they plan to earn a graduate degree (42.4% a master’s degree and 18.2% a doctorate), National Center for Education statistics show that only 35% of bachelor’s degree recipients enroll in a master’s or doctoral program within 10 years of completing their bachelor’s degree. Future increases in graduate enrollment will depend on improving undergraduate graduation rates and also on helping more undergraduates transform their aspirations into graduate applications.

In projecting graduate vs. undergraduate enrollments, we must also consider the likely effects on our future enrollments of current developments such as increased federal funding for community colleges and the push within Massachusetts from state colleges that wish to become universities. These two developments in particular suggest that we would be wise to emphasize our role in educating graduate students, especially doctoral students, if we wish to distinguish our mission from that of community colleges and state universities.

The AEP recommends modest growth in the percentage of graduate students relative to undergraduates at UMass Boston by 2025, but only as we can provide the resources needed for
that growth.

**Number of Doctoral Programs**

While our percentage of graduate students is quite comparable to other peer institutions, our number of doctoral programs and PhD graduates is very low. The range among peer institutions is from 8 to 63 doctoral programs, and we are the second-lowest in the group of peers for which we have data. Looking at doctoral degrees awarded in 2008-09, we are the lowest among our peers, as Cleveland State, with only 8 PhD programs, awarded many more PhDs than we did (256 to our 41 in 2009). We are well on the road to adding five to seven new doctoral programs in the next five years. (One Stage II proposal is at the President’s Office; one is under review by campus governance; two Stage I proposals are under review by the President’s Office; and three other proposals are in various stages of development on campus). That number will still leave us with the second lowest-number of doctoral programs among our peers, and we will not see PhD degrees awarded from any of the programs now being developed within the next five years. If we wish to increase the number of doctoral graduates by 2015, we will have to do so by increasing the numbers of students in and the number that graduate from existing programs. To do this, existing programs need additional resources. Even if we increase the numbers of students in existing programs, it is unlikely that many of the new students in existing programs will finish their programs in five years. We are more likely to see significant growth in doctoral degrees granted in 2015-2020.

The AEP recommends that we make it a strategic priority to increase enrollments in existing PhD programs and continue to add new doctoral programs over the next 15 years if we wish to become a major public research university. Doctoral programs are, however, extremely expensive to implement and maintain. We recommend adding PhD programs sequentially and only as new resources—tenure-stream faculty, research facilities, graduate stipends, space, and technology—allow us to ensure that they are programs of very high quality.

**International Students:**

The percentage of international students on peer campuses ranges from 3 to 9%. At 5% international students (3.3% of our undergraduates and 7.6% of our graduate students), our numbers are currently very much in line with those of our peers. Given our location in Boston, we may have the capacity to attract a higher percentage of international students than some of our peers, especially at the graduate level. Increasing the number of international students on campus, perhaps to 10%, would have many advantages, including increasing the rich diversity of the learning environment and increasing the amount of out-of-state revenue available on campus. The successes of our ESL/University Preparation Programs, our partnerships in China, and our new contract with Navitas suggest that we should be able to increase our international student numbers by 2015 and beyond quite easily. We are already seeing increasing numbers from these pipelines and may need to manage this carefully so as not to tip the balance of international to domestic students too quickly. Increased numbers of international students are likely to require dormitory facilities and other academic and administrative support systems that we do not currently have in place. We need to do a careful study of the teaching and academic-support costs associated with increasing our international student numbers relative to the revenues they
generate, to determine if they actually increase the revenues of the university. We also need to ensure that we have the right support resources in place to make UMass Boston a successful educational destination for international students. Subjects reported to be growing in international student interest according to a recent survey by Hotcourses.com, are: social sciences and psychology, physical and earth sciences, and business. We have the capacity to accommodate more international students in some of these areas but not others without additional instructional resources.

The AEP recommends that a careful study be done in 2010-2011 of the teaching and academic-support costs associated with increasing the number of international students on campus relative to the advantages offered by increasing their numbers, and allow that study to inform how quickly we move forward to increase the number of international students on campus.

