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Preface

The history of universities has been closely tied to the fate and development of modern states and the societies those states have come to govern. At no time in this history have the roles of universities been more central than today to the character and direction of states—and to the moral and intellectual standing of universities themselves—in view of the cultural and social leadership universities must provide in our emerging, single (though highly differentiated) global society.

First, universities must shape the globalization of scholarship, embodying multiple modes of collaboration among students, faculty, and staff in the process of knowledge-making, knowledge-transferring, and knowledge-sharing. The national and trans-border recruitment of students and faculty; the extension of online teaching and learning across political and geographical markers; trans-national research endeavors; joint and dual degree programs within and outside trans-societal university campuses; and partnerships among governments, universities, and private foundations (local and global) to promote local and international socio-economic development—these are but some current examples of this globalization.

Second, if universities are to be leaders in the ongoing globalization, they must be the sites of a rich repertoire of pedagogies—a repertoire co-extensive with the cultural richness and complexity that will define the best environments for learning and teaching across cultures. Waiting on the development, refinement, or use of these pedagogies are billions of minds and the growth of huge bodies of knowledge to which both students and professors can have access. So professors will now become guides—mentors—in the process of organizing, testing, interpreting, and applying knowledge. Students, no longer solely recipients of “the facts” (a significant portion of which will be available electronically), will be co-designers of curricula and co-teachers in their own intellectual, social, and professional development. Universities must be prepared to adapt accordingly.

A third essential feature of the new university follows from the first two—an acknowledgement that our traditional disciplinary walls do not work well enough, and that trans-disciplinarity (which requires mastering a conceptual language that enables professors and students to migrate intellectually across disciplinary boundaries) must become routine, in order to integrate into teaching and learning a fluid, reciprocal relationship between the kinds of research that are called pure and applied. The collaboration and pedagogies just mentioned, along with trans-disciplinary research and teaching, must be allied to a translational approach to research—one which, because of the nature of reality itself and the extraordinary problems the world faces and will face, requires the researcher to move fluidly between the pure and the applied, and vice versa, with each approach informing and refining the other. Of course, the need for partnerships will also be an element of this feature. The academy must join with government, industry, non-governmental networks of organizations, and local communities to co-construct the processes by which knowledge is gained and distributed, and thus to co-create our common future.

The evaluation and use of knowledge—from the traditional outcomes assessment we now speak about, to the standing of peer-review journals (in contrast to or alliance with online publication and review), to the more general relationship between print and the emerging social web—are also undergoing change and will more radically change in the future. An aspect of this fourth feature will be the role of intellectual property (patentable and copyrightable productions,
especially those potentially allowing for certain forms of institution-specific comparative advantage, material or other) in the determination of recruitment, tenure, and promotion. The right to participate in the cultural life of communities, to enjoy the arts and share in scientific advancement, is specified by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a moral claim of all. Working to realize that right—a fifth feature—is now among the responsibilities of universities, and will grow even more weightily so in the future. This is especially true of public universities, which are called on to help maintain and promote the public sphere, and to effect deep engagement with communities and their development at local, national, trans-national, and global levels. Understanding the issue of development helps one grapple with the sixth feature—the primacy of knowledge and culture in that development, and the centrality of universities in the production of knowledge that leads to the transformation and security of societies and peoples. This understanding also indicates why the university is the fundamental site from which the ingredients for social inclusion flow—a fact not lost upon those who believe in social and human equality. A focus on new professional possibilities and the portability of skills will be part of this emphasis on development, and these skills will, in part, come by way of co-curricular learning. Clearly, given the realities described above, a wise university must be prepared to assess the very character of its present organization, not only to improve its effectiveness and its reach, but also to convey a message to the various constituencies within that reach that it deserves their generous and sustained support; and that in supporting the university, they demonstrably support themselves and their communities. This strategic plan is an important step toward building the new university, some features of which are touched on above.

Winston E. Langley  
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs  
University of Massachusetts Boston
FULFILLING THE PROMISE:
A BLUEPRINT FOR UMass BOSTON

I. Introduction

“The year is 2025. At the University of Massachusetts Boston, a great public urban research university, we honor our origins as a teaching institution and our tradition of public service. At the same time, we have taken bold steps to grow in stature as a sophisticated research university, and to play a distinguished part on the global stage. We have become the university our founders destined us to be in their original statement of purpose (Appendix A): well equipped to provide opportunities truly ‘equal to the best.’

“In 2025, UMass Boston maintains a firm commitment to teaching modest-income and first-generation students from urban areas. We offer them—and students from geographic areas both nearby and half a world apart—vital academic programs that prepare them to be competent, creative, and compassionate citizens and leaders who shape the quality of individual and social life. The campus, as a result, is truly international. Effective and transparent practices with respect to faculty hiring, course load assignment, and space allocation ensure an optimal and well accepted balance of large and small classes. And residence halls, the first of which opened in 2014, are among the safe, modern, and technologically advanced academic and student-life facilities that now grace our expansive waterfront campus.

“In 2025, UMass Boston is 25,000 students strong. More than 60 percent of undergraduate students graduate, ready to succeed in a transnational world. Faculty pursue deeply engaged research, teaching, and service. Sponsored research activities have increased the university’s external funding by at least 300 percent, enabling the university to continue to rise within the Carnegie Foundation’s Research/High ranking, earned in 2011, to research status of the first order. As undergraduate and graduate students engage in research, they acquire the refined and complex knowledge, values, and skills of inquiry that the globalized world requires. We are meeting our founders’ challenge to ‘preserve and extend…the domain of knowledge’ through research with local and global reach. We are creating new knowledge in all major areas of human concern.”

This is the destination. What we must do in order to reach it is the substance of this Strategic Plan: a blueprint for UMass Boston to guide us through the next 15 years. It addresses the ways that the university should and must advance in the coming years in the face of—and often because of—financial considerations. Divided into three five-year segments, this plan is a natural outgrowth of our first 45 years and a bold leap forward. Our ambition is to have, by 2025, national standing and an international imprint comparable to the best public urban universities in the country. This is a vital ambition, for only at this level can we thrive, keep pace with our founding mission to offer students affordable access to opportunities “equal to the best,” and fulfill our covenant to serve urban communities on a global scale.

This is also a realistic ambition, for UMass Boston already enjoys a strong national reputation often overlooked close to home, having gained stature in disciplines crucial to the well-being of people, societies, and the environment. Our steps over the past 45 years have been so gradual and so deliberate that one might easily take our breathtaking transformation for granted. We began as a largely state-supported, primarily undergraduate college largely based in a single building in
downtown Boston. Since then we have metamorphosed into New England’s premier public urban research university, with 25 percent of our students in master’s and doctoral programs.

Over time, the university’s economic model has also altered radically. In FY 1985, state appropriations accounted for 75 percent of total operating revenue. Twenty-six years later, in FY 2011, that share has plunged to 28 percent, while revenue from other sources (chiefly tuition and fees, grants, and contracts) has grown accordingly.

Throughout a history characterized by deep change, the university has combined thoughtful planning with creative responses to external pressures, challenges, and opportunities. The results are visible today in programs, service, and leadership comparable—as our founders hoped—to those provided by land-grant universities that are now research powerhouses.

Today we find ourselves at an important crossroads: still committed to our founders’ statement of purpose, we are poised to seize imperative opportunities to grow in size and rise in academic stature at an unprecedented pace. Yet this is not a strange or new place for us. We belong here. We have worked carefully, deliberately, and tirelessly to prepare ourselves for this moment. We are ready.

It is imperative that we seize the moment. Why? Because over our shoulder we see competitors that aspire to be where we are and are closing the gap. We are in competition for talented students, faculty, and staff who seek an academic experience in which deep research and a concrete global presence fortify a strong teaching mission. We need to ensure that the degrees we grant signify attainment at the top of American public higher education, and that our graduates are coveted worldwide in all sectors. The strategies laid out in this document aim to achieve this by raising our research productivity, enlarging our full-time faculty, increasing the numbers of our out-of-state and international students, and building our financial strength.

Through his convocation addresses, the chancellor has laid out a remarkable and expansive vision for the role and future development of UMass Boston, anchored in a deep understanding of a “student-centered, urban, public, research university with a teaching soul.” Similarly, the provost has expressed his unyielding commitment to a richer, more global, research status for this campus. Both have asked us to think boldly and to speak candidly in our effort to help them realize those extraordinary visions.

