October 7, 2019

Dear Colleagues,

This report provides an account of our progress in achieving the goals first set out in the town hall meeting in the Fall of 2018, the blueprint for our work across the Fiscal Year 2019. In particular, it embeds an analysis of the sources and uses of our financial and personnel resources as a set of investments to achieve those goals.

We provide this record in service of increasing budget transparency. It complements a number of town hall meetings – which included budget as a central agenda item – that were conducted in October ‘18, December ‘18 and May ‘19. Quarterly “budget-to-actual variance reports” have also been implemented to provide more timely financial information to departments and to enable ongoing budget review with the budget office. Numerous other updates and communications were shared with the community throughout the 2018-19 academic year. In the future, this year-end report will be provided annually after the books close for the prior year, which is generally after the end of the add-drop period in late September.

As the report shows, the 2018-19 academic year was one of considerable advancement for the campus in many, though not all, domains. We were successful in bringing the budget into balance as a result of the careful stewardship of our resources in every division and department. Our faculty and advising staff worked very hard to support our students in their academic pursuits and can point to places where that effort paid off. But the report also makes clear that we have more distance to travel before our retention rates move up to where we would like to see them.

We were able to bring costs under control, thanks to the diligence of faculty, staff and administrators, but our revenues lag what we had hoped for. For the campus to be truly healthy, revenue needs to grow so that we are not constantly in a position of having to cut expenses to reach the Trustees’ budget requirements. Growth will enable investments in new fields, in student support, and in departmental budgets. As explained below, we are investing strategically toward that goal.

The FY19 efforts detailed here – which have truly engaged all members of the campus community – are best understood against a broader portrait of the university’s financial structure, but that is a topic that only the hardiest will find interesting enough to digest. Accordingly, we follow this report with an overview that readers can turn to if they want a more contextual understanding.

Accounting in a university of this size is complicated and this report is not meant to be a comprehensive or definitive financial statement. The university’s actual financial statements, once issued for FY19, will be found here: https://www.umb.edu/controller/financial_reports. Rather, this report is intended to provide transparent detail on the uses we make of campus resources in pursuit of our objectives.

Finally, let me acknowledge how hard it has been on this campus community to bring ourselves into financial balance in each of the past three years. RIFs, VSIPs and general belt tightening have impacted the lives of many of our colleagues. Although these cuts have been necessary, I know they have not been easy. I want to thank the entire community for weathering the storm, for making hard decisions, and for remaining committed to the mission of this incredible University.

Sincerely,

Katherine S Newman, Interim Chancellor
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Section 1: Chancellor Goals and University Investments

Fiscal Year 19 ("FY19"), which ran from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, and which generally corresponds to the 2018-19 Academic Year, marked a period of improvement in UMass Boston’s multi-year pursuit of financial stability and educational excellence. A set of ten goals designed to provide granularity underneath these broader aims was articulated in the Fall of 2018 by the interim Chancellor and her leadership team. This section reports on progress against these goals, while describing financial and strategic investments devoted to their achievement.

Several of the targets below were mandated by the UMass President’s Office, while others were developed at the campus level. For more information about how these objectives were defined for each major division of the University, please visit the “Goals and Priorities” section of the UMB website.

| 1. OPERATING MARGIN: The campus will achieve an operating margin consistent with the Board-approved budget of 0%, as measured by financial results for the fiscal year. (Goal established by UMass President’s Office.) |

**Progress achieved:**
The campus’s audited financials will show that we accomplished this goal. We were able to achieve this result through structural cuts and scrupulous adherence to the budget by all campus departments. Expense control was essential to realizing the “zero margin” and was executed carefully and effectively throughout the campus.

In the middle of the spring term, the President’s Office determined that a one-time, system-wide adjustment to a particular category of debt (the reserves each campus holds for unpaid tuition debts) should be made. Accordingly, our budgeted amount was adjusted down by $3.4 million. As a result, we ended the year with a final surplus of $3.9 million. It is important to understand, however, that this adjustment will not be repeated and hence cannot be spent on recurring expenses (since it won’t recur). It will, instead, be deposited into our reserves which were severely depleted over the past few years and which are also not available for ongoing expenses, but instead are banked for unforeseen one-time problems. Apart from this one-time adjustment, the University ended the year almost exactly in line with our budget projections.

Several financial challenges arose in the course of the year that had to be addressed to get to this end point. The most consequential of them was a sharp change in student course-taking behavior: an increase in students enrolling for 15 credits and so taking advantage of “free” credits that are afforded by the University’s tuition structure when taking more than 12 credits. For academic reasons, we encourage full time enrollment and on-time graduation, but these come at a cost to our revenues.

Although we projected a decrease in revenue as more students shifted to full-time study, we underestimated the extent of the trend. In the end, we found ourselves in the ironic position of seeing an absolute increase to our FTE enrollments, but a decrease to our tuition revenues.
Because so many made the wise educational decision to pursue this path, we had to be very careful to avoid the emergence of a significant deficit. We are gratified that so many stakeholders stayed within budget and weathered another year of tight finances in order to ensure that we met this most important target.

Below are some of the important efforts made to ensure the final result of a zero-deficit end point for FY 2019:

- **Re-organizations**: Gaining efficiency in offices across campus has been a critical priority of the university as it seeks to manage costs. Reducing cost while improving efficiency can be an intractable problem, especially after years of cuts on campus. Accordingly, we enlisted the advice of experts in each of the relevant fields – a form of “administrative peer review” – to provide re-organization advice in several administrative units as described in more detail under goal #10.

- **Enrollments**: Maintaining student enrollments through the recruitment of new students (undergraduate freshmen/transfers, graduate students) to campus is critical to hitting revenue projections. Significant resources – staff, technology, events - are devoted each year within Graduate Studies and Enrollment Management to support this effort. Over the past year, we have made several strategic investments to further them:
  
  o **New Student Portal**: Leveraging resources from UITS (UMass System IT), Enrollment Management developed a new student portal for fall 2019 applicants. It enabled prospective students to view their application status and admissions decision, as well as financial aid information and next steps. The portal allowed us to tailor the presentation of information by student status (freshman, transfer, international student), providing content most relevant to each audience. Over 70% of our 13,000+ first-year applicants utilized the portal on a regular basis.

  o **VisitDays**: As we approached the May 1 deadline for admissions acceptance, it became clear that the freshman class of Fall 2019 would be smaller than projected, with a corresponding shortfall in tuition/fee revenue. Hoping to make late gains in yield, we engaged VisitDays, a firm with expertise in student recruitment. Their analysis showed that the percentage of our applicants that had visited campus, a reliable predictor of enrollment, was lower than our competitors. VisitDays proved to be a productive investment. For an outlay of about $170,000, we yielded approximately 35 additional first-year students, for a revenue increase of approximately $475,000 for FY20.

  o **Shorelight**: For many years the University has maintained a successful and collaborative partnership with Navitas, a partner that helps us recruit international students. In 2018 we added a second partner, Shorelight Education, to bolster international admissions. In FY19, we invested roughly $500,000 for the successful recruitment of 39 undergraduate students, one master’s student, and 13 English as a Second Language (ESL) students. The resulting tuition and fee revenue was over $1,000,000 in FY19 and will recur as long as these students remain with us.
Lead generation and communication: The Office of Graduate Studies made strategic investments in FY19 to improve their ability to gather applicant leads for high priority master’s programs and to communicate with leads through proactive communication campaigns. These investments included $150,000 in digital marketing lead generation and $93,000 for the purchase of software tools to digitize the student application process and to manage prospective student communications campaigns. These efforts, combined with website improvements, led to the generation of more than 7,000 leads in FY19, and importantly led to application and enrollment increases in priority programs. In addition, the Enrollment Management division invested $22,500 on a new technology tool to bolster our efforts to reach out to veteran applicants through more personalized communication.

2. STUDENT SUCCESS: Develop a campus-wide program of student success initiatives designed to significantly improve retention (and ultimately graduation), increasing first-year retention of freshman students by 3-5%.

Progress achieved:
Coordinated by Deputy Chancellor Garrett Smith in close collaboration with the Provost, Deans, advising staff, and Vice Chancellors, our student success program concentrated on improving retention and graduation rates. 2018-19 efforts built on those underway over the past 10 years, which have already increased our six-year graduation rate for freshman by 15 points (from 33% to 48%).

Major retention and graduation initiatives for this year included the opening of on-campus housing, enhanced advising efforts, and investment in financial aid, new technology tools and organizational efficiency.

Official retention data is not yet available, but initial indications show that freshmen retention and academic performance is roughly stable from the prior year. We will need to study the outcomes and learn how to maximize the benefits of these initiatives for future years:

- **Retention campaigns using early-warning predictors, supported by analytic technology.**
  - **Salesforce CRM:** Salesforce technology can now be used by advisors to communicate with students about early alerts (see below) and provide targeted outreach to students who have not yet registered for the fall semester. Roughly $75,000 was spent to build an advising case management technology tool using the Salesforce platform. This tool enables advisors to more easily manage their caseload of students, reducing administrative burden and providing real-time data and facilitating proactive student communication.
  - **Early alerts:** In fall 2018, we launched an initiative in which faculty provide mid-term feedback on student performance to enable additional encouragement and support for students. More than 8,000 early alerts were provided to over 5,000 unique students by 170 faculty members in the pilot effort. An additional 7,000
alerts were provided in the spring during the second implementation of this initiative. Feedback has been very positive from students, advisors, and faculty.

- **Predictive analytics:** Using 10 years of historical data, Civitas Learning developed a predictive analytics system to identify at-risk students before they experience consequential academic difficulties, or conversely on the occasion of a particularly successful semester, and provide a platform for us to communicate proactively with them. For example, 2,000 students were sent a “kudos” message by their deans because they did well academically, to increase their sense of connection to the campus. We entered into a contract with Civitas for 2 years, at a cost of $140,000 per year.