In-State vs. Out-of-State Students:

UMass Boston currently has 92% in-state students, 3% out-of-state, and 5% international students. Many of our peers appear to admit a somewhat higher proportion of out-of-state students: the range is from 2 to 26% (George Mason - 18%; Temple - 26%; Portland State - 21%; UMKC - 22%). Since out-of-state students pay somewhat more in tuition and fees, and since out-of-state students would further enrich the diversity on campus, it would help to increase the percentage of out-of-state students. It would especially help financially if we were allowed to keep out-of-state tuition as UMass Amherst is now allowed to do. To admit more out-of-state students, however, we will need dormitories and other amenities and a larger recruitment budget. Increasing the number of out-of-state students, like increasing that of international students, may be perceived by some as moving away from our mission to serve the students of the Commonwealth, and we must set a goal for the percentages of non-state students with this in mind. Because out-of-state students are likely to require dormitories if we wish to increase their numbers significantly, and since we already have programs in place to recruit international students, we recommend planning for out-of-state student growth in the second five years of the 15-year strategic plan.

Freshmen vs. Transfer Students:

Our current new undergraduate student enrollment is made up of approximately one-third freshmen and two-thirds transfer students. Although our total new undergraduate population has grown from 2,114 to 2,750 students between fall 2005 and fall 2009, the freshman/transfer mix has remained essentially the same. With our current array of programs and without the addition of housing and more vibrant student-life opportunities, we do not anticipate changing this mix.

A review of enrollment data from our peer and aspirant peer institutions shows UMass Boston along with Cleveland State to have the smallest percentage of freshmen at 37%. The range is from that 37% to 74% at the University of Toledo. The average is 56%. The addition of student housing and expanded student-life programming would enable us to increase freshmen enrollment and likely move us more toward the middle of our peers at 50%+/- of our new undergraduate enrollment. As a public university, we under-serve the high school population because we do not offer the residential environment that 70% of high school graduates seek in
higher education. Our top feeder high schools delivered only 259 freshmen to us in 2009. These same high schools enrolled 5,220 in grade twelve in 2008-09. In addition, increasing the number of freshmen as a proportion of our total new students would provide a level of stability in enrollment for planning, scheduling, providing needed services, and improving retention and graduation rates.

According to the US Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics, overall enrollment in higher education in the US is expected to grow until 2018. Actual high school graduation numbers will vary by state, with Massachusetts projected to decline 5% by 2015 (WICHE projections). However, Massachusetts has high college-attendance rates and families are beginning to turn toward public higher education as private higher education prices exceed the $50,000+ mark. With additional amenities we could anticipate growth in freshmen enrollments to be relatively steady.

Transfer-student enrollment will continue to grow incrementally, as it has over the last five years, when the number of new transfers grew from 1,326 to 1,756. We enroll a large share of transfers currently and expect to preserve this share. Nine of the state’s fifteen community colleges transferred 627 students to UMass Boston in fall 2009.

We expect that our new undergraduate student enrollment will be relatively level at 2,700+/- until we have additional classroom space, new programs, and housing to accommodate growth.

The Honors Program

While overall enrollments in the Honors Program have grown, the number of new freshmen entering the program has remained relatively stable over the last five years, and, in fact, decreased somewhat this past fall (See Table 3 in Appendix E). It has been suggested that we try to increase our Honors Program enrollment to 4% of the new students we admit. While this would be highly desirable, it would require more than doubling our current Honors enrollments, and, if we want to maintain standards, that seems unlikely unless we have dormitories. It also cannot be done without additional scholarship funds and additional support staff for the Honors Program Office. While we aspire to steadily increase our Honors enrollments, doubling them may be a goal for 2015-2025 once we have dormitories on campus.

Objective 3: Programmatic Projections by Colleges

The AEP asked each of the college deans to provide programmatic and enrollment projections for the next 15 years. Their submissions are included in Appendix D, and a brief summary follows. We have listed the programs envisioned by the deans in Table 8 below. It is clear that a great deal of new program development is anticipated in coming years at the undergraduate, master’s, and doctoral level. Of the programs listed in Table 4, several are admitting first classes in fall 2010, and five have formal program proposals under review either on campus, or at the President’s Office; four of those are new PhD programs and one a new master’s program. We expect that these five programs will begin to admit students between 2010 and 2015. Other programs envisioned are in varying stages of development. Because new programs, especially PhD programs are, expensive (we estimate that each new PhD program will cost between
$500,000 and $1 million) and the campus will need to stage their implementation, we recommend that during 2010-2011 the university establish a plan for which new programs it will implement between 2010-2015, between 2015-2020, and between 2020-2025.