We did not shrink from this challenge.

II. The Strategic Planning Process

When Chancellor Motley took office in 2007, he inherited a nearly complete three-year plan, which he honored and saw through to completion in 2010. In that year, the Bayside purchase presented us with an unparalleled opportunity to take a major step in our evolution. With a solid foundation in a 25-year, fully vetted and approved master plan—the framework for developing our campus infrastructure and landscape—the chancellor determined that the time was right for a 15-year strategic plan. The length of this cycle enabled the longer-term strategic thinking needed to improve graduation rates, advance and strengthen academic programming, and expand the research enterprise. The 15-year window also allowed the university to think more strategically about infrastructure and new economies of scale needed to support this evolution.

In January 2010 the chancellor convened a Strategic Planning Task Force, chaired by Provost Winston Langley, to explore strategies for seizing the new opportunities before us. Between then
and June 2010, planners engaged in a thoughtful and thorough updating of UMass Boston’s Mission and Values Statement and rewrote our Vision Statement to express this conviction: “As Boston’s only public university, while we honor our origins as a teaching institution and our tradition of public service, we must also move forward as the increasingly sophisticated research university that we are and continue to become.” (Appendix B contains the full text of the revised statements.)

At the same time, task force sub-committees tackled the university’s major strategic planning areas. Their final reports, published in June 2010, addressed a range of problems in depth. These led to the five broad goals cited in Section III below. In the fall of 2010, the provost created the Implementation Design Team (IDT) to use these goals as a planning foundation to guide development of specific planning objectives and practical strategies for achieving them. Headed by Stephen Crosby, dean of the McCormack Graduate School, the team was divided into seven workgroups. (See Appendix C for workgroup membership and missions.)

Between October 2010 and June 2011, the IDT held 22 meetings to define the critical steps the university must take to realize its vision over the next 15 years, focusing in detail on the first five. The workgroups also met frequently during that period, submitting all reports by early April. University-wide outreach for reactions and feedback began in the spring of 2011 as IDT members spoke and listened at more than 30 campus events, including a Faculty Council open meeting and two open campus forums as the IDT grappled with its most challenging issues and recommendations. Outreach included posting the spring 2010 task force reports (http://bit.ly/mKcafH) and spring 2011 IDT workgroup reports (http://bit.ly/ixfxn1) on the university’s website as well as surveys and focus groups conducted by the Communications and Infrastructure workgroups.

The planning process thus sought broad participation, and with good reason. The plan will affect all classroom and co-curricular study, research, civic engagement, and global outreach initiatives over the next 15 years. Everyone connected to this campus—both those on campus and external constituencies—therefore has a stake in how this Strategic Plan will shape the future. Broad participation and transparency remain ongoing pursuits.

III. The Plan at a Glance

The Implementation Design Team formed its recommendations around the five major goals of the Strategic Plan, paying close attention to the goals’ strong inter-relationships and interdependencies.

- **Advance student success and development** by increasing graduation rates, increasing the percentage of tenure-stream (those who are tenured or eligible for tenure) and full-time non-tenure-stream, research, and clinical faculty, opening the first residence hall by 2014, and establishing an Honors College.

- **Enrich and expand academic programs and research** through undergraduate and graduate program development, expansion of on-line offerings and University College, and expansion of the research enterprise.

- **Improve the learning, teaching, and working environment** with new academic buildings, programs to nurture and retain the best faculty and staff, a reduced
courseload for tenure-stream faculty with research and teaching responsibilities, and consideration toward replacing part-time with full-time non-tenure-stream faculty.

- **Establish a financial resources model consistent with the university’s vision statement.** This includes increasing the enrollment in stages, raising the proportion of out-of-state and international students, discussing differential fees, expanding extramural funding, working to secure more state funding, and adopting a review and reallocation process.

- **Develop an infrastructure supportive of the preceding goals,** which includes a process to deal with short- and long-term space needs; a thorough review of administrative systems and organizational structures; a comprehensive review of the mission, staffing, and technical capacity of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs; and development of a comprehensive and well-supported communication strategy. Rebuilding the technology infrastructure according to the IT Master Plan is also a part of this goal.

### IV. Charting the Course

The size, complexity, and multi-level interdependencies of our Strategic Plan have motivated us to treat it as one would a major construction project, using project management tools to guide plan implementation by identifying checkpoints at which to judge progress and to choose among appropriate courses of action. When completed, it will provide UMass Boston with a clear path toward fulfilling itself, to achieve—in today’s global and educational context—the stature and effectiveness its founders envisioned fifty years ago.

Appendix D contains executive summaries of the workgroup reports with links to the full reports on the university’s website. We hope the reader will read the reports in their entirety. In this section we highlight several critical conclusions about vital aspects of this report. We also want to address important concerns raised among ourselves and across the campus. Members of the university’s faculty, students, and staff have raised concerns that the changes envisioned in the Strategic Plan may compromise important commitments and values from UMass Boston’s past and present. Indeed, the Strategic Plan does propose changes on the campus—just as the world around us has changed. While we believe strongly that this plan will not compromise any of UMass Boston’s essential values, it is appropriate to address those concerns clearly.

**Goal 1: Advance student success and development.**

**Objective 1: Increase the graduation rates of freshmen and transfer students** by building a system of on-track indicators and pathways; expanding learning community programs; and providing developmental advising for all students, better orientation, assessment, and placement processes, more academic support, a richer campus life, and teaching and learning that promotes engagement and success. Target graduation rates for fall 2015 entering cohorts:

- 60 percent for first-time and transfer freshmen (assumes residence halls open in fall 2014)
- 62 percent for transfers with sophomore status
- 73 percent for transfers with 60 or more credits
UMass Boston loses 20 to 25 percent of each entering cohort (freshmen and transfer) by the second fall. Our freshman retention rate (75 percent of students who entered in fall 2008) is just below the average of 77 percent for our peer and aspirant peer institutions. And our six-year graduation rates have consistently been in the bottom quartile relative to our peer and aspirant peer institutions, averaging 36 percent over the past five years. In 2010 both the Chronicle of Higher Education and the Huffington Post listed UMass Boston among the colleges with the lowest rates.

Analysis of student success and progress to degree completion revealed that students who continue into the second year on track are far more likely to graduate than students who do not. And except for transfers who enter the university with 60 or more credits, most who continue into the second year are not on track in terms of credit accumulation (24-30+ credits per year) and grade point average (2.5-3.0 or better).

Improving retention and graduation rates must therefore be a top priority. University of Massachusetts President Robert L. Caret said it best: “We must provide appropriate support to all students who walk in our doors. To fail to do so is disingenuous and inappropriate. Students arrive with the expectation that they will be successful and if we accept them, we need to take the steps needed to ensure that they can be successful. We want to remain accessible and we should, but we need to do so in ways in which student attrition is minimized and student success is maximized.”

Graduation Rate workgroup findings indicate the need to build a new system and culture that places and keeps students on track, integrates their academic and social experiences, and connects them to networks from the start. Needed are appropriate and clear pathways through major and degree requirements, quality involvement and engagement, and academic and co-curricular experiences that are educationally purposeful. We also need to increase students’ connections to collective and individual cultural agents who value academic achievement and can engage students.

Advising is key to student success. We need to significantly increase the capacity of departments to provide advising for declared majors and recommend hiring college and department-based professional advisors to augment faculty advising in the majors.

To increase the success of students who enter as freshmen, we need to develop a fully coherent first-year experience including orientation, intake advising, assessment, and transition support. We recommend the expansion and development of college-based learning communities. Similarly, we need to develop programming that connects transfer students to the university community early and often. We also recommend the identification of and support for teaching and learning activities that address the specific needs of freshmen and transfer students. We need to increase opportunities to extend learning and engagement (undergraduate research, study abroad, service learning, civic engagement, co- and extra-curricular activities).

Increasing need-based financial aid, on-campus employment opportunities, and college-sensitive off-campus employment opportunities also remain especially important. Likewise, as discussed in a later section, it is crucial for retention efforts that the campus move more quickly toward establishing UMass Boston residence halls.