- **Registration campaign:** Spring 2019 and Fall 2019 semesters saw UMB create campaigns using text messaging, email, and phone calls to urge students to register, to offer support for removing registration holds, and to provide advising support in choosing classes.

- **Remove barriers to student progression**
  - **Reducing course bottlenecks:** An intentional effort to eliminate course bottlenecks and increase access to critical gateway courses assisted students with on-time progression. $600,000 was reallocated in the Fall 2018 semester to ensure that our largest-ever freshman class would have access to required gateway courses in English, Math, and the Sciences.
  
  - **Micro-grants:** We invested in micro-grant programs designed to support students facing financial crises. 100 students received approximately $65,000 in funding. Students who received one small retention grant (less than $500) were 10 percent more likely to return for the spring semester than similarly situated applicants who did not receive funding.

  - **Reducing DFW rates:** Our math department undertook an effort to address the high DFW rates in introductory math classes, nationally a barrier to progression and graduation. They strengthened and expanded supplemental instruction for struggling students, examined the relationship between placement exam scores and course grades, increased coordination across sections of large multi-section courses, and launched a spring pilot in the gateway Calculus course.

  - **Need-based financial aid:** Need-based financial aid (exclusive of merit aid) was increased by 4% in FY19, which was larger than the University’s rate of tuition and fee revenue growth of 0.8%. This represented an increase of about $800,000 over FY18, for a total spend on need-based financial aid (exclusive of merit aid) of nearly $22 million.

- **Under the leadership of Vice Provost Joan Becker and the college deans, enhance undergraduate advising effectiveness through common practices, tools, and metrics**
  
  - **Common tools:** Salesforce CRM enhances advisors’ day-to-day student support activities, enabling advisors to take and reference notes on student interactions, collaborate across offices as students progress in their careers, and manage the advising workflow by creating and assigning tasks.

  - **Consistent caseloads:** We rebalanced the allocation of advisors to each college, ensuring that resources are spread more equitably across our campus and that
advisors in different colleges are managing similarly sized caseloads. These efforts have resulted, for example, in three new full-time advisors within the College of Science and Mathematics, where student-to-advisor ratios significantly exceeded our target (based on national best practice) of 300:1.

- **Common survey metrics:** Our college advising directors collaborated in the development of a common survey tool designed to gather feedback from students on their interactions with advisors.

- Worked to improve student engagement on campus, through the opening of the new residence hall, development of 24/7 services, and growth of on-campus activities and co-curricular programming.
  - See goal #3 for detail on this initiative.

### 3. RESIDENCE HALLS: Ensure successful opening of residence halls and a successful shift to a 24/7 campus, including development of student life programming (co-curricular, athletics, RA sponsored).

Under the leadership of Vice Chancellor Gail DiSabatino, other Vice Chancellors, and dozens of staff, the first residence halls in the Commonwealth to be built and operated as a public-private partnership opened on September 2, 2017 with 99.3% occupancy (1070 of 1077 beds).

- Freshmen living in the dorms showed the following demographic breakdown
  - **Gender:** 57% female and 43% male
  - **Ethnicity:** White (54%), Hispanic/Latino (14%), Asian (10%), Black/African American (10%), and two or more races (5%); (4% were international and 3% were not specified).
  - **Income:** 42% of residents were Pell-eligible, as compared to 52% of all first-time freshmen
  - **Residency:** 82% of residents were in-state as compared to 84% of all first-time freshmen.

- Official full-year retention data are not yet available, but Fall-to-Spring rates show that the residence halls made a positive difference.
  - Residence hall students had a Fall-to-Spring retention rate of 93% compared to a rate of 89% for all first-time, full-time freshmen.
  - Residents had a higher average GPA (2.93) than non-residential freshmen (2.76) in the spring semester.

- Students are responding to efforts to support their quality of life:
  - 70% of freshman respondents reported that they participate in campus activities and events "very much" or "quite a bit," up 27% points over the 2017 NSSE survey.
  - 54% of respondents to the Student Affairs spring survey reported “strongly agree” or “agree” to the question: “if I needed to seek professional help for my mental or
emotional health, I would know where to go on my campus.” This is up from 49% from the previous campus survey.

- 52% reported receiving information from UMass Boston on violence prevention, up from a 2013 ACHA/NCHA benchmark of 37%.
- U-ACCESS distributed 31,047 pounds of food, which is more than five times FY18’s total distribution of 5,420 pounds of food.
- Though the Police Department’s call volume was up, there was no significant increase in crime statistics, as defined by federal “Clery reporting” categories.

- A program to support revenue-generating summer conferences and summer residents in the dorms began in Summer 2019. Occupancy in Summer 2019 fell short of budgeted targets and needs to be a focus for improvement for COCM and UMB over the coming year.

**Investments:**
To achieve these positive outcomes in the residential experience, we made a number of investments in residence life, safety, student care, and financial aid in FY19.

- **Residence life:** As newcomers to campus housing, UMB needed to build up a 24/7 staff, including six new full-time positions: a director of residential life, an assistant director, an employee focused on academic initiatives, and three residential community directors. Thirty student residential advisors round out the staff. A faculty member in residence was also supported with a small operating budget for events and other programming. Finally, student workers were hired as desk assistants to support resident needs in the halls.

- **Campus Living Grants:** $1.5 million was devoted to Campus Living Grants, which provide financial support to PELL-eligible freshmen students living in the residence halls. This investment helped ensure diversity in the community of freshmen residents in the dorms.

- **Safety:** Increased investment in security and safety in and around the residence halls was needed. Twelve new positions were created on the UMB police force: a lieutenant, a sergeant, seven officers, and three dispatchers, in order to take care of 1,000 full-time residents on campus 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. In addition, the University contracted with a private security firm, at a cost of roughly $125,000, to enhance security in and around the residence halls after student safety concerns were raised at the beginning of the school year.

- **Student care:** Several new positions were created on campus to provide greater support and care to at-risk students in anticipation of increased need arising from students living on campus in the residence halls. One additional counselor was hired in the University Health Services Counseling Center. One additional nurse was hired in University Health Services. And two new employees were hired in the Dean of Students office.
4. FACULTY AND STAFF: Enhance our ability to attract a diverse and highly qualified faculty and staff.

Progress achieved:
- **Highly qualified and diverse faculty:**
  Building and replenishing the tenure-stream faculty on campus is one of the most fundamental and rewarding tasks of administration. It requires a delicate balancing act among scholarly and instructional aspirations and the realities of student enrollment and fiscal constraints.

The University built the tenure-stream (TS) faculty aggressively in the period just preceding the budget crisis that began in FY2017. As new departments and programs came online (e.g., Engineering, Communication, Early Childhood Education), and systematic efforts were made to redress legacy reductions (many of which dated back to the early retirement program in 2002), the TS faculty ranks (tenured or untenured) grew by 15 FTE during AY2014-15, and another 10 FTE between Fall 2015 and Fall 2016. These 25 additions, though programmatically salubrious, contributed materially to the budget deficits of FY17 and FY18 and have necessitated more fiscally prudent practice regarding the filling of tenure-stream lines.

In March 2018, the Provost notified the deans of the following guidelines for requesting faculty searches to take place during FY19, for hire as of September 2019:

- The University would fund no new TS faculty lines for FY19;
- The University would strive to maximize the number of TS replacement lines available (with ‘replacement lines’ defined as vacancies for which the funding remains in the budget);
- In allocating lines, the Deans and Provost would exercise their due authority to reallocate lines among departments or colleges/schools, respectively; and
- Through reallocations, the University would strive to restore a limited number of lines that had fallen out of the budget as a result of replacements deferred in previous years.

The Provost’s announced criteria for prioritizing requests from deans were:

- Building diversity among the faculty;
- Supporting student success by prioritizing hiring in high-enrollment departments or critical programmatic needs; and
- Supporting transdisciplinary efforts.

The University started the AY 2018-19 recruiting season with 18 faculty vacancies for which funds remained in the budget. These vacancies issued from the colleges or schools as follows: 4 CEHD, 9 CLA, 2 CM, 1 CPCS, 1 CSM, 1 MGS.

In accordance with our guidelines, in Summer 2018 the Provost approved 10 TS replacements, two restoration appointments, and one renewal of a failed search; set aside a pool of up to three lines to allow for target-of-opportunity hires or twinning of hires on a completed search (also
known as ‘two-fers’, where two hires are made for exceptional candidates in a single search); and approved one search for an endowed chair on a new line funded by a major gift.

One metric applied by the Provost to assess need as reflected by student demand was the ratio of IFTE (instructional student FTE served by the department) to TT faculty. This ratio as of Fall 2017 is noted in the list below for the departments that received authorization to search. Decisions were not, however, made on the basis of quantitative metrics alone; considerations of critical programmatic needs, as advanced by department chairs and supported by deans, were also weighted heavily.

The department-assigned searches were authorized as follows (2 CEHD, 8 CLA, 2 CM, 1 MGS/CNHS):
- 2 Africana Studies, CLA (IFTE/TT 51:1); both these lines were restored to fill vacancies for which funding had fallen out of the budget during a previous year
- Anthropology, CLA (IFTE/TT 25:1), filling a departmental vacancy
- Curriculum and Instruction, CEHD (IFTE 16:1), filling a college vacancy transferred from another department
- Counseling and School Psychology, CEHD (grad-only department, IFTE 14:1), filling a departmental vacancy
- Economics, CLA (IFTE/TT 26:1), filling a departmental vacancy
- Gerontology/Nursing, MGS/CNHS (IFTE/TT 7:1 Gero, 47:1 Nursing), filling a Gero vacancy cooperatively across two colleges
- History/Labor Studies, CLA (IFTE/TT 14:1 History, 20:1 Labor), filling a History vacancy cooperatively across two departments; critical programmatic need in Public History
- Management, CM (IFTE/TT 30:1), filling a college vacancy transferred from another department
- Marketing, CM (IFTE/TT 21:1) filling a college vacancy transferred from another department
- Psychology, CLA (IFTE/TT 24:1), filling a departmental vacancy
- Sociology, CLA (IFTE/TT 26:1), filling a departmental vacancy
- Women’s, Gender, Sexuality Studies/TCCS, CLA (IFTE/TT [WGSS] 31:1), filling a college vacancy transferred from another department

An intercollegiate search was authorized for an endowed chair in Sport Leadership. At the start of the search the candidate’s tenure home and the program’s location were yet to be determined, but assumed to fall within CLA, CM, or CEHD; both line and program have ended up in the Leadership in Education Department in CEHD.