The deans’ projections in some but not all cases include estimates of the resources needed to mount these programs. We recommend that in constructing an implementation plan for each of the next three five-year periods a more precise analysis of resource needs associated with new program development be undertaken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>PSMs</th>
<th>CAGs</th>
<th>PhD/EdD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>Survey Methodology</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>Ed. Admin for Superintendents</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies</td>
<td>Applied Ethics</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studio Art</td>
<td>Infant Mental Health</td>
<td>Software Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>Public History Track (History)</td>
<td>Green Chemistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>Archival Track (History)</td>
<td>Clinical Laboratory Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology, CSM</td>
<td>Exercise Health Sciences</td>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Policy Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services CPCS</td>
<td>Teach Next year – One Yr Residency Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Studies CPCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exercise Health Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Studies CPCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling &amp; School Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerontology CPCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PhDs in Education in Educ. Admin and LIUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Education in Inclusive Settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EdD for School Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note. Not included here are any programs developed in University College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee has also reviewed OIRP data on enrollment trends on an undergraduate major-by-major and graduate program-by-program basis. Those projections are also included in Appendix E. We note that the vast majority of undergraduate and graduate programs have increased or maintained steady enrollments over the last five years with the exception of several programs that are being phased out (e.g. Russian Studies, German Studies, the Study of Religion, Biomedical Technology) and the special case of CPCS, where admission to undergraduate programs has been suspended for the last two years.
The AEP recommends that a more systematic study be undertaken during 2010-2011 of those programs that are likely to diminish in size in the next five years with an eye to reallocating resources from those programs to new program development.

A very important issue in our discussion of new program development and future enrollment growth is the anticipated retirement of significant numbers of tenure-stream faculty members in the next five years. Appendix D2 provides an analysis of faculty by age groups by college. The percentage of faculty 60 years old and older is high (28% in CLA; 27% in CSM; 22% in Management; 25% in CEHD; 21% in MGS; 67% in CPCS; and 33% in CNHS). This level of potential faculty retirement represents both an opportunity and a challenge for the university. Faculty retirements create flexibility in terms of bringing to campus new faculty members with the expertise needed to offer new academic programs. At the same time, faculty retirements, if not properly and expeditiously replaced, will contribute to the already problematic shortfall in numbers of tenure-stream faculty. This may be especially true in nursing, where student demand promises to remain high and recruiting additional tenure-stream faculty a challenge due to the shortage of PhD nurses. The AEP recommends that during 2010-2011 the university do a systematic analysis of likely faculty retirements by departments and establish principles for replacing or reallocating faculty lines as they become available. This should become part of the overall faculty hiring plan needed to increase the percentage of tenure-stream faculty.

An important consideration that the AEP did not have time to discuss is accreditation requirements for those programs on campus that are externally accredited (e.g., MBA, Nursing, Clinical Psychology, Family Therapy). Tenure-stream-faculty-to-student ratios are often an important aspect of accreditation and must be factored into our faculty hiring plan for the next five years.

Objective 4: Resource Needs to Match New Program Development and Enrollment Projections