Raising retention and graduation rates, standard metrics of student success, is as strategic to institutional advancement as enrollment growth. Improving retention not only increases and sustains revenue, it also contributes to UMass Boston’s quality and reputation; better undergraduate retention boosts the graduation rate, the most widely cited measure of instructional outcomes.
**Objective 2: Increase the overall percentage of tenure-stream (tenured and tenure-track) faculty** to make us comparable to the best of our peers and aspirational peers. Using headcount figures (as opposed to full-time equivalency) for better comparison to peer institutions using Integrated Post-secondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data, we recommend raising tenure-stream faculty to 45 percent of total headcount by 2015 and to 50 percent by 2025.

Nearly a decade ago, the university lost 100 senior faculty to state-sponsored early retirement initiatives. Since then we have worked to replace those who retired and have recruited new faculty for new programs. However, in the last five years—in keeping with the past strategic plan—we have hired only 41 net new tenure-stream faculty, well below the number required for replacing retirees and others who have left the university. As a result, the percentage of tenure-stream faculty has decreased: tenure-stream faculty were 54 percent of total headcount faculty in 1999, 47 percent in 2004, and are currently at 41 percent. This places us in the bottom third of our peer and aspirational peer group: nine of 15 comparison universities have higher percentages of tenure-stream faculty than we do. Enrollment growth has further complicated our efforts, increasing the ratio of students to tenure-stream faculty from 22:1 to 28.4:1 in the last five years. Increasing to 45 percent by 2015 would place us at the national average and bring us to the middle of our peer and aspirational peer comparison group. Increasing to 50 percent by 2025 would move us into the third quartile.

Faculty success is related not only to the personal expertise and skill of individual faculty members, but also to the size, diversity, composition, and workload of the faculty as a whole. In the area of teaching, tenure-stream faculty are responsible for developing and evaluating curricula, providing instruction, and advising students. Non-tenure-stream faculty, on the other hand, have a more limited set of teaching responsibilities, often confined to direct instructional activities. Similarly, tenure-stream faculty are explicitly responsible for engaging in significant research and mentoring graduate and undergraduate students in research, whereas non-tenure stream faculty are not. We must therefore rebuild the tenure-stream faculty in order to provide much needed research experiences for undergraduates and mentor graduate students appropriately.

In addition, current educational research suggests that student learning outcomes and graduation rates may be compromised by heavy dependence on part-time non-tenure-stream faculty who are less available to students outside the classroom. This is especially true for students who are most “at risk.” It is the tenure-stream faculty who will provide undergraduates with the research experiences and skills they need and the engagement outside of the classroom that will help increase retention and graduation rates. It is also tenure-stream faculty who will enable us to build the new PhD programs we envision. Therefore, the ability of the university to carry out its responsibilities fully and well rests in part on having enough tenure-stream faculty to teach at all levels of the curriculum.

To be “equal to the best” means raising our academic stature by changing this trend, thereby enhancing our ability to attract and retain the best possible faculty, better support undergraduate and graduate student success, and continue to increase the research profile of the university. Therefore, increasing the number of tenure-stream faculty in our classrooms to keep up with enrollment growth goals is a major concern, particularly in the College of Nursing and Health Sciences and the College of Liberal Arts.

Not only does UMass Boston have a lower percentage of tenure-stream faculty than nine of our 15 peer or aspirant peer institutions, we also have a lower percentage of non-tenure stream full-time faculty than 12 of our peers. This is the result of having so few full-time clinical and research...
faculty among our faculty mix. These full-time faculty in particular have the time to work with students outside of the classroom and help tenure-stream faculty mentor students in clinical applications and in research.

The Academic Planning and Enrollment workgroup conducted its faculty analysis for the university as a whole. The Implementation Design Team concluded that further study is needed to refine the university’s optimal mix of tenure-stream, full-time non-tenure-stream, research, and clinical faculty by academic unit. More unit-specific analyses are also needed to determine where to concentrate incremental faculty growth. We also recommend further consideration toward growing our full-time, non-tenure-stream teaching and research faculty. The guiding principle is clear: to rebuild the faculty to make UMass Boston comparable to the best of our peers and aspirational peers.

**Objective 3: Open the first residence hall by fall 2014.**

The addition of residence halls is a critical condition for the ultimate success of this Strategic Plan. Specifically, residence halls will support sustained enrollment growth, improved graduation rates and retention, increased revenue generation, and an expanded honors program. We have assumed the advent of at least 1,000 beds by the fall of 2014. We believe this is a minimum, and we believe this commitment must be met.

Residence halls—together with the recommendation to increase out-of-state and international students, many of whom will be in campus housing—have raised the issue that this new dynamic might compromise or diminish the undergraduate experience. We see on-campus housing as vital, however, if UMass Boston is to live up to its promise of being “equal to the best.” The urban students who make up the majority of our student body deserve no less an opportunity for a residential experience than do their counterparts in other institutions. Residence halls are vital to UMass Boston’s ability to grow and thrive. We lose too many highly qualified prospects to other universities, and too many students who transfer out of UMass Boston, because we lack on-campus housing. Residence halls will enable us to attract and keep these students, enhance campus life, improve retention and graduation rates, and grow our honors and athletic programs. They will also help us qualify for international opportunities that require on-campus housing, benefiting the campus with additional international diversity.

**Objective 4: Establish an Honors College** that enrolls five percent of the undergraduate population, signaling the university’s ability to cater to the needs of motivated, academically talented, and educationally ambitious students.

Among UMass Boston’s freshman applicants are significant numbers who have completed AP courses, suggesting that there is a sufficient pool of qualified students for the Honors Program. Lack of housing and regional misperceptions of UMass Boston, however, are major factors hindering our ability to attract these high-achieving high school seniors. Last year, we extended Chancellor’s Scholarships to 153 students; just 47 (about 30 percent) accepted. In addition, substantial work needs to be done to improve five-year graduation rates for honors students, which currently stand at about 50 percent—highly disappointing for students of this caliber.

From a functional standpoint, there appears to be little difference between honors programs and colleges at the institutions reviewed by the Honors College Committee. However, the committee concluded that an Honors College, rather than an expanded Honors Program, would be more appropriate and advantageous for UMass Boston for these reasons:
- An Honors College would be a clearer indication of the university’s resolve to meet the needs of all levels of students in our urban location.

- Innovative curriculum that crosses disciplinary boundaries, for example, and that offers a global perspective, is key to attracting high-functioning students. An Honors College would offer greater autonomy in achieving this goal.

- The current honors program has limited visibility among students. The existence of an Honors College—with its resources and programmatic advantages—would support more aggressive and better targeted recruitment. Its added gravitas (vs. that of a program) might also support more effective and targeted donor appeals.

The distinguishing feature of UMass Boston’s Honors College would be a curriculum to engage students with the urban environment in complex ways. Taking the city of Boston as an integrating theme, it would span the four categories of: (i) Arts and Culture, (ii) Science and Technology, (iii) Government and Community Services, and (iv) Sister City Comparative Urban Experiences. Senior year leadership-building activities would comprise a classroom component and a field experience, making the Honors College a true community partner. This experiential hands-on learning in an urban setting, with an added global perspective, would give students vital skills for any profession they pursue.

To successfully build an Honors College from the current Honors Program and to ensure effective delivery of its curriculum and other student-related services, the Honors College Committee projects that an estimated $465,000 – $520,000 will be needed for administrative staff (director/dean, associate director, program coordinator, and up to two advisors as the college grows) and operating costs (field trips, recruitment, research support, special seminars). Discussions are underway about allocating dedicated space in General Academic Building #1, including areas for group study, computer use, and project displays.

**Goal 2: Enrich and expand academic programs and research.**

Since its founding in 1964, UMass Boston’s academic programs and research have stretched into vital and wide-ranging areas. Underlying this evolution has been the way the university has expanded the notions of “urban” and “civic engagement.”

“The urban university must stand with the city, must serve and lead where the battle is,” declared UMass Boston’s founders. Their ambitions for the “great public urban university” they were launching were crystal clear: to provide “the kind of program, service and leadership [of] land-grant universities.” We at UMass Boston have steadily risen to this challenge, providing opportunities to an extraordinary range of students. We have also been redefining “urban,” stretching our horizon from greater Boston to urban areas throughout New England, the nation, and overseas. No longer are we simply Boston’s public university; we now face the opportunity and obligation to apply our intellectual capital to urban life on an international scale.

Benefiting from Boston as a center of research, technology, education, medicine, and commerce, we embrace cities’ role in giving rise to creative and complex endeavors, and social and political transformations. We celebrate the advantages of the urban, yet confront its social problems. Through long experience in research, teaching, and civic engagement we have gained a practiced eye and a keen instinct for what “urban” means and what it implies for global society. Its ever-changing complexity has much to teach us.