A failed search in Vision Studies (SGISD) from AY2017-18 was renewed; it failed again in AY 2018-19.

The lines reserved for target-of-opportunity or two-fer hires were filled in the following departments:
- Anthropology, CLA (twinned from the department’s original search)
- Nursing, CNHS (a target of opportunity with abbreviated search)
Urban Development (SFE)/Africana Studies (CLA) (a target of opportunity with abbreviated search)

As the year progressed, faculty incumbents vacated 5 additional funded lines – one each in Computer Science and Physics (CSM), SFE, Economics and Sociology (CLA). Replacement hires were made as follows:

- Computer Science, CSM (IFTE/TT 28:1); this search resulted in 2 hires, the second twinned from their original search, funded by savings in the first round of line allocations
- Economics, CLA (IFTE/TT 26:1), filled through a target of opportunity
- Physics, CSM (IFTE/TT 12:1), filled through a target of opportunity
- SFE (IFTE/TT 14:1), filled through a target of opportunity
- Sociology (IFTE/TT 26:1), twinned from their original search

Finally, a spousal hire was authorized for the Management Department, CM (IFTE/TT 30:1).

In all, 23 new faculty members were hired: one who started Spring 2019, 17 who started Fall 2019, three who will start Spring 2020, one who will start Fall 2020, and one who will start Fall 2021. Two searches failed but have been reauthorized for this coming year.

**Building Faculty Diversity:**
Faculty, chairs, and deans committed themselves to the effort to recruit diverse faculty candidates, with the result that diversity hires were exceptionally numerous.

Of the 23 new hires:
- 8 are black (4 male, 4 female)
- 1 is black/Hispanic (female)
- 4 are Hispanic (3 male, 1 female)
- 1 is Native American (female)
- 1 is Asian (female)
- 8 are white

Of the 8 white hires, 3 add to diversity as females in STEM disciplines (Computer Science, Physics, SFE).

This is an extraordinary track record by any measure. Indeed, we believe it compares favorably to any other campus in the country, and we intend to prioritize repeating this performance in the future.

Deans and departments are also developing and improving mentoring for junior faculty through department mentoring programs, while the Provost’s Office has funded a campus membership in the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD) that provides an array of mentoring programs and services. The Provost’s Office funds two junior faculty per year to attend NCFDD scholarly boot camps.
• **Highly qualified and diverse staff:** Enhancements to staff diversity outcomes are expected to result from re-organizations of HR and the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI) staffs (which both occurred in FY19), as well as from the related recruitment process changes that will be implemented in the ongoing HR restructuring. The move of more compliance-oriented functions from ODEI to HR has freed Assistant Chancellor Georgianna Melendez to focus on greater community-building efforts and improvement to the campus climate.

• **Leadership searches:** It is important to note the campus’s good fortune in being able to attract our first-choice candidates for several important leadership positions: Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Ray Lefebvre reports to the Chancellor and enjoys a strong dotted line relationship to system-wide CIO John Letchford (who served on the search committee); Dr. Robin Côté, a distinguished physicist, recruited from the University of Connecticut, has been leading the College of Science and Mathematics since August 15, 2019; and John Drew assumed the role of Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management in September, after a search initiated in FY19.

5. **FUNDRAISING:** Increase donor visits, principal gifts, and endowment, with a target minimum of $10.5 million in total gifts. *(Goal established by UMass President’s Office.)*

Progress achieved:
Vice Chancellor Adam Wise was hired in the Fall of 2018 and under his leadership and with the support of his team, the University has exceeded the President’s office goal of $10.5M for a total of $23.8M, the largest annual amount in the history of this campus. Not included in the $23.8M total is a new $3.2M signed pledge, the largest ever secured from an alumna; it will be formally announced in November. This year, thirteen new endowments were established, supporting a combination of faculty chairs and student scholarships.

University Advancement (UA) undertook an office-wide reorganization in February, as is detailed further under Goal #10.

As the following chart illustrates, UMB exceeded all of the sub-goals set in this area in FY19.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers as June 30, 2019</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fundraising</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new commitments</td>
<td>$23.79M</td>
<td>$10.5M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new commitments from alumni</td>
<td>188%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endowment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new commitments designated for core endowment</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13 new endowments totaling $5.6 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chancellor activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significant investments were made in this area after the hiring of the Vice Chancellor for University Advancement in September 2018. Two different external consultants were hired to provide advice and guidance that informed the evaluation and re-organization of the Alumni Relations and Annual Giving departments. The re-organization resulted in positions being eliminated or repurposed in several areas while staff investments were made in others, as explained further in Goal #10. As noted above, the investments in this area are paying dividends already.

**Investments:**
UMass Boston established a goal of growing online revenue by 5-7%. Growth of 6% would result in total online revenue of $21 million. UMB did not meet this goal. Revenue was down roughly 1% in FY19 as compared to FY18. As a result, we launched a reorganization of our online efforts and created a dedicated division based on an external review by the former head of two successful online university divisions.

---

| Number of days dedicated to advancement | 116 | 30 | Includes half days, full days, events and meetings |
| Number of prospect meetings attended by the chancellor | 105 | 90 |
| Number of substantive off-campus alumni events hosted by the chancellor | 19 | 3 |
| Number of prospect meals hosted by the chancellor | 27 | 12 |

**Total Major Gift Officer activity**

| Average number of annual visits | 53 | 110 | The Major Gifts officer team is just forming so this number was low. 3 MGO’s: include: Adam Wise, (start date 9/4) visited 81 prospects; Ryan McDonald, (start date 12/18) visited 31 prospects; and Anne Kelly-Contini visited 49 prospects. |
| Number of new + re-rated major prospects | 374 | 20 | Primarily research and gift officer ratings 278 (newly discovered) and 96 (re-rated) |

---

**6. ONLINE:** Increase online substantially via collaboration with UMass Online, restructuring of CAPS, and/or expansion of campus online programs. Target is $21 million. (Goal established by UMass President’s Office.)

**Progress achieved:**
UMass Boston established a goal of growing online revenue by 5-7%. Growth of 6% would result in total online revenue of $21 million. UMB did not meet this goal. Revenue was down roughly 1% in FY19 as compared to FY18. As a result, we launched a reorganization of our online efforts and created a dedicated division based on an external review by the former head of two successful online university divisions.
We commissioned an external review of UMB’s online operation from Dr. Kathleen Burke, who has led two successful online divisions (at George Washington and Johns Hopkins Universities). Her assessment of our operations, staffing, marketing, and program offerings made it clear that our current arrangements were not optimal for encouraging growth.

Accordingly, we have restructured the operation: online programs have been pulled out of CAPS (our continuing education operation) to be managed independently by a senior leader reporting directly to the Provost and with a strong dotted line to the Chancellor.

The leader of this new unit, Dr. Mya Mangawang, has led graduate admissions and marketing efforts for the past two years, where she has brought substantial improvement and operational excellence to the Office of Graduate Studies. Dr. Mangawang is well positioned to invigorate the strategy and capacity of our online efforts, working closely with departments across the University and through collaboration with UMass Online and/or other partners.

Several initiatives are in play that should boost online revenue over the next 12 months.
- Revenue sharing is back for online programs, providing a clear incentive to deans and departments for online program growth.
- In lieu of collaborating with a third party provider (OPM), our College of Management (CM) has undertaken initiatives to boost online demand in the MBA program.
  - The core MBA program is already online, which provides a platform for additional growth. A third start date was added for summer 2019. Additional courses are being converted into online offerings.
- Our College of Nursing and Health Sciences (CNHS) has developed a strategy for growing online graduate programs.
  - CNHS hired a faculty member to focus on converting the accelerated bachelor’s of science in nursing (ABSN) from a face-to-face second-degree program to a fully online program available to a national market. The goal over the next 36 months is to increase the number of students in this high-demand program from 30 per year to over 250 per year.
  - CNHS is actively developing an online RN to BSN to DNP pathway for launch in spring or fall 2020.
- The McCormack Graduate School has struck a partnership with Leading Age, a national association of 6,000 gerontology professionals, to serve as a marketing tool.
channel to increase enrollment in the online Master’s in Management of Aging Services starting in FY20.

- We are working with our partner, Shorelight Education, to offer courses and/or programs leveraging technology, expanding our ability to serve international students and generate incremental revenue for our campus. Initial areas of focus include graduate level computer science and an undergraduate college-preparatory accelerator to students in Qatar.

**Investments:**
A great deal of time was allocated in FY19 to planning for the growth of our online business – both through our own campus efforts and through collaboration with UMass Online. An expert consultant was hired to provide advice on potential growth opportunities, organizational design, and action planning for the future. The consultant’s recommendations have informed our re-organization of the online function.

| 7. UNIVERSITY RELATIONS: Contribute to the enhancement of the University’s public position. |

**Progress achieved:**
An external review of our communications and marketing functions was conducted to assist us in the optimization of our approach and organizational structure in these areas.

- **Communications:** The campus has engaged Howell Communications to execute on our campus communication strategy in collaboration with our in-house staff. This has reinforced our marketing efforts while helping us better reach important stakeholders such as business and opinion leaders, alums, donors, foundations, and students/families. We believe this is rebounding in important ways to the benefit of admissions and advancement.