In their reports of projected program development and enrollment growth, the deans estimate a need for significant numbers of additional tenure-stream faculty and support staff to mount the programs they envision. They also note the pressing need for more classrooms, faculty and staff office space, and faculty and student research space and technology improvements. The amount of time available for the development of their reports did not allow for systematic analysis of these needs. The AEP also noted in its preliminary report of May 3, 2010, (see Appendix A) that many student service offices both centrally (e.g. Admissions-Undergraduate and Graduate, Financial Aid, the Bursar, Central Academic Support Services, Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, Student Affairs) and within the colleges (e.g. advising, student success programs, and academic departments) have not added sufficient professional and support staff to meet the growing student demands over the last five years because of budget constraints. Too many academic departments and administrative offices currently operate with inadequate staffs, technology, and operating budgets. Inadequate space for programs and staff is an issue across the campus. These deficits as well as the demands placed on academic and administrative units by anticipated new program development must be identified and addressed moving forward. The AEP recommends that this analysis be undertaken during 2010-2011 as we move into the implementation phase of the strategic plan.
The projection of resource needs will likely be influenced by a number of factors outside the scope of this committee (e.g. decisions regarding a two-course teaching load for tenure-stream faculty; the proposed move from three- to four-credit courses; and the addition of more large lecture courses). The committee has looked at one model prepared by Jennifer Brown for projecting faculty needs in relationship to various assumptions about enrollments, teaching loads, and class sizes. That model can be found in Appendix F, but is actually an interactive table that is best accessed online at our wiki site. While this model is very good, it is incomplete. Additional metrics need to be added to it if it is to be useful in calculating future resource needs.

**Work that Remains to Be Done to Achieve Goals**

- Do a careful assessment during 2010-2011 of the faculty, staff, administrative structures, space, technology, and operating budgets needed to support all students (existing and new) in order to provide them with the highest quality education.
- Undertake a careful study during 2010-2011 of the teaching and academic-support costs associated with increasing the number of international students on campus relative to the advantages offered by increasing their numbers and allow that study to inform how best to manage international enrollments and set realistic targets for the different pipeline programs we now have.
- Undertake a more systematic study of when new programs that are envisioned are likely to emerge and plan for their implementation in a way that matches implementation dates with availability of needed resources.
- Undertake a more systematic study during 2010-2011 of those programs that are likely to diminish in size in the next five years with an eye to reallocating resources from those programs to new program development.
- Do a systematic analysis during 2010-2011 of likely faculty retirements by departments and colleges and establish principles for replacing or reallocating faculty lines as they become available.
- Do a systematic analysis of our space needs and how they will be addressed during 2010-2015 and beyond as we proceed with the master plan.

**Recommended priorities for 2010-2015**

- Set an enrollment target for 2015 that reflects no more than the modest growth target of 16,400 and ties that target to the availability of appropriate resources.
- Make improving the retention of current students a high priority and look to the Retention Subcommittee to help us establish an appropriate retention target for 2015.
- Establish and enact a five-year faculty hiring plan that significantly increases the number of tenure-stream faculty, begins to address the disparities in the tenure-stream-faculty-to-student ratios among the colleges, and ensures that faculty hiring matches program and student growth.
- Establish and enact a plan for replacing or reallocating faculty lines as faculty retire.
• Modestly increase the percentage of graduate students relative to undergraduates as new resources - tenure-stream faculty, research facilities, graduate stipends, technology, and space - allow these students to be served well.
• Add five to seven new PhD programs sequentially as new resources – tenure-stream faculty, research facilities, graduate stipends, and space – are available to ensure the high quality of these programs.
• Devote 75% of our discretionary resources during the next five years to strengthening existing programs and operations and 25% to new program development, with the goal of addressing existing deficits so that we might then devote 50% of our discretionary resources to existing programs and 50% to new program development from 2015 onward.
• Establish a standing committee charged with addressing resource needs associated with enrollment growth that operates throughout the year.

Measurable Outcomes for Recommended Priorities

• An enrollment target of 16,400 achieved.
• An improved retention rate by 2015. The AEP will discuss and attempt to specify the expected rate of improvement during 2010-2011 informed by the Retention Subcommittee’s report.
• An increase in the percentage of tenure-stream faculty by 2015. The AEP is in agreement with the Academic Affairs committee that we should strive to move to 65-70% tenure-stream faculty by 2025. The increase by 2015 should position us to achieve that goal.
• A modest increase in the percentage of graduate students relative to undergraduates by 2015, perhaps to 27 or 28% of overall enrollments depending on the availability of appropriate resources.
• The addition of five to seven new PhD programs by 2015.
• A transparent budget process that enables all university members to identify the funds allocated to strengthening existing programs and those allocated to new program development.
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