Civic engagement, as well, has always been closely tied to academic and scholarly pursuits at UMass Boston. As we engage with the community, our experiences inform our teaching, learning,
and research, leading to new knowledge applicable to an even broader context. We expand our spheres of engagement by applying new knowledge to urban situations around the world and setting our sights on academic partnerships worldwide. Recent evidence of the university’s growing internationalization includes the renaming of two schools to reflect global involvement: The College of Education and Human Development (formerly the Graduate College of Education) and the McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies (formerly the McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies). Reflecting the interconnected world in which our students and graduates will live and compete, measures like these extend our global reach and impact:

- The Office of International and Transnational Affairs (OITA), facilitating linkages between local and global resources to “extend the domain of knowledge” worldwide.
- The International Visiting Scholars Academy (IVSA), that engages foreign scholars in wide-ranging discussions. IVSA revenue helps support study abroad for faculty and students.

The change we pursue thus stems from a change of worldview. Our commitment to the urban already extends well beyond addressing social problems—and greater Boston. Our achievements show a deep awareness of the complex global realities of the urban. And the vision of our imperative future reflects the realization that, by 2050, the majority of humans will be in urban areas. These areas will be even more defining of what we do, how we see ourselves, and the aspirations we hold.

**Objective 1: Ensure that we offer our undergraduate students the full range of academic programs offered by all major urban research universities**, doing so in stages as the faculty, staff, and operational resources are available to ensure that each new program is excellent in quality. This means implementing the new undergraduate programs currently in the pipeline such as computer and electrical engineering, communications, and international relations, and continuing to develop new undergraduate programs that meet student need and demand.

Going forward, we need to continue to build on our strengths as we implement new programs. This strategy has already borne fruit in many disciplines, including biological systems and technology, integrated environmental monitoring, neurosciences, urban health disparities, and entrepreneurship. In addition, by recruiting first-class faculty, UMass Boston has begun to raise its reputation in providing the best possible science education to a diverse body of students. New programs build on strengths in the sciences, such as our ground-breaking initiatives on climate, oceans, and human security; science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education; and the computational sciences.

Creation of new programs and development of existing ones will be guided by insight gained in a flourishing university culture of assessment. We will review and strengthen the learning outcomes assessment component of the university system’s Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQUAD) program, which charges each academic unit to examine teaching and learning for continuous program improvement. AQUAD complements our long-standing examination of student progress in our professional programs as well as in our Writing Proficiency Requirement and General Education Seminar portfolio reviews.

We will also continue to participate in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Vision Project, which introduces high expectations for postsecondary students through a shared language of assessment in the University of Massachusetts system, the state universities, and the community colleges. The Vision Project expands our culture of assessment nationally through its developing relationship to
the Liberal Education and America’s Promise principles of the American Association of Colleges and Universities. We will also learn through our piloting of the Voluntary System of Accountability assessments of our first-year students and seniors, participating with the other UMass campuses in a national initiative of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities and the Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Objective 2: Develop new graduate programs in keeping with our strategic vision to improve the overall quality and competitiveness of UMass Boston’s research profile and advance the institution to national prominence in a number of strategic areas, doing so in stages as the faculty, staff, and operational resources are available to ensure that each new program is excellent in quality. PhD programs are especially critical to this mission.

Four such programs are already in the pipeline and should move forward expeditiously. Five others are in the planning stages and should be introduced in stages during the next five to ten years as the resources are available to do them well. Yet others will need to be developed between 2015 and 2025 that will continue to move us forward as a major urban research university.

Some have expressed concerns that new doctoral programs will substantively change the teaching environment for undergraduate students, replacing full-time faculty with graduate teaching assistants. Even with the addition of eight to ten new PhD programs, we will not have high numbers of graduate students flooding the teaching ranks. It is worth noting, however, that some of the adjunct faculty who teach our undergraduates are other universities’ graduate students. The advent of more doctoral programs will allow our own graduate students to hone their classroom skills. And we will be able to mentor them more effectively than we currently mentor adjunct faculty members who are graduate students from other universities.

Others are concerned that the growth of expensive new doctoral programs will come on the financial backs of undergraduates. Will increases in undergraduate fees, they ask, be used disproportionately to fund graduate education? The answer is that much of the cost associated with this strategic plan will support either undergraduate education directly or both undergraduate and graduate together. With respect to funding doctoral programs:

- Much of the cost of new PhD programs is the cost of adding faculty who may not otherwise have been hired (or not in the same numbers, or as quickly). In most cases, they will teach both undergraduate and graduate students, thereby benefiting undergraduate students as well as updating and expanding curricula.

- Research faculty often create vertical research teams that include undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students. More senior students help mentor the more junior students and model for them what it takes to become a research scientist. Being a member of a research team with graduate students is an extremely positive experience for undergraduates and is often a key element that leads to undergraduates applying to and being accepted into graduate school.

- Graduate students often involve undergraduates in their thesis and dissertation research, providing them with rich training experiences.

- PhD programs are often paid for by master’s programs. This, in fact, is one of the key mechanisms we propose for funding UMass Boston’s new PhD programs.

- Overhead on grants generated by faculty and graduate students will help provide research opportunities for undergraduates and fund investment in the infrastructure and support systems of the entire university.
Objective 3: Expand the on-line offerings of the university and improve the infrastructure support for faculty teaching online courses and the academic support for students taking such courses.

In an effort to expand student access and improve teaching and learning efficiencies, UMass Boston continues to explore various technologies as they affect the learning environment, including online education. Through University College and UMassOnline, online student enrollment reached 10,773 in AY 2010-2011, nearly double what it was in 2007. From their launch almost ten years ago, online offerings have increased regularly.

We expect continued growth over the next several years, particularly through University College, the College of Management, and the College of Science and Mathematics. To support such growth, we continue to provide technological, pedagogical, and academic support to online students and faculty through initiatives such as the Center for Innovation/Excellence in E-learning and online tutoring, as well as support for online students with disabilities.

Objective 4: Expand University College.

University College is committed to the diverse interests and needs of adult learners, which vary from focused short-term, non-credit training to wide-ranging, long-term academic undergraduate and graduate professional degrees. It focuses on providing quality education accessible to all: on campus, online, in a remote setting, in the evening, or on weekends. Programs are also relevant to all adult students, from those with previous experience to those approaching college for the first time. University College is also an entrepreneurial medium through which we can experiment with and accommodate ongoing rapid innovations in higher education.

As it expands, University College will continue to develop timely programs that are applied and interdisciplinary, many focusing on international exchange. These will address state and public priorities such as sustainability and the environment, globalization, civic engagement, health care, infrastructure, education, community-based support systems, and others. Current and new academic programs will complement interdisciplinary research on campus, including that which has been identified in this strategic plan. New academic programs and certificates will complement and expand the range of certificates and degrees now available within the colleges, rather than replicate their offerings. The primary audiences for new undergraduate degree programs will be students seeking second degrees and transfer students. Most of these programs will lead to degrees in applied and professional fields.

Objective 5: Expand the research enterprise, increasing our extramural funding by 5 to 15 percent annually, putting our extramural funding at between $200 and $300 million dollars by 2025.

During the 1982 state-mandated absorption of Boston State College into UMass Boston, planners looked hard at how to relate the university to the particular needs of Boston and the Commonwealth. The resulting doctoral programs, institutes, and centers developed in the 1980s focused on harbor and coastal waters, the elderly, ethnic populations, and emerging public policy issues. As our horizons have expanded, so has our research enterprise grown. From 2002 to 2010, external funding increased by 80 percent. Over the past fifteen years the amount has more than tripled, from $15.6M in 1996 to $49.7M in 2010. R&D expenditures in the social sciences and in non-science/engineering fields now rank this institution above many major private and public universities.
The university has focused on research in the humanities and the social sciences with great success; our external funding in those areas now rivals or exceeds that of some major research universities. The same cannot be said in the natural sciences, the target disciplines of most research grants. Our strength in these areas is growing, however. Under the chancellor’s leadership, the university has been positioning itself to gain competitive access to federal research funds through program development in the natural sciences, while maintaining and extending our lead in the social sciences and humanities.