- **Government Relations:** Under the leadership of Assistant Chancellor Matt Fenlon, we are undertaking a shift from reactive meetings with public officials to a series of one-on-one introductory meetings in service of relationship building with federal and state elected officials. These meetings enable the Chancellor and others in the leadership to update our legislators on initiatives that reaffirm our important role as Boston’s public research university. In roughly three months, over 20 individual legislative meetings have been held, a practice that will continue on an ongoing basis.

- **Industry clusters:** Last spring, we launched our “industry cluster initiative” to provide an avenue for outreach to the Boston business community. The goals are multiple: securing internship and employment opportunities for our students; generating philanthropic opportunities for advancement; enlisting industry advice on state-of-the-art curricula for world-class employees; and showcasing our faculty in ways that we hope will lead to industry investment in UMB research. Three clusters met on campus in the Spring of 2019: accounting, finance and communication. The seniority and prominence of our industry visitors was notable, with firms like Blackrock, JP Morgan, Brown Advisory and the “Big
Four” accounting firms sending senior management officials. For the majority, this was their first visit to UMass Boston, and the opportunity for us to showcase our students, faculty and physical plant was transformative in terms of their knowledge and appreciation for the campus. In the ensuing months, they have begun requesting student resumes and have at this point offered positions to a number of UMB applicants.

We plan at least eight more cluster visits this fall, to include banking, biotechnology, data/computer science, cyber security, nursing and health sciences, social services and criminal justice, block chain management and a summit with VCs on working with startups. We hope to maintain twenty industry clusters on an ongoing basis.

**Investments:**

A major strategy for the improvement of communications with internal and external stakeholders was the engagement of Howell Communications. Roughly $50,000 was spent in this area in FY19 for strategic communications advice, expertise and services. In addition, we hired a consultant with expertise in marketing to provide advice on our approach and organizational structure in this area. Further, some shifting of responsibilities was necessary to bolster our external relations efforts and to cover the responsibilities of the Vice Chancellor role, which was left vacant for the majority of FY19. These investments were made in lieu of replacing the Vice Chancellor of Government Relations and Public Affairs, who left the University in summer 2018. Since the Vice Chancellor’s salary was more than $200,000 per year, these initiatives resulted in savings overall within this functional area in FY19, while reinforcing our marketing efforts and more meaningfully engaging stakeholders. (Note: Funds will be reinvested in the chief marketing officer position in FY20.)

**8. CAPITAL PROJECTS AND BUDGETS:** Work with the system office to proceed with substructure and Bayside projects.

**Progress achieved:**

Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Kathleen Kirleis has led the campus’s construction enterprise, including REAB (Renovation to Existing Academic Buildings) and substructure projects, the completion of the construction of the Utility Corridor Roadway Relocation Project, the Residence Halls, and the West Garage, and the operationalization of these facilities. In addition, she has also worked closely with the UMass Building Authority, the President’s Office and Chancellor Newman on the evolution of the Bayside project.

- Five major construction projects, with a total value of $417M, were completed on the campus in FY19:

  1. **Utility Corridor and Roadway Relocation Project:** This $259.5M project protects campus operations from catastrophic utility failure due to the deterioration of the Substructure and allows for its demolition. Substantially completed in FY19, UCRR has established a modern mechanism for providing utilities to all main campus buildings and building sites, completely revamped roadways and walkways, and opened and humanized the campus. Some remaining landscaping work will be completed in FY20.
2. **Residence Halls:** As noted earlier, construction of the $137.3M residence complex, consisting of residence halls and a dining facility, opened in September 2018.

3. **West Garage:** Construction of the $69.7M West Garage, with approximately 1400 parking spaces, was completed in September of 2018, replacing a substantial portion of the parking capacity lost when the Substructure was closed in 2006. New parking rates that were necessary to support the cost of the garage were negotiated with the university’s collective bargaining units. Discounts were created to make sure that our students paid the lowest rates available at all parking facilities.

4. **Elevator Renovations:** This $8.3M project – which replaced the original passenger and freight elevators in Clark Athletic Center, McCormack Hall, the Quinn Administration Building and Wheatley Hall – was successfully completed in FY19. Unlike the old elevators, the new ones are safe, efficient, and code-compliant.

5. **Clark Athletic Center:** This $5.3M project was completed with the help of $1.6M in funding from the State’s Department of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM). Along outdated spray-on roof above the Gymnasium (whose floor and bleachers were replaced in FY14 at a cost of nearly $2.5M) was replaced, as were two deteriorating and potentially hazardous exterior wall areas of the Clark complex.

- **SDQD:** Work continues on the campus’s major remaining active capital project, the $155.5M Substructure Demolition and Quadrangle Development (SDQD).
  - REAB, which enables the substructure project, began in January 2018; it entails construction in McCormack, Wheatley Hall, Healey Library and the Quinn Administration Building.
    - It will result in the renovation of predominately vacant spaces to accommodate the movement of programs out of the Science Center in preparation for its demolition.
  - The catwalk connecting Healy to McCormack is the final enabling project to be completed prior to the start of the demolition of the Science Center, plaza and pool. This project will enable safe campus navigation during the demolition work.
  - Design work for the demolition of the Science Center and the new campus quadrangle will also be completed in FY2020.

- **Bayside:** In collaboration with the UMass Building Authority and the President’s Office, UMB participated in the evaluation of proposals and the ultimate selection of a developer for the Bayside property.
  - The Board of Trustees and the UMass Building Authority approved the selection of Accordia Partners as the developer to build a mixed-use urban innovation complex of up to 3.5M square feet.
  - In exchange for a long-term ground lease and development rights, Accordia Partners and its capital partner, Ares Capital Corp, will pay a minimum of $192.5M and as much as $235M (upon the project being successfully permitted) to UMass Boston for
qualified capital projects as approved by the Board of Trustees through its established capital planning process.

- Following a due-diligence period, the Agreement to Lease was executed which initiated a sixty-day inspection period. Now that inspection is complete, Accordia will be hosting a series of community meetings regarding the project during the Fall of 2019, as well as meeting with the faculty experts on coastal resilience from the School for the Environment.

**Investments:**
Each of these projects involves major capital investment by the University through bonds issued by the University of Massachusetts Building Authority and/or the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

**9. PLANNING: Develop coherent and integrated plans – including Strategic Plan, Academic Master Plan, Capital Master Plan – to provide a roadmap for the future of the university. Ensure that research excellence is central to the planning process.**

**Progress achieved:**
- **Academic Master Plan:** Working as a committee of the whole and under the aegis of Provost McDermott, the college deans began a planning process in the Fall of 2018 that will lead to development of a full academic master plan. Progress to date includes:
  - Creation of a fast-track process and guidelines for its application.
  - Identification of principles and criteria for program development that were sent to departments for feedback.
  - Cataloguing all existing proposals and their status in the governance pipeline so that advocates can always figure out where they are in the process.
  - Examination of ways to align academic master planning with better budget planning tools and templates, Curriculog, external market studies (including exploring vendor options), and the revised AQUAD process, so that academic master planning proceeds in a systematic way.
  - Development of a process for using these principles and criteria to create a five-year planning document.

  Deans will be sending a draft detailed academic plan/calendar to the Provost by the end of the fall semester.

- **Capital Master Plan:** Work on an update of the Capital Master Plan can begin now that the developer for the Bayside project has been selected. A preliminary master plan update will be undertaken in FY20 as a next step in the campus’s master planning process. The Board of Trustees voted in September 2019 to approve the Calf Pasture Pump Station as a project to be funded by alternative financing and to allow the UMass Building Authority to explore options for its renovation, respecting its historic designation. The Calf Pasture Pump Station itself will be used for university purposes, while private development of some of the adjacent parcels will ensure that this expensive reconstruction will not require campus debt.
**Investments:**
While much work was undertaken related to strategic planning, academic master planning, and capital planning, no financial investments – apart from considerable staff time and consulting support for technical aspects of land use and evaluation of Bayside options – were made in this area in FY19.

---

**10A. EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT: Participate robustly with the UMass President’s Office on the “Shared Services” initiative.** *(Goal established by UMass President’s Office.)*

---

**Progress achieved:**
Overall, the Boston campus is on track to fully achieve this goal, in alignment with system-assigned communications and objective. Progress on the Shared Services goal is as follows:

- **Metric 1:** Campus staff participation in workshops, steering committee meetings, data and other deliverable reviews.
  - Interim Chancellor Newman was assigned to, and has been a full participant in, the Shared Services Oversight committee.
  - Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Kathleen Kirleis has been fully engaged in system office-led steering committee meetings on behalf of the campus.
  - UMB payroll, accounts payable and procurement staff participated actively in the system-wide workshops and working sessions with Accenture.
  - UMB A&F payroll, accounts payable, and procurement staff supported the production and analysis of required data in a timely fashion.
  - Vice Chancellor for Human Resources Marie Bowen has collaborated with the system HR leaders to support the development of the labor strategy and an appropriate staff communication strategy.
  - The Shared Services Comprehensive Plan was presented to the UMass Board of Trustees Committee on Administration and Finance on March 27, 2019.

- **Metric 2:** Campus communications providing information and support for the goals of the project.
  - A Chancellor’s memo introducing the project was sent to entire UMB community in October 2018.
  - A project update was presented at a campus-wide town hall in December 2018.
  - Information regarding the campus shared services goal was posted online and is accessible to the entire UMB community.
  - A memo updating the UMB leadership on the project was sent on February 6, 2019.
  - A meeting of Procurement and the Controller’s Office Accounts Payable staff on Shared Services with the Vice Chancellors of Human Resources and Administration and Finance was held on April 12, 2019.
  - A campus-wide forum on Shared Services was held on May 20, 2019 with the President’s Office staff.
• **Metric 3:** Participate in the creation of an organizational model for the Shared Services Organization, which will include the organization structure, staffing pattern, position titles and job descriptions.
  o This support to the President’s Office is ongoing as requested.
  o The campus is represented on a university-wide collective bargaining team for the project.
  o Position titles and job descriptions have been provided to collective bargaining units as part of the collective bargaining process and to non-unit staff.
  o Vice Chancellor for A&F served on the search committee for the new system-wide, Chief Procurement Officer, who has been hired and will start on September 30, 2019.