Achievements that mark the university’s evolving research enterprise include more interdisciplinary clusters, spawning new graduate programs; a growing number of global and local partnerships; and more equitable distribution of extramural funding across all research areas. A growing entrepreneurial spirit is evidenced by initiatives such as the Venture Development Center, the Institute for Community Inclusion, and the partnership with the Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center. As it is further kindled, this spirit will further reinforce an institutional mindset that generating one’s own revenue is necessary to support research and programming.

Some have wondered if the emphasis on research will come at the expense of teaching. It is our view that a university is “a place of teaching universal knowledge, but also of advancing knowledge through research and of diffusing knowledge through publication, as well as relating such advancement, teaching, and diffusion to the training of professionals” (Jaroslav Pelikan, 1992. The Idea of the University: A Reexamination). Programs leading to the masters and doctorate degrees are what generally distinguish universities from two- and four-year colleges, as do high and extensive research activities to create new knowledge. The Massachusetts Board of Education’s degree-granting regulations for independent institutions of higher education (http://bit.ly/msjWf8) require a university to “clearly identify graduate studies as a distinct element within its organization, and provide the additional faculty, facilities, and resources necessary to support sound graduate programs.” Unlike many countries where more dedicated national research institutes have been created to carry out cutting-edge research, the United States has placed the lion’s share of this burden on our doctoral/research universities.

Continued research growth will not sacrifice the university’s commitment to teaching; the two will remain fully compatible with each other in this “research university with a teaching soul.” Through active and productive research, faculty can link students’ intellectual curiosity to challenges that lie at the frontiers of scientific inquiry and technological innovation—and in our communities. Research experience can improve undergraduate learning outcomes by promoting critical and creative thinking, analytical problem-solving, and intellectual independence. Research opportunities also make the university more competitive in attracting and retaining highly talented students, maximizing our students’ intellectual potential, and heightening interest in graduate studies and research-oriented careers.

Furthermore, as a public university we have a vital responsibility to provide the Commonwealth with first-rate graduates who will become research scientists, top designers, respected innovators, senior policy makers, and more. We have an equally vital responsibility to offer our student body—the most diverse among all four-year public institutions of higher education in our region—opportunities that are “equal to the best” to be those first-rate graduates. At UMass Boston, undergraduate research experience has thus far been limited to a small number of students involved in special programs, such as the Honors Program and the McNair Scholars Program, and some externally funded projects. Many students leave us before graduating due to inadequate opportunities for maximizing their intellectual and career development potential. Expanded and strengthened research programs will enable us to better serve our students’ current needs and
future ambitions. It is also our obligation to serve the ambitions and needs of our current
graduate students—about 25 percent of our student body and, in 2011, 34 percent of our degree
recipients—pursuing advanced knowledge, skills, and career opportunities.

Finally, it is a fact of university life that established indicators of the quality of academic programs
and institutions include the number of doctoral programs and doctoral degrees awarded; the
dollar amount of externally funded research; the number of tenure-stream faculty, research
faculty, and post-docs; the number of publications, citations and prestigious awards; the career
options of our graduates; and the economic, cultural, and social impact on our communities. The
perceived quality of academic programs and institutions clearly has profound impact on faculty
and student recruitment and retention, the success of sponsored programs and fund-raising
efforts, and the career developments of graduates. Nationally and internationally recognized
research programs often bring tremendous synergistic and radiating effect across an entire
campus.

**Goal 3: Improve the learning, teaching, and working environment.**

A broad consensus exists that certain cultural, leadership, and decision-making qualities of the
university, many deeply historic in nature, sap our confidence. If not corrected, the concern is
that they will hinder the achievement of strategic plan goals. Some of these, such as a lack of
systematic and transparent processes, are discussed elsewhere in more detail. Our needs include
prompt, clear decision making; strict accountability for everyone on campus, particularly senior
administrators including those involved in this planning process; management meetings that
involve rigorous, honest, good faith discussion of our most important and challenging issues; and
genuinely participatory processes—including our own—that actively listen to and incorporate
constructive criticism and feedback. We therefore recommend that a streamlined version of the
Implementation Design Team be appointed to follow up on implementation of the strategic plan
eventually approved by the provost and chancellor.

**Objective 1: Construct new academic buildings with state-of-the-art teaching and
learning spaces.**

As interim chancellor, Keith Motley was involved in discussions of UMass Boston’s 25-year
Master Plan. As chancellor he has presided over its further development. More than $700M will
have been spent by early 2017 on that plan, including the 2009 purchase of the 20-acre former
Bayside Expo property. The current master plan calls for two new classroom buildings with the
physical and functional flexibility to accommodate more than 15,000 students; a new Integrated
Sciences Complex to replace the existing building (to be demolished); student residences;
upgrading the library and the two major existing academic buildings; accommodating the Edward
M. Kennedy Institute for the Study of the Senate; and new parking garages.

UMass Boston has broken ground for the Integrated Sciences Complex, and planning for General
Academic Building No. 1 is well underway. The university has also advanced plans for renovation
of existing facilities and improvements to the campus infrastructure and physical plant. These are
welcome developments—but they are not enough. We have good reason to believe that we can
attract, by 2015, a student population of 18,000, or 3,000 more students than the 25-Year Master
Plan anticipated. This would mean that, despite spending the lion’s share of the anticipated $700
million by then—and gaining much-needed new space with greater and more sophisticated
functionality—we would still lag behind in meeting the needs of students, faculty, and staff.
Shifting our thinking with respect to facilities and space needs and adjusting our master plan
accordingly is mandatory.
**Objective 2: Put in place programs to nurture and retain the best faculty and staff.**

Establish and sustain mentoring programs in the areas of publishing and grant writing, and in teaching. Offer professional development workshops that introduce all faculty, tenure-stream and non-tenure stream, to a range of pedagogical approaches. Facilitate the growing emphasis on attending to student learning outcomes and embracing best practices for fostering student success.

Given budget constraints coupled with the need to keep a UMass Boston education affordable, faculty replacements over the past five years have largely comprised junior faculty. While the influx does result in some loss of institutional memory, the new faculty make up for it with their willingness to embrace the untried, their infusion of passion and energy, and their fresh perspectives. Accomplished, skilled, and poised to act boldly, they also come with high expectations that the university will provide strong support for intensive research and be attentive to faculty professional development. Meeting their expectations is crucial to our ability to support their productivity and to retain them.

**Objective 3: Lower the teaching load for tenure-stream faculty with research and teaching responsibilities to 2:2, consistent with most other research universities.**

The university’s expectations for its tenured and tenure-track faculty have changed over time. As the campus has gained stature as a research university, faculty members have been called on to produce a greater amount of sophisticated scholarly work. Because our faculty have answered that call, we can now look back over a decade or more and take pride in the effort that has led to our designation as a Carnegie Research-High University. It is time to recalibrate the way in which we use faculty time in the three primary areas of academic life: teaching, research, and service. In order for faculty to continue to grow as researchers, while maintaining the excellent quality of teaching for which UMass Boston is deservedly known, the campus must create teaching assignments that more closely mirror those of our peer and aspirational peer institutions. Developing a consistent course-release policy should result in a typical teaching assignment of two courses per semester for the majority of tenure-stream faculty.

UMass Boston increasingly and emphatically defines itself as a major research university. That status manifests itself in the number of graduate programs offered in selected units across the campus and in increased research expectations in all units on the campus. The standard teaching formula must be commensurate with this status if our reputation is to be credible and if our faculty is to be appropriately productive. We must move as quickly as possible to a new model for calculating work expectations as we move to a greater emphasis on scholarly productivity; we cannot have one without the other.

**Objective 4: Raise the proportion of full-time non-tenure-stream [NTS] faculty.**

Faculty who are neither tenured nor eligible for tenure are nonetheless a vital part of the university’s teaching mission. The university should consider the areas in which numbers of part-time appointments should be replaced by full-time NTS appointments, in order to assure better attention to our students and better working conditions for the NTS faculty.

UMass Boston’s policy of providing contractual security to full-time non-tenure-stream faculty is a national model. Our challenge remains, however, to increase our proportion of full-time NTS faculty who are fully invested in the progress of our students and institution. We also have the highest percentage (together with Cleveland State) of part-time non-tenure-stream faculty of any of our peers. This sets UMass Boston apart from many public research universities in its very high use of part-time NTS faculty as opposed to having a mix of full-time teaching and research.
faculty—tenure-stream and non-tenure-stream—and using our doctoral students as teachers of record. Part-time non-tenure-stream faculty members often have heavy teaching loads, frequently at more than one university. This makes it difficult for them to be available to students outside of classroom hours. While many are excellent teachers, their workloads and work contexts make it difficult for them to keep up with the latest scholarship in their disciplines, to expose their students to that scholarship, or to take on research projects with students. Students may receive fine classroom teaching but they do not receive the research mentorship they should be receiving at a major research university.

We also do not use as many graduate students in undergraduate teaching roles as most institutions do because we lack the number of doctoral programs—or doctoral students that can serve as teachers of record—that exist at other major research universities. This means undergraduates are less likely to work on research teams with graduate students, or to have the opportunity to learn from them how to conduct independent research. It also means that many undergraduates are not exposed to graduate students as role models for possible future career paths.

**Objective 5: Maintain a balance of large and small classes while providing students with the full range of class formats and pedagogies necessary to address diverse student learning styles and needs.** Decisions about raising or lowering class size need to come after careful consideration of what size is appropriate for a given course.

Small classes will not disappear; in fact, some classes may decrease in size. The Graduation Rate workgroup recommends that writing-intensive classes be reduced to 18:1 instead of the current 25:1, to meet the recommended standard. On the other hand, the Academic Planning and Enrollment workgroup strongly recommends that a significant number of large classrooms—seating at least 200—be programmed for the new academic building, with state-of-the-art technology that allows learner engagement in a large class format. A certain number of large class sizes make this a financially viable option, and will promote up-to-date pedagogy that will most benefit our students. Our recommendation, like that of the Academic Affairs Committee that preceded this workgroup, is to maintain a balance of large and small sections. While many courses will always be taught in small class sections, the university now lacks the classroom facilities to teach large lecture courses needed and wanted in management, nursing, the sciences, and social sciences. Large classrooms are therefore needed in the new academic building.

**Goal 4: Establish a financial resources model consistent with the university’s vision statement.**

The financial models and the spending attitudes and behaviors that have shaped this university since its inception are built upon assumptions about state appropriations that are now obsolete. As noted earlier, about 28 percent of our total operating revenue came from state monies in FY 2011, compared to 75 percent in FY 1985. As the proportion of public funding has declined, it has been necessary not only to try to cut our operating expenses, but also to diversify our funding sources and adopt measures to raise the amounts obtained from those sources.

With public support static at best, the university now operates with less than half of the baseline revenue per student (tuition, fees and state support, independent of financial aid, fee waivers, etc.) of local private institutions such as Boston University, Northeastern, and Suffolk. This translates into approximately $14,000 per student for UMass Boston and about $30,000 per student for these institutions. For our projected enrollment growth (assuming no increase in state aid), UMass Boston is now operating with less than a third of the per-student revenue of the
above-mentioned private institutions, or approximately $8,000 per student. The nature of our
university today is such that increased support from University Advancement or the Office of
Research and Sponsored Programs will not make an immediate impact, though we strongly urge
more attention to these areas. The university must prepare for a significant increase in student
tuition and fees—with a concomitant increase in need-based financial aid—and in out-of-state and
international students in order to generate the revenue to properly fulfill our mission.

One key element of the 15-Year Strategic Plan, therefore, is to identify appropriate and
meaningful ways to expand our financial resources. This means engineering a major paradigm
shift: adopting new financial models that reflect the new reality of public funding. Later in this
report, we will propose a comprehensive approach to future financing; we believe that through
intense and thoughtful discussion, we have begun to identify new strategies for meeting our
financial challenges.

Critical to this paradigm shift will be a willingness to reframe the notions of access and
affordability with respect to market value. Raising the stature and the profile of this university
will be costly. But one of the key benefits will be to raise the currency of the UMass Boston degree,
providing significant value for all of our constituencies, not just students and alumni. We
therefore need to examine closely the cost of that degree to determine a level that is realistic and
commensurate with its value. At the same time we must provide financial aid at a level that
maintains our firm commitment to access and affordability.

**Objective 1: Increase enrollment to 18,000 students by 2015, 20,000 by 2020, and
25,000 by 2025.** Maintain or increase the current racial/ethnic diversity; maintain the current
25:75 ratio of graduate students to undergraduates with a view to increasing it over time; and
increase:

- the ratio of incoming undergraduate freshmen to transfers to 50/50 percent by 2020.
- the number of PhD students while maintaining our current undergraduate-to-graduate
  ratio in the short term.
- out-of-state students to five percent by 2015 and ten percent by 2020.
- international students to ten percent by 2015 and 15 percent by 2020 and beyond.

This substantial increase will not only increase revenue, but will also enhance UMass Boston’s
reputation as a major influence in the greater Boston higher education market. Increasing the
percentage of international students will also add new cultures, experiential backgrounds, and
perspectives to students’ academic and social lives.

For many years the university’s student body developed “naturally,” remaining relatively stable at
approximately 12,000. Seeing declining state support for higher education and the competition
facing the university, Chancellor Motley’s predecessor pushed for enrollment increases despite
others’ concerns about space, housing, and the projected decline in the college-age population.
Chancellor Motley both supported the planned increase and presided over its implementation.
Over a five-year period, enrollment experienced an intentional—and unprecedented—growth
spurt, rising 25 percent from 12,362 in the fall of 2006 to 15,454 by fall 2010. Student headcount
enrollment is projected to be 16,200 in fall 2011, having exceeded the planning goal of 15,000 by
2010. Increasing the total enrollment will enable us to maintain or increase access for local
students as we continue to shift the balance of enrollment in these areas:

- **Graduate vs. undergraduate.** While 34 percent of the degrees conferred in 2011
  were graduate degrees and 25 percent of our student enrollments are graduate students,
  we can and should build on our strengths to grow our graduate education programs
further. With increased federal funding for community colleges and the repositioning of Massachusetts state colleges to universities, UMass Boston must distinguish itself by promoting its decades-long history of education at the masters and doctoral levels. Achieving even modest growth by 2025 in doctoral students, however, will be costly. In addition, new programs take time to develop, take through the governance review process, and implement fully. We have many new graduate programs in the pipeline, including nine new PhD programs. Over the next five years, these programs will add substantially to the number of graduate students on campus. However, with undergraduate enrollment projected to increase, and the need for the campus to increase its overall headcount to 18,000 by 2015, it is unlikely that the overall percentage of graduate to undergraduate students will change in the next five years. It will begin to shift after 2015 as we add a number of professional masters programs to the mix.

- **In-state vs. out-of-state.** As state support declines, raising the number of higher-paying out-of-state students—including international students—is crucial. This will enable us to keep in-state tuition affordable and offer more financial aid. “We need to insure that we maintain an appropriate balance between tuition costs and aid to insure no qualified student is denied access due to insurmountable financial hurdles,” wrote UMass President Robert L. Caret.

  We also need to work assiduously with the governor and legislature to allow us to retain in-state student tuition (approximately $2,000 per student). While the first year of this change would likely be revenue neutral, increased student enrollment would generate substantially greater revenues thereafter.

- **Commuter vs. residential.** While we will always remain predominantly a university for commuter students—and, thanks to enrollment growth, will not reduce the number of openings for them—our master plan includes residence halls, as soon as possible. Surveys indicate that 70 percent of high school students seek a residential college experience. A residential option will attract more new freshmen, thereby building enrollment. By adding a richer dimension to the college experience, residential life will also help retain students. Not only does that raise a metric that is instrumental in attracting more federal dollars, it also offers our students the same opportunity that other UMass campuses provide. UMass Boston students deserve that.

**Objective 2: Engage in thorough consideration of differential fee expansion through close, careful study with respect to implementation.**

Looking forward, if we assume annual enrollment growth to 18,000 by 2015 (with associated expense increases) with the same proportion of out-of-state and international students, merely inflationary hikes in student fees and no major rise in differential fees, little or no increase in state support, substantial investments in strategic growth, tenure-stream faculty hiring at the same rate as in the past two years, and the addition of two new academic buildings, we will face an operating deficit of approximately $50M by 2015 (see “Budget Implications of the Strategic Plan” below).