**Investments:**
Significant staff time was committed to realizing this goal.

**10B. EXCELLENCE IN LEADERSHIP/MANAGEMENT: Focus on quality across the board and reinforce a customer service approach and “accountability culture.”**

**Progress achieved:**
Fostering a positive customer service environment has been a priority for the interim Chancellor and the University’s leadership team. Across the University, we aim to reinforce a culture of proactive service and accountability while becoming as efficient and effective as possible.

A recurring theme in feedback from all campus constituents—faculty, staff and students—is the need for enhanced performance in the delivery of campus administrative services. Satisfying this demand is a critical priority for the University, although it is complicated by resource constraints endemic to the campus’s current budget position. This section aims to i) detail the efforts made to date to facilitate administrative enhancements within this environment and ii) provide a roadmap for the next steps in this critical process.

**Background: Resource Constraints**
Improving administrative operations requires careful consideration of the level of existing staffing. Comparative data on administrative staffing levels at peer institutions are important for this analysis. This is a complicated matter and subject to a variety of definitional questions about how to categorize positions. That caveat notwithstanding, a recent Institutional Research analysis suggests that UMass Boston is thinly staffed in key areas of administration compared to our peer campuses. (See Report on Administrative Staffing and Expenditures, attached as Appendix A). Such a conclusion aligns with the perspective that administrative service levels are less than ideal, at least in certain areas: low staffing levels may be contributing to sub-par service.

This image of a leanly staffed organization at UMB is not surprising since the campus has been through waves of reductions necessitated by the need to significantly reduce costs and administrative overhead over the past three years. These efforts included the 2017-2018 reduction-in-force that eliminated approximately fifty staff positions, as well as additional
staffing reductions achieved through the 2017 Voluntary Separation Incentive Program (VSIP) and other measures instituted at or around the same time. Changes made to administrative staffing in the Chancellor’s Office, the Provost’s Office and Administration and Finance Office are cases in point. In the Chancellor’s Office, for instance, the staffing model has been substantially altered since 2017, resulting in a net reduction since that time of 3.5 benefited FTE’s and several hundred thousand dollars of savings annually. The Provost’s Office has reduced staffing by two benefited FTE senior leadership positions as well as one classified position. In the Administration and Finance Office, the staffing model has been reduced by 6 FTE, at a savings of over $600K.

These offices are hardly alone; other administrative units have been even more severely reduced. The VSIP that is ongoing in FY20 is expected to reduce our budget deficit, but also place additional demands on our administrative functions. Continuing to monitor the latter as we strive to institutionalize our structurally balanced budget will be a priority.

Finances dictate that we learn to live with more modest levels of administrative support in order to direct as much resource as possible to the academic mission, especially our students. That reality, in turn, places a primacy on efficient deployment of what we have.

*Current Focus: Administrative Enhancement*

Given the budgetary and other constraints that the campus continues to face, going forward we look to complement additional savings with budget neutral—and in exceptional, high-priority cases, low additive-cost—solutions to enhancing productivity and effectiveness in all operating areas.

Determining exactly how to do that depends both on local wisdom and external, expert review. Our own campus leaders and outside specialists with deep experience in each functional area can help to identify better organizational structures that enhance our productivity. As detailed below, external reviews have been accompanied by internally designed reorganizations. In addition, the university’s system-wide Shared Services initiative also is expected to achieve budget savings and promote administrative service enhancements.

- **University Advancement**
  Success within the Advancement function is crucial to the campus’s financial well-being, as increased gift revenues can enable more funding for research and new programs, while reducing the need for additional budget cuts. As an initial step, external reviews from a firm specializing in advancement were undertaken for two important components of the fundraising operation--alumni relations and annual giving. The findings revealed underperforming results as measured against industry norms. In some areas, more resources were being spent than were being raised in donations.

  Based on the external recommendations, as well as leadership’s internal assessment of needs, the Advancement division was realigned in early 2019 to increase the focus on securing larger gifts, with a corresponding reduction in emphasis on individual smaller gifts. Two new senior fundraising positions were created and reporting relationships for
frontline fundraisers were consolidated under a single line of management. Additionally, for the first time, individual goals for fundraisers were established and attainment of these goals will be continuously reviewed as is the common practice in Advancement divisions nationally. As these positions are filled over time, the expectation is that we will see a corresponding improvement in our fundraising outcomes to the benefit of the entire campus.

The University just recently filled an additional new role in corporate and foundation relations. This hire should allow us to further enhance fundraising performance by more fully engaging target corporations and foundations in strategic partnerships, both in the local Boston market and nationally.

A similar consolidation has taken place in alumni engagement: two positions were eliminated and one new position was created with the recommended skill set for a more active division. Donor research also was reorganized to ensure that the fundraising team is supported by a sophisticated research operation. Further, the event planning operation was streamlined to allow a reallocation of resources from event management to direct fundraising without any significant diminution in events support.

Much of this realignment was accomplished through the reallocation of existing resources, including difficult but necessary administrative staffing reductions. Given the priority we are placing on enhanced philanthropic performance in our longer-term strategy, however, this was one of the very few areas to which new staffing resources were allocated in the FY19 budget year. More specifically, $500,000 of additional phased-in salary spending was authorized in Advancement with the expectation that this investment will allow the University to generate funding in excess of its cost. And indeed that has already transpired since we blew through the goals set by the system office and achieved UMB’s most successful fund raising year yet, more than doubling the intake relative to the goal amount. We are hopeful that completing the staffing plan will enable us to do even more.

- **Human Resources**

This budget-neutral, department-initiated, reorganization was undertaken in response to feedback from a variety of stakeholders across campus, which was confirmed and elaborated via external review. Concerns about the timeliness and effectiveness of i) the hiring process and ii) the job classification and compensation review system were identified as priorities for improvement. In addition, the overall approach to customer service was found to be in need of improvement.

Addressing these issues required structural changes, including staffing resources that did not exist in the department; some reorganization of the HR staff was therefore necessary. As a result, the department eliminated five positions through attrition and layoffs early in the Spring 2019 semester. The reallocation of these resources allowed for the creation of new positions focused on needed performance improvements in the areas of customer service, hiring and compensation review. A reallocated position in the compensation and classification area recently was filled, and this new hire is focused on crafting and implementing a plan to eliminate a job review backlog and streamline processes and
enhance customer service. Performance metrics also will be introduced and tracked on a regular basis to complement the reorganization and to promote transparency and accountability in HR operating processes.

The external review recommended that all aspects of the hiring process be consolidated within Human Resources to maximize efficiency and promote clarity for end users. These include those hiring-related functions previously performed by the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (ODEI), such as candidate pool approvals. Accordingly, HR and ODEI will partner to assess campus recruitment outcomes with regard to support for diversity and inclusion.

Improving processing time is a key component of the HR strategy. A critical aspect of this strategy is to convert from a paper process to an electronic workflow in order to expedite hiring processes and enhance transparency for HR customers. This process is now complete. As a result, it is now possible to log into the system and find out where a request is in the review process, whereas requestors were often “in the dark” in the past. Early reports indicate that the transition to a digital hiring process has been a successful step forward in enhancing the hiring process.

- **ODEI**
  As noted above, ODEI no longer has operational responsibilities for individual hiring processes. The investigative and disability accommodation compliance functions previously performed by ODEI have also transferred to HR. This separation of compliance functions from community-building and outreach initiatives will allow ODEI to focus more singularly on the latter, allowing for a greater emphasis on enhancing the campus climate than was possible under the old structure. And facilitating a closer working relationship between ODEI and the Chancellor’s Office will more strategically support efforts to promote a welcoming institutional culture that fully values and supports diversity and inclusion.

  To ensure that the investigative function transferred from ODEI to the new Office of Civil Rights and Title IX is working effectively, we have commissioned an external review of this function that will include soliciting feedback from participants in prior investigations. This data will be an important tool in helping to ensure that our processes are aligned with best practices and are meeting the needs of our community.

- **Marketing**
  Given the essential role that marketing plays in revenue-critical components of campus operations, such as Enrollment Management, Advancement, online education and the like, an external review was initiated to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the structure of our organizational marketing function. Completed in Spring 2019, the review observed that our marketing resources are distributed too widely across different departments on campus, at the expense of cohesion and clarity in our messaging.

  The reviewer recommended that we consolidate many, if not all, of these dispersed resources within a single reporting structure so that all of our marketing materials—digital
as well as analog—will reflect a shared branding and will consistently prioritize key message points. A centralized marketing function is in the process of formation and will be overseen by a new leader whose responsibilities will include supervision of a consolidated marketing unit, establishment of clear branding messages and guidelines, and responsibility for overseeing third party marketing efforts that are currently spread all over campus. The search to fill this chief marketing role is underway and should be complete by December 2019. Funding for this position, and for the ad hoc retention of external marketing support, will be derived from reallocation of existing resources.

- **Administration and Finance (A&F) Reorganization**
  The Administration and Finance division now more closely links the Budget and Financial Planning, Controller, and Contracts & Compliance functions of the campus. Functional silos in these areas had historically caused a breakdown in communication that led to losses in data integrity, poor projection of budgets and cash, and duplication of efforts through multiple positions. Changes in leadership in several A&F departments have also enabled the development of a stronger organization.

  In order to promote greater effectiveness and coordination across these functions, several organizational changes were implemented:
  - Re-organized reporting relationships within A&F to ensure Controller/Bursar, Budget & Financial Planning, and Contracts & Compliance (including Procurement) all report to the Associate Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance
  - The Emergency Management function was moved under the leadership of the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Contracts & Compliance

  In addition, the retirement of several departmental leaders enabled the promotion of talented long time University employees into new positions of leadership in several of areas, providing stability and strength across numerous departments.