Given that sobering reality, fulfilling even a fraction of the strategic planning recommendations—and realizing the vision of a necessary future—hinge on the university’s ability to find significant new resources. In fact, just to support new programs in the pipeline will necessitate new revenue sources. Some programs will generate revenue, but many—especially new doctoral programs—are expensive to offer, requiring faculty lines and start-up packages, appropriate staff support, state-of-the-art facilities, and operating expenses.
Objective 3: Continue to work with the President’s Office and Board of Trustees to secure more state funding for higher education and establish reasonable student fees to support a top quality education in accordance with state funding.

UMass Boston sees the President’s Office and Board of Trustees as critical partners in working with the governor and the legislature on higher education policy and appropriations. This is important in light of one of the priorities of the Department of Higher Education’s Vision Project: to increase state support for public higher education. Our partners can also serve an important role in helping to communicate the university’s value proposition to all external constituencies, including the general public.

Objective 4: Adopt a process for reviewing academic units, centers and institutes, and administrative departments on a regular basis. Create a more rigorous culture of assessment and accountability. Review criteria should include criticality of mission in the context of the strategic plan, performance against their own and the university’s annual stated goals, and adherence to accepted university best practices and metrics. The aim should be to reallocate resources from underperforming areas to high performing, mission-critical areas.

Throughout the 18 months of discussions held by the original strategic planning task force and the current Implementation Design Team, reallocation of university resources to support strategic priorities has been a constant topic of conversation. This led to a unanimous conviction that the university needs to adopt a process for regular review. With resources so severely limited at UMass Boston, as in public higher education generally, we must have the ability to set priorities, modify or eliminate underperforming or least relevant programs, and hold our managers and leaders rigorously accountable for critical performance metrics. This is a process that requires strong support from the campus leadership and perhaps the trustees.

We believe that reaccreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), which will require serious self-assessment, may offer an opportunity for beginning this process of review and—where necessary—reallocation. At a minimum, the university needs to think in terms of performance metrics for all units and review the strategic relevance of its units so that, at minimum, reallocation decisions may be appropriately considered upon faculty and staff retirements. Further, we urge the university, either as a part of the strategic planning process or independently, to consider using the National Study of Instructional Costs & Productivity (“The Delaware Study”) to analyze faculty teaching loads, direct instructional cost, and separately budgeted scholarly activity, all at the academic discipline level.

Goal 5: Develop an infrastructure supportive of the preceding goals.

Objective 1: Implement a transparent, equitable, and expeditious process for dealing with daily and year-over-year space needs. The single biggest problem in the daily lives of most of the constituencies on campus is the inadequacy of our space and space management. We believe no single issue is more demoralizing to the campus, or holds greater potential for positive impact, than space and space management. We recommend several crucial steps:

- Implement a transparent, equitable, and expeditious process for dealing with daily and year-over-year space needs.
- Implement rigorous space utilization rules and standards in order to make complete and efficient use of all of the space that we have.
• Undertake a speedy and comprehensive review of our space needs over the coming 5-10 years, to determine the need for interim space (before construction of all our requisite new buildings) and, if needed, to implement space acquisition and utilization projects.

Space management will become even more critical with expanding enrollment. The Academic Planning and Enrollment workgroup recommends increasing the proportion of large class sections as we expand enrollments. This will require more large classrooms. A critical need also exists for additional office space and non-classroom spaces for students to gather and to study. As discussed in previous sections, we are recommending hiring professional advisors and additional tenure-stream faculty who will need appropriate office space. We are also recommending expansion of doctoral programs. These students will need office/work space. Finally, as the university has grown, existing gathering and study areas are becoming increasingly overcrowded and are not conducive to student success. Implementation of strategies regarding student success, faculty development, and academic program expansion depends on our ability to address these space issues.

**Objective 2: Undertake a thorough review of administrative systems and organizational structures** including human resources, finance, procurement, enrollment management, graduate admissions, grants management, and others.

There is broad consensus across the university that most, if not all, of our underlying operational and administrative systems need systematic review and upgrading. Irritations and necessary rules and regulations are inherent to the nature of a large bureaucracy. But we believe, and feel most people on campus agree, that our systems need to be updated, aggressively reinforced with a customer service culture, and reconsidered in light of our evolution into an entrepreneurial and revenue-generating university, as opposed to a purely public entity. We are undertaking much of this review as part of the planning process, and recommend that the university make it an urgent and routine priority.

In addition, as is often the case in complex institutions, the university's development is often hobbled by rigid adherence to the past; limited coordination, communication, and cooperation across many major operational units; and ad-hoc decision making. The 25-Year Master Plan, for example, is at odds with our 15-Year Strategic Plan, with no formal mechanism in the master plan for flexibility and review. Program planning and development in Academic Affairs is often not fully and collaboratively communicated to Administration and Finance. And new academic programs frequently lack coordination with key stakeholders. We fully appreciate the need for clear lines of accountability and authority on the one hand, and speedy innovation on the other. But the challenge of reaching our vision for 2025 will require coordinated and collaborative planning.

**Objective 3: Undertake a comprehensive review of the mission, staffing, and technical capacity of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs**, and develop and implement a plan to provide grant development and management services commensurate with our goals.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) struggles to provide adequate research support services due to several factors. The first is lack of clarity about the purpose and role of ORSP in relation to expectations for faculty and staff, as well as the appropriate balance of central and decentralized support. Another is that limited revenue from indirect charges on external sponsored projects—a key funding source for staff salaries and benefits—has limited our ability to hire, leaving gaps in technical expertise. Also, frequent change of leadership in academic affairs...
during the last 18 years has impeded efforts to develop and implement a well-designed, consistent strategy for research development, support, and administration. Meanwhile, competition from other Boston-area institutions, coupled with less-than-competitive salaries and few performance incentives at UMass Boston, has resulted in high turnover of ORSP leadership and staff and hampered recruitment. Finally, there is no systematic professional development for the staff who remain—and who work hard to sustain the operation under less than optimal conditions.

To realize UMass Boston’s ambitious vision to be a major research university will require major operational changes. We must:

- Clarify the mission, purpose, and appropriate role of the office.
- Identify the necessary resources for filling the many existing staffing and leadership gaps.
- Provide suitable professional development opportunities to improve and renew the technical competency of the research support staff.
- Allocate resources to address the significant deficits in our critical research infrastructure: physical space, information technology, and library resources.
- Develop proper policies, standards, and procedures to assess productivity, increase accountability, and align resource allocation with strategic priorities and productivity metrics.
- Work with other support units on many existing interface issues related to grant-funded hires, purchase, budget transfers, and financial reporting.
- Add new research support staff, embedded in colleges or other units, to focus on research development and work directly with faculty and research staff in identifying funding opportunities and preparing grant proposals.

**Objective 4: Strengthen the university’s capacity to make the case for itself.**

We specifically propose developing and promoting a clear value proposition for the quality of a UMass Boston education. This should be done as part of a comprehensive and well-supported communication strategy for building the university’s reputation among all its constituents and friends, current and potential. The strategy should be tied to the university’s upcoming 50th anniversary, and should link the principles of our founders to the plans spelled out in this document. For further comments, see “A Funding Strategy for UMass Boston” and “Articulating the Value Proposition” in Section V.

**V. Getting Down to Business**

**Workgroup Reports and Strategic Plan Management Chart**

We strongly urge readers of this strategic plan to read all the reports in their entirety, particularly those of the Academic Planning and Enrollment and Graduation Rates workgroups. Those two reports are not only done with great thought and attention to detail, but also represent the most critical elements of our strategic evolution and improvement as a university. Workgroup executive summaries with links to full reports on the university’s website are in Appendix D.

As we have worked on this strategic planning process, we have grown profoundly aware of the audacity of the vision for the university in 2025 and of the immensity of the challenge to attain
that vision. We have resolved throughout this process to avoid merely rhetorical aspirations and goals; instead, we have insisted on matching every goal and objective to a timeline and a budget. We know that change can be difficult, and that incorporating the kind of rigor and accountability that this plan requires will be a learning experience for us all.

To facilitate this process, we have deployed a Gantt chart—a project management chart using Microsoft Project 2010—to discipline our analysis and provide a usable roadmap for implementing this plan. Key steps in implementing the strategic objectives of the Implementation Design Team workgroups have been plotted on this chart, with underlying budget numbers attached. This tool has helped us understand the interrelationships among the workgroup goals and objectives and forced us to carefully think through the implications of our stated aspirations. Our hope is that, once the strategic plan is reviewed and approved by the provost and the chancellor, the final version of the Gantt chart will be used to oversee plan implementation on a nearly monthly basis.