- **Facilities**
  The Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance initiated an external review of the Facilities Department to identify steps that need to be taken to improve the maintenance and operation of the campus’s physical plant. All buildings, including the newer ones completed as part of the University’s capital master plan must be properly supported. The review was conducted by APPA, a leader in the educational facilities area that relies on a tested review methodology involving peer review and industry standard benchmarks. This approach also was used previously, and successfully, by UMass Lowell and UMass Amherst in enhancing their facilities management operations.

  The APPA report was completed in April 2019 and is on the University website at [https://www.umb.edu/facilities](https://www.umb.edu/facilities). Its recommendations include updating the department’s leadership organization, improved strategic and operational planning, and improved measurement of performance, including enhancing the use of the department’s TMA computer maintenance management system. Department leadership and campus stakeholders have assessed the implications of the APPA report and responsive actions have commenced with the launch of a search for a new Associate Vice Chancellor for
Facilities. Once hired, this new leader will be charged with overseeing the implementation of all of the recommendations.

- **Provost’s Office Budget Management Consolidation**
  The Provost’s Office is in the process of examining ways to provide administrative financial support to smaller academic units through a centralized unit. The flexibility inherent in this model would allow us to enhance service and better meet peak period demands for individual units without adding new administrative resources, while at the same time maintaining consistent, reliable quality support for each unit. Budgets of the individual units will be better aligned with their revenues and allow for reallocation of resources away from administrative overhead toward more direct service of their missions.

- **Shared Services**
  The UMass system-wide Shared Services initiative presents a valuable opportunity to improve the quality—and reduce the cost—for the areas of Procurement, Accounts Payable and Payroll. The first part of this project includes procurement and accounts payable, both of which are affecting Administration and Finance units; specifically, the Controller’s Office and the Procurement Office will be impacted by the implementation of the Shared Services model.

  Personnel dedicated to these functions will be consolidated at the UMass System’s Shrewsbury Office, with a limited number of staff potentially remaining on campus. The individual campuses will then essentially act as customers to the shared services organization, drawing service in the relevant area from the consolidated service center. This project is projected to realize approximately $16.5 million in annual savings system-wide, when fully implemented, as a result of consolidated purchasing power and administrative efficiencies.

  This transition to shared services in the areas of accounts payable and procurement is well underway. Affected staff have been offered positions in the new organization and the process of making final staffing assignments has begun. This process is expected to be completed in early November 2019. The UMass system recently hired a new Chief Procurement Officer, David Cho, to oversee the newly consolidated purchasing and accounts payable areas, with a specific charge to improve operations and customer service. The campus should begin to experience the benefit of the shared services model as of January 2020. Human Resources also may be affected in future, with a second phase of the project underway to assess the viability of shared services in payroll.

Administrative reorganizations have also been undertaken on the academic side:

- **Online education**
  To assist in the development of our plans for online education, as noted earlier we hired an outside expert with 20+ years’ experience in the online education field. This purpose of the review was to consider best practices and identify opportunities for improvement, including new program development, organizational structure, governance, tools &
supports, and finances. The recommendations informed the creation of a dedicated online division reporting directly to the Provost and Chancellor.

- **College of Advancing and Professional Studies (CAPS)**
  Concomitant with the move of online instruction out of CAPS, this unit will be recast as a continuing education division with responsibility for winter and summer sessions, off-site instruction, and professional/corporate development. Degree programs presently housed in CAPS will be moved into their sponsoring colleges. This reorganization has begun and will be complete this fall.

- **School for Global Inclusion and Social Development (SGISD)**
  Over the course of FY19, a process was undertaken by the Provost that culminated in moving the School for Global Inclusion and Social Development (SGISD), originally created as an independent school, under the aegis of the College for Education and Human Development. Through this merger, the school will maintain its academic integrity and national and international brand, while benefiting from incorporation into a mature collegiate structure. This merger was implemented as of March 1, 2019.

- **Office of Global Programs**
  The Office of Global Programs commissioned an external review of operations and based on its findings began implementing a series of structural changes designed to enhance service levels and maintain rigorous compliance with applicable requirements, including the creation of a new Executive Director role to promote focused leadership in the office. Other elements of the reorganization are ongoing under the aegis of the new office leadership.

These changes to the administrative structures of CAPS and SGISD, coupled with the dissolution in FY19 of the College of Public and Community Service, have reduced the number of colleges or independent schools on campus from 11 to 8. These reductions have been designed to maintain or strengthen academic quality while also rationalizing administrative structures and generating considerable administrative savings.

*Future Focus: Continuous Improvement*
In keeping with our commitment to continuous improvement, our intent is to make periodic administrative reviews part of our standard operating procedures moving forward. Several areas will engage in administrative reviews during FY20.

- The new campus CIO has been reviewing IT operations since his arrival on campus this summer. Operational alignments in key areas such as information security have already been implemented. His review is ongoing and likely will result in additional reorganizational moves over time.
- Our undergraduate and graduate enrollment management functions were recently studied by an outside consultant, who conducted data analysis and on-site interviews in order to benchmark our campus against industry practices. The consultant is also conducting a deep dive in the area of financial aid in FY20, in order to provide recommendations based on industry best practices. Further, the new Vice Chancellor
for Enrollment Management, John Drew, has begun the process of assessing organizational needs, in parallel with this external study. Additional phases of this review process will be developed and implemented after the new Vice Chancellor has the opportunity to complete his initial assessment. Recommendations from these activities will be pursued in the coming year.

- In Athletics, a peer review has been commissioned and was under way as of late September 2019.
- An internal review of ORSP, complemented by external expertise where useful, is also slated for 2019-20. UMass’ Internal Audit Department is also presently reviewing the university’s post award grant process. Further study is needed to understand how we can improve on pre and post award services to PIs.
Section 2: Financial Status of the University

Summary: UMB Financial Status
The campus has made significant progress in financial stability since interim Chancellor Barry Mills reported in May 2017 that the campus was facing close to a $30 million budget deficit for Fiscal Year 2018. After implementing a series of steps to increase revenues and decrease expenses throughout calendar year 2017 and early 2018 – including a voluntary separation program and a reduction in force, among other initiatives – the campus was able to close FY18 with a small $2.4 million (0.6%) operating surplus. That year marked the first time in four years that UMass Boston had generated an operating surplus, after posting operating deficits of -$1.3 million (-0.8%), -5.5 million (-1.4%), and -3.0 million (-0.7%) in the previous three fiscal years.

In summer 2018, as interim Chancellor Katherine Newman succeeded Barry Mills, plans were in place to achieve another balanced budget in FY19, with increases of approximately $15 million in new revenue and $15 million of increased costs expected, including $7 million of depreciation and interest payments. The projected operating margin (surplus) at that time was just shy of $500,000.

However, despite welcoming the largest freshmen class in UMB history in Fall 2018, revenues fell significantly short of budgeted revenue during FY19. These shortfalls were driven primarily by unanticipated changes in student course taking behavior, as students increased the number of credits taken (receiving more “free” credits), while also taking fewer (revenue producing) credits online and in face-to-face continuing education courses. The shortfall was also driven by deterioration in specific student segments, such as new undergraduate transfer students, continuing master’s students, and international students.

The revenue shortfalls required the campus to diligently manage and monitor expenses throughout FY19 in order to stay on course to the positive operating margin goal. It is testimony to the hard work of many stakeholders that the campus was able to keep expenses in line, ending the year with a slight surplus of $500,000. A one-time accounting accrual adjustment contributed another $3.4 million, leading to a final surplus of $3.9 million (0.9%).

Detail: UMB Financial Status
The following pages provide detail on the University’s finances, including the sources and uses of funds during FY19. Accounting in a university of this size is complicated and this section is not meant to be a comprehensive or definitive financial statement. The university’s financial statements can be found here: https://www.umb.edu/controller/financial_reports. Rather, this section (and this report in whole) is intended to provide transparent detail on the uses we make of all campus resources.
The university’s unaudited income statement for FY19 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenues</th>
<th>FY19 Income Statement</th>
<th>FY19 Restated (Gross Revenue/Expense)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition &amp; fees</td>
<td>245,734</td>
<td>245,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Discounts</td>
<td>(64,836)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition net of Discounts</td>
<td><strong>180,898</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and contracts</td>
<td>36,535</td>
<td>36,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private grants and contracts</td>
<td>15,939</td>
<td>15,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local grants and contracts</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>4,312</td>
<td>4,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>12,315</td>
<td>12,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>140,659</td>
<td>140,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts</td>
<td>4,907</td>
<td>4,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>2,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Income</td>
<td>3,082</td>
<td>3,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BABS Subsidy</td>
<td>3,059</td>
<td>3,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-operating Federal Grants</td>
<td>26,782</td>
<td>26,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenue (expense)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Fund Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**  
434,861  499,697

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>207,016</td>
<td>207,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>62,707</td>
<td>62,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-personnel expense</td>
<td>98,428</td>
<td>98,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and fellowships (Natural)</td>
<td>17,983</td>
<td>17,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>28,010</td>
<td>28,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>16,823</td>
<td>16,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition Discounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total**  
430,967  495,803

Operational Surplus/(Deficit)  
3,895  3,895

Note: The official income statement that the university publishes includes “tuition discounting” as part of operating revenues. For the purposes of this document, we have moved tuition discounting into the operating expenses to get total gross revenue and expense, as seen above. Tuition discounting refers to the scholarships and grants that universities provide to students.
Preliminary Fiscal Year 2019 actual revenues of $499.7M are in excess of expenses of $495.8M by $3.9M. This means the campus had an operating surplus of $3.9 million in FY19. The following pages explain the major sources of revenues1 and categories of expenses of the university.

**Revenue**

Overall gross revenue from all sources to the university totaled $499.7M in fiscal 2019. There are two major categories of revenue: Unrestricted and Restricted. Restricted revenue must be spent according to rules defined by the source of the funds whether that be a grantor, legislation or another limiting set of rules. Unrestricted revenue, which can be spent more flexibly, is largely from State Appropriation and Tuition & Fees, as well as other smaller sources, general funds totaled $390.5M, or 78% of revenue, revenue based funds, such as Educational Sales & Services and Research Trust Funds, totaled $28.2M or 6%. Restricted revenue such as Financial Aid, Grants or restricted Gifts totaled $81.0M or 16%. In total, unrestricted funds made up 84% of all revenue to the university.

1 Revenue and Expenses have been restated in this report to adjust for discounts netted against Tuition and Fee Revenue.
Unrestricted general funds revenue totaled $390.5M, 99% percent of which is derived from Tuition & Fees from students ($245.7M, or 63%) and State Appropriation ($139.3M or 36%).

Tuition & Fees in Fiscal 2019 were approved by the Board of Trustees. In-state undergraduate tuition was $13,841. Undergraduate out-of-state tuition was $33,620 and graduate tuition rates were $17,896 and $34,932 for in-state and out-of-state, respectively. (see Appendix B for detailed rates).

Undergraduate mandatory fees (Student Activity and Technology fees) were $326. Graduate mandatory fees were at $355.

State Appropriation includes both the university’s allocation from the larger UMASS System appropriation ($97.8M) and reimbursement for fringe benefit costs of employees whose salaries are paid with these funds ($45.5M).

Restricted Funds totaled $81.0M split nearly evenly between Financial Aid/Work Study and Grants and Contracts. Smaller amounts of restricted funds arise from Endowment, Private Gifts and some restricted funds appropriated by the state (ISA agreements).
Unrestricted Revenue-based funds totaled $28.2M in FY19 and consisted of several categories of funds:

Research Trust Funds (“RTF”) are the indirect administrative costs reimbursed by grants. These reimbursements range in the percentage available to be recovered for university costs but the weighted average of approximately 18.5%.

Food Services includes the revenue generated from the residential (mandatory) and commuter (voluntary) meal plans offered by the university to its students as well as the commission from on-campus food services sold to students, faculty, staff and the general public. The meal plan revenue is offset by expense to the campus food services vendor, Sodexo, for the cost of the meal plans offered.

Educational Sales & Service (“ESS”) is derived from faculty sales of educational products such as conferences and consulting.

Parking Operations includes parking fees received from sales of passes and gate revenue from the university’s garages and parking lots as well as parking fees paid by university departments for events.

WUMB is the university’s radio station which generates revenue from sales of merchandise, fundraising and workshops and events offered for a fee.

Development includes unrestricted gifts or donations made to the university.

Unrestricted Other Operating includes commissions from the university bookstore, game room and energy incentives and rebates.

Other includes miscellaneous unrestricted revenue generated from many different sources like rentals of sports facilities, housing and roof space for cell towers, as well as vendor rebates.
Expenses

FY19 gross expense was $495.8 million. Total expenditures are broken down by revenue sources as follows:

The majority (70%) of expenditures were in Unrestricted General Funds totaling $347.7 M, which originate from Tuition & Fees and State Appropriation. These funds are used for normal operating budget expenses like Personnel and Non-personnel costs.

Depreciation, Interest, and Plant expenditures are also funded from Unrestricted General Funds, but are shown separately because they are related to capital expenditures and are typically fixed costs, these costs total 9% of expenditures.

Unrestricted Revenue-Based funding accounts for 5% of total expenditures at $24.4M, these expenses include funding from Research Trust Fund ("RTF"), Educational Sales & Service ("ESS"), Food Services, and other revenue generating activity. The expenses are unrestricted, however they are spent by the areas that are generating the revenue, and are not allocated from central funding sources in the budget process. Expenses are limited to the revenue generated in a given year unless authorization is given to use past year balances called “carry-forward.” The use of carry-forward funds in excess of current year revenue generated in their aggregates negatively impacts the university’s operating margin and, therefore, is managed closely.

Restricted expenses accounted for $78.6M, or 16% of expenditures. Restricted expenses are funded only from direct restricted revenue sources. The largest sections of restricted expense
are Grants and Contracts and federal financial aid, but also includes gifts and special state allocations. These funds are also used in operating budgets for Personnel and Non-Personnel costs associated with the restricted nature of the source funding.

Unrestricted General Funds are allocated from Tuition & Fees and State Appropriation through the annual budget process. The majority of these expenditures are by Academic Affairs/Vice-Chancellor area budgets – totaling 68%. State fringe is accrued for, however is related to employees on state funding and can be tied directly to Academic Affairs and Vice-Chancellor budgets. When Fringe costs are included, Academic Affairs Unrestricted General Fund expenses amount to 53% of the total and Vice-Chancellors, 28%.

Financial Aid accounted for 17% of Unrestricted General Fund expenditures. This category includes waivers, university funded need-based financial aid, and merit-based financial aid.
Central Campus-wide/Accrual expenses account for 2% of unrestricted General Fund expenses and are not allocated to areas through the budget process but are required for operation. The types of expenditures here are centrally paid legal fees, employee vacation pay-outs, vacation and sick liability, allowances for doubtful accounts, uncollectable revenue write-offs and various other centrally managed expenses.

Financial Aid

Above, Financial Aid accounted for 17% or $59.0M of Unrestricted General Fund spending. When adding Restricted spending on Financial Aid the total spending rises to $95.9M or 19% of all university spending. Restricted Financial aid includes: Federal Pell Grants, State and Federal Aid, and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants ("SEOG").
Appendix A: Report on Administrative Staffing and Expenditures
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DOES UMB HAVE TOO MANY ADMINISTRATORS OR SPEND TOO MUCH ON ADMINISTRATION?

James J. Hughes Ph.D., OIRAP

May 2019

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The most recent comparative occupational data available from IPEDS suggests that UMB is understaffed at the “management” level compared to peers. In 2017 UMass Boston reported roughly a third as many “management” FTEs per 1000 student FTEs as peer institutions, and the fewest of any of our peers.

- Both federal occupational classifications schemes, and federal categories for spending, leave large discretion to HR and Finance staff. This makes comparing institutions, or comparisons over time, suspect. From year to year, there are large jumps and drops in reported numbers of staff by category, and amounts spent in different categories, as HR and Finance personnel change their minds about how to classify particular positions or expenditures.

- Nonetheless, since the 1980s, UMB has classified about 80-90 positions as “executives” or “managers.” (A bungled reclassification of employees in 2011 led to the mis-impression that we had more administrators than peers, until they were re-classified again in 2017.) Even this number may be misleadingly high, since there are approximately 20 of those 80-90 that are presently under consideration for re-classification as “professionals.”

- While UMB appears to be understaffed at the executive/management level, and in non-instructional staff in general, it is on the high end of instructional staffing. In the Fall of 2017, out of 177 public universities in the US News rankings, we ranked 149th in management FTEs per student FTEs and 134th in non-instructional staff FTEs per student FTEs, but 13th in instructional FTEs per student FTEs.

- UMB also appears to spend more on instruction than most peers. In the 2016-2017 fiscal year, out of 173 public universities in the US News rankings, we ranked 116th in non-instructional expenditures per student FTE, but 46th in instructional expenditures per student FTE.
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFFING

The federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) started collecting data about the employees at universities in the 1970s. In 1993 this task shifted to the National Clearinghouse for Educational Statistics (NCES), and the administration of the IPEDS HR survey. Until 2011 IPEDS continued to ask for staff by their EEOC categories. Then in 2011 the survey switched to a new, and much more detailed, set of occupational categories used by the Department of Labor, the Standard Occupational Classification (SOC). Any comparison across institutions to determine the proportion of administrators to faculty, staff or students needs to rely on the reported data from these surveys.

Unfortunately, there are large differences between these two different methods of classification, and institutions have a lot of discretion in how they classify employees into these systems.

First, let’s look at the EEO-6 (or Employee Assigned Position) category of “Executive, Administrative and Managerial” jobs used until 2011. The NCES specified that the following types of employees should be assigned to that category if they were in these federal SOC categories. One can see that there will often be some discretion as to whether someone is an educational administrator, some other kind of administrator, or a “professional.”

Executive, Administrative and Managerial Positions

11-1000 Top Executives
11-1010 Chief Executives
11-1020 General and Operations Managers
11-2000 Advertising, etc Managers
11-3000 Operations Specialties Managers
11-3010 Administrative Services Managers
11-3020 Computer and Info Sys Managers
11-3030 Financial Managers
11-3040 Human Resources Managers
11-3060 Purchasing Managers

11-9033 Education Administrators—includes Presidents and vice presidents
assistant and associate vice presidents (if they direct the work of others)
deans (if their principal activity is administrative)
assistant and associate deans (if they direct the work of others)
directors and department heads (if their principal activity is administrative)

For the most part administrators who are not classified as “managers” are found in the next category of “professionals,” i.e. administrators who don’t direct others.

However, parsing who is actually “directing the work of others” among those with the title of Assistant Dean, or Director, or Associate VP, is not straightforward. The table below shows the reported FTEs in this category at our peer institutions from the 1980s to 2011. I have highlighted in red places where HR departments changed their minds about how to apply these categories, resulting in large shifts in the number of reported administrators.
### Reported Fall “Executive, Administrative and Managerial” FTEs, 1987-2011 (EEO6/EAP Categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1987</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMass Boston</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State U</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1038</td>
<td>1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Louisville</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U MD Baltimore County</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Memphis</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-Kansas City</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nevada-Reno</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Dartmouth</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large year-to-year fluctuations in reported administrative FTEs illustrate the subjective nature of the classifications at each institution—as well as the fact that comparisons among institutions, even peers, and even UMass peers, are unreliable.

---

### A Note on Peer Groups

We compile metrics for 380 colleges and universities. But our principal comparative focus is on the peer group chosen for us by the UMass President, supplemented by our UMass peers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presidential Peers</th>
<th>UMass Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State U</td>
<td>U of Maryland, Baltimore County, U of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>U of Massachusetts Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Louisville</td>
<td>U of Memphis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Maryland, Baltimore County</td>
<td>U of Nevada-Reno</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chart shows the relationship between reported management FTEs and student FTEs in the Fall of 2011. UMB is in the middle of the pack.

In 2011, when the IPEDS HR survey switched to asking for Department of Labor SOC occupational categories instead, many institutions applied large re-code tables to their HR data. In the UMass system however, these tables were misapplied. For instance, from 2011-2016 many administrators and professionals here were re-classified to, and reported as, “Construction Managers”, including myself. This led to our reporting twice as many (150-200) “managers” as we should have (80-90).

In 2017, waiting for the position of HR Information Services (HRIS) Director to be filled, OIRAP began attempting to re-classify all UMB employees. Using the O-Net online tool (https://www.onetonline.org) we came up with several wildly divergent interpretations of how employees should be re-coded. We were greatly relieved when Michael Glynn was hired as HRIS Director, and he undertook a revision of the SOC categories for the 2017 reporting.
However, as highlighted in the table below, there were large shifts resulting from Michael’s corrections to the SOC codes, and some large fluctuations at other institutions as similar recodings took place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management FTEs 2012-2018 (IPEDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012  2013  2014  2015  2016  2017  2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Boston  149  164  173  195  184  89  82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State U  234  249  260  267  282  269  129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Illinois at Chicago  752  751  757  747  781  801  783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Louisiana  535  534  542  570  539  549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U MD Baltimore County  290  305  328  330  330  339  363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell  255  289  322  359  365  382  399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Memphis  81  80  73  64  177  179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-Kansas City  280  270  263  263  291  274  156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nevada-Reno  71  104  106  111  113  115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst  515  167  183  191  186  195  204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Dartmouth  176  171  172  167  161  174  177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At UMB our most recent recodings have resulted in roughly the same – 80-90 - number of executives according to both our pre-2011 EEO-6 methods and post-2011 SOC classification methods. The chart below shows that UMB’s reported 80-90 managers are roughly a third of the number of Management FTEs per 1000 annualized student FTEs as at peer institutions. Even before the clean up of our coding, UMB was reporting about 75% of the management staffing as at peer institutions.

**Reported Management FTEs per 1000 Student FTEs**
In 2017 UMB reported the fewest administrative FTEs of any of our peers.
Combining "executives/managers" with "business and finance" employees smooths out most of the shuffling of classifications since 2012. The chart below shows that UMB has had roughly half the number of Management plus Business and Finance FTEs per 1000 student FTEs as peer institutions.

**Reported Management, Business and Finance FTEs per 1000 Annual Student FTEs**
By contrast, there have consistently been more instructional FTEs (about whom there is also less classification uncertainty) per annualized student FTEs here, which is another way of saying that we have had *lower student-faculty ratios*.

**Instructional FTEs per 1000 Annual Student FTEs**

![Graph showing instructional FTEs per 1000 annual student FTEs from 2012 to 2018 for Univ of Mass Boston, Avg Pres Peer Group, and Avg UMass Peers.]
A common charge is that higher education has been adding not just more executives, but more non-instructional staff in general, than faculty. So another way to look at staffing is the relationship of instructional to non-instructional FTEs. An advantage of this perspective is that it gets around the classification issues; there is little ambiguity about who is an instructor and who is not.

While UMB is on the spare end of non-instructional staffing, it is on the high end of instructional staffing. In the Fall of 2017, out of 177 public universities in the US News rankings, we ranked 149th in management FTEs per student FTEs and 134th in total non-instructional staff FTEs per student FTEs, but 13th in instructional FTEs per student FTEs.
Looking just at our immediate peer group, we see again that UMB is on the high end of instructional staffing, and the low end of non-instructional staffing.

In July 2018 the UMass President’s office released the “FY2019 Annual Operating Budget” which included staffing at UMass schools, but using the old EEO-6 categories.


Although these are no longer collected by IPEDS, we continue to report our employees in these categories to the state, and on our website here:

https://www.umb.edu/oirap/statistical_portraits/faculty_and_staff

It has been pointed out that the reported FY2019 executive FTEs in that UMPO report – again, using the old EEO-6 categories – were 91 for UMB, 56 for UMass Dartmouth, 69 for UMass Lowell, and 138 for UMass Amherst. Clearly there is a large disconnect between the “executives” in this classification and the much larger numbers of “management” FTEs our UMass peers are reporting to IPEDS.
When we examined the roughly 80-90 positions that we have been reporting as "executives" (EEO6) or "managers" (IPEDS) we discovered about twenty of them should probably be reclassified as "professionals," including staff with the titles of Assistant Dean, Assistant Vice Chancellor or Associate Provost who do not in fact manage staff. We will be exploring further reclassifications of staff with HR which may make the administrative understaffing at UMB appear even more severe.

INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENDITURES

Every Spring the federal IPEDS system collects finance data from universities broken down by various categories. As with the occupational categories above, institutions have large discretion as to how to categorize spending, limiting the utility of comparative spending data. With that caveat in mind, administrative salaries appear in several of the IPEDS spending categories:

**Institutional Support**: “Expenses for general administrative services, central executive-level activities concerned with management and long range planning, legal and fiscal operations, space management, employee personnel and records, logistical services, public relations and development and information technology.”

**Academic Support**: “Expenses associated with activities and services that support the institution's primary missions of instruction, research, and public service.” This would include provosts and deans.

**Student Services**: “Expenses associated with admissions, registrar activities, and activities (contributing to student well-being including) student activities, cultural events, student newspapers, intramural athletics, student organizations, supplemental instruction, career guidance, counseling, financial aid administration, and student records”

IPEDS also publishes a metric of each category of expenditure divided by the unduplicated annual student FTE. These also reflect the wide discretion in how to classify expenditures.

### FY2017 Expenditures per Student FTE (IPEDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
<th>Academic Support</th>
<th>Student Services</th>
<th>Institutional Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UMass Boston</td>
<td>$14,654</td>
<td>$3,940</td>
<td>$633</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
<td>$2,462</td>
<td>$5,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State U</td>
<td>$9,773</td>
<td>$902</td>
<td>$638</td>
<td>$2,684</td>
<td>$1,799</td>
<td>$2,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>$30,165</td>
<td>$10,344</td>
<td>$8,785</td>
<td>$7,417</td>
<td>$2,463</td>
<td>$2,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Louisville</td>
<td>$16,438</td>
<td>$8,291</td>
<td>$8,275</td>
<td>$8,318</td>
<td>$2,079</td>
<td>$5,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U MD Baltimore County</td>
<td>$11,426</td>
<td>$6,788</td>
<td>$1,942</td>
<td>$2,450</td>
<td>$1,922</td>
<td>$4,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Lowell</td>
<td>$11,575</td>
<td>$4,107</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$3,305</td>
<td>$3,263</td>
<td>$3,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Memphis</td>
<td>$9,820</td>
<td>$3,127</td>
<td>$832</td>
<td>$1,961</td>
<td>$3,872</td>
<td>$1,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Missouri-Kansas City</td>
<td>$13,714</td>
<td>$1,489</td>
<td>$2,335</td>
<td>$3,364</td>
<td>$1,730</td>
<td>$3,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Nevada-Reno</td>
<td>$14,571</td>
<td>$4,624</td>
<td>$3,151</td>
<td>$3,067</td>
<td>$2,915</td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Amherst</td>
<td>$15,975</td>
<td>$4,690</td>
<td>$1,132</td>
<td>$3,031</td>
<td>$2,561</td>
<td>$3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMass Dartmouth</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
<td>$1,795</td>
<td>$507</td>
<td>$3,499</td>
<td>$3,004</td>
<td>$4,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the 2016-2017 fiscal year, out of 173 public universities in the US News rankings, we ranked 116th in non-instructional expenditures per student FTEs, but 46th in instructional expenditures per student FTEs.
## Appendix B

### University of Massachusetts

#### BOSTON Campus

### Student Tuition/Fees

#### Fiscal Year 2019

## FY 2019 TUITION & MANDATORY FEES SUMMARY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY2018 Actual</th>
<th>FY2019 Proposed</th>
<th>$ Change FY18-FY19</th>
<th>% Change FY18-FY19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDERGRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (resident)</td>
<td>$13,110</td>
<td>$13,503</td>
<td>$13,841</td>
<td>$338</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate New England Regional</td>
<td>$24,511</td>
<td>$25,473</td>
<td>$26,453</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (non-resident)</td>
<td>$31,698</td>
<td>$32,660</td>
<td>$33,640</td>
<td>$980</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATORY FEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities (Undergraduate)</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MANDATORY FEES &amp; TUITION</strong></td>
<td>$13,435</td>
<td>$13,828</td>
<td>$14,167</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (resident)</td>
<td>$24,836</td>
<td>$25,798</td>
<td>$26,779</td>
<td>$981</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (non-resident)</td>
<td>$32,023</td>
<td>$32,985</td>
<td>$33,966</td>
<td>$981</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTS ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Room</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$9,468</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Board</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5,390</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$14,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TUITION AND ROOM &amp; BOARD</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$29,025</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (resident)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$29,025</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (NER)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$41,637</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate (non-resident)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$48,824</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (resident)</td>
<td>$16,863</td>
<td>$17,375</td>
<td>$17,896</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate New England Regional</td>
<td>$27,040</td>
<td>$28,042</td>
<td>$29,059</td>
<td>$1,017</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (non-resident)</td>
<td>$32,913</td>
<td>$33,915</td>
<td>$34,932</td>
<td>$1,017</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MANDATORY FEES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Activities (Graduate)</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MANDATORY FEES &amp; TUITION</strong></td>
<td>$17,218</td>
<td>$17,730</td>
<td>$18,251</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (resident)</td>
<td>$27,395</td>
<td>$28,397</td>
<td>$29,414</td>
<td>$1,017</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate (NER)</td>
<td>$33,268</td>
<td>$34,270</td>
<td>$35,287</td>
<td>$1,017</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADUATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>