While certain workgroups carried some of their analyses out to 2025, we focused our work on the first five years of the plan, AY2011 - AY2015. These are included in the detailed Gantt chart. Appendix E contains the full version of the chart, with over 700 total line items. Appendix F contains detailed projections of most revenues and expenditures associated with the strategic planning initiatives.

**Acknowledging Budget Implications**

One of our greatest concerns from the beginning of this process, and one of the most frequent skepticsisms heard around the campus, was whether or not the university will have the financial resources (as well as the decision-making rigor) to implement the strategic initiatives required to attain the strategic planning vision for 2025.

We must squarely face the fact that the financial challenges are very real. The following table summarizes budget modeling by the Division of Administration and Finance in March 2011 specifically for the use of the Additional Investment and Operational Revenues workgroup (the full table appears in the workgroup’s April 1 report on the university website). The model’s assumptions include:

- annual enrollment increases based on the Academic Planning and Enrollment workgroup’s projections,
- expense increases associated with this expanded enrollment,
- merely inflationary increases in student fees,
- no major expansion of differential fees (higher fees for certain programs reflecting higher demand and operating costs),
- continued commitment to meeting 90 percent of need through financial aid,
- little or no increase in state support,
- additional tenure-stream faculty hired at a rate similar to the past two years, and
- the addition of two new academic buildings and a residence hall by FY15.

To clarify issues and expose potential difficulties, the modeling takes a conservative approach, including all currently foreseen expenses but not anticipating many steps that might be taken to
reduce deficits. It does its best to foresee problems without hiding the problems by also assuming solutions.

**Table 1: Budget Projections as of March 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In $ millions</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$326.3</td>
<td>$346.1</td>
<td>$369.6</td>
<td>$394.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$351.1</td>
<td>$376.7</td>
<td>$419.3</td>
<td>$446.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>($24.8)</td>
<td>($36.1)</td>
<td>($49.7)</td>
<td>($52.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we should add that since March 2011, costs of pursuing the 15-Year Strategic Plan have been projected with considerable specificity. These new projections generally agree with the cost assumptions reflected in Table 1. We do not believe that the plan in its currently itemized detail appreciably changes the long-term budget situation anticipated by the university.

It is now possible to update the figures in Table 1, taking into account some new facts established and decisions made since March 2011. By making adjustments of several kinds, the university balanced its FY12 budget while avoiding layoffs, preserving core functions, and retaining funds for strategic initiatives and investments. While some of the adjustments affect only FY12, others affect base assumptions for subsequent years.

In Table 2 (below) the FY13-15 projections reflect the recent 7.5 percent increase in all student fees; additional FY12 fee increases for students in certain high-demand programs; and an FY12 adjustment in baseline budgets for programs throughout the university. Other broad assumptions, including those about the costs of strategic initiatives, remain unchanged from those of Table 1. As in Table 1, the Table 2 modeling includes all currently foreseen expenses. Its revenue assumptions are similarly conservative, and its deficit projections do not reflect possible future management actions regarding spending and revenue, of the kind pursued during annual budget processes.

**Table 2: Revised Budget Projections, August 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In $ millions</th>
<th>FY12</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Revenues</td>
<td>$330.9</td>
<td>$351.1</td>
<td>$375.0</td>
<td>$400.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$330.4</td>
<td>$371.7</td>
<td>$414.3</td>
<td>$441.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Income/(Loss)</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>($20.6)</td>
<td>($39.3)</td>
<td>($41.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We must note that these, like all multi-year financial projections, are only as good as their underlying assumptions; inevitably the assumptions here are likely to be debatable and perhaps not always accurate. And despite all the work of Implementation Design Team members and others, the current version of the strategic plan is not comprehensive. For example, it does not reflect costs for the Honors College, revenue from new professional masters’ programs, or the financial implications of some academic policies now under consideration. It is also likely not to include all of the necessary staffing increases at the college and departmental levels.
We strongly encourage regular interchange between those responsible for strategic plan implementation and those responsible for the overall university budget, with the goal of early inclusion of plan-related specifics in university budget projections.

**Planning Tools for Addressing Budget Issues**

For coming to terms with projected deficits, the university already has important resources at its disposal:

- a sophisticated annual budget process, providing many opportunities for cost savings and resource realignments; and
- a project-management system using Microsoft Project software to produce a Gantt chart that has been well populated with information by the workgroups.

As the Additional Investment and Operational Revenues workgroup has pointedly recognized, “monies wasted or underutilized mean fewer dollars for the academic priorities of greatest urgency.” We can assume that each year’s budget process, like the process for FY12, will involve a rigorous review of all proposed expenses and a readiness to cut, defer, and reallocate as necessary—all with the university’s strategic imperatives foremost.

In this regard, the newly developed project-management function should prove extraordinarily useful. It will permit regular and frequent re-adjustments according to the realities of the moment, within and beyond the university. When specific costs or revenues differ from projections, or new opportunities or difficulties present themselves, its capacity to create detailed “what-if” scenarios will allow planners to make highly informed decisions even when considering major changes.

**Prospects for New Revenue**

Since the university clearly faces significant challenges in balancing its operating budget through FY15, the Implementation Design Team also looked at options, beyond those already projected, for generating additional net revenue.

- If mandatory student fees are increased by an additional three percent per year, $4M per year of additional revenue could be raised. An increase of eight percent per year would raise the revenue by $9M more per year.
- Increasing the number of out-of-state and international students by 1,000 could generate as much as $13M in net operating revenue. Increasing that number to 3,000 could generate as much as $39 million. But gearing up to recruit more out-of-state and international students will take several years, so is not likely to be a major part of the revenue plan before FY2014 or FY2015.
- Raising application fees, registration fees, and/or penalty fees (now comparable to other Massachusetts public and private institutions of higher education) will not yield significant new net revenues.
- Differential fees—higher fees commensurate with higher demand and operating costs—for certain programs are the highest immediate source of potential net revenue expansion, potentially yielding $2M - $11M more per year. We recommend that this option be closely studied, with more discussion on issues related to differential fee expansion.
- Servicing unmet student demand by offering more sections of consistently over-subscribed courses in order to avoid having students taking these courses elsewhere can yield at least $600,000 a year in additional net revenues.
These options are summarized below. It is important to note that some of the possible increases will be harder to achieve than others, and that some will take longer to achieve than others.

**Table 3: Possible Additional Revenue Per Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Gross Estimates of Annual Revenue*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More aggressive differential fees</td>
<td>$2M - $11M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain in-state tuition: $2,000 x 3,000 new students</td>
<td>$6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state/international enrollment: 1,000 students</td>
<td>$22M gross revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$13M after direct incremental costs of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 students</td>
<td>$66M gross revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$39M after direct incremental costs of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-8 percent mandatory fee increase</td>
<td>$4M-$9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting unmet course-section demand</td>
<td>$0.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25.6-65.6M</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These numbers are gross amounts, and do not account for fee and tuition waivers, financial aid, certain probable administrative costs, or possible additional revenue from University College. For order-of-magnitude purposes only.

**Closing the Gaps**

The Implementation Design Team believes that a careful combination of revenue increases and expense reductions, with informed resource reallocation from lower to higher priority programs and activities, could make substantial progress in closing projected budget gaps. Revenue increases could include differential fees for higher-demand programs, moderate across-the-board increases, possibly tuition retention for in-state students, and—most important—a significant increase in the number of out-of-state and international students. The Academic Planning and Enrollment workgroup report calls for out-of-state enrollment to reach five percent of the student body, and international enrollment to reach ten percent, by 2015. However, it states that only with residence halls—making UMass Boston an attractive campus for out-of-state and international students—would that level be possible. A carefully choreographed and forceful plan over the next four to five years to target out-of-state and international student growth will enable us to accomplish many if not most of our strategic objectives, while avoiding dramatic increases in fees to our in-state students.

Resolving the details of this approach to closing the university’s projected operating deficits and dramatically increasing our out-of-state and international students will require a great deal more work. We recognize that many moving parts will have to be coordinated and come together quickly if we are to be able to complete the first phase of the 15-Year Strategic Plan successfully by 2015.
A Funding Strategy for UMass Boston

If we meet the key objectives in our strategic plan and master plan, the fall of 2014 will see a dramatic new UMass Boston. We will have opened two extraordinary new academic and science buildings; we will have residence halls; we will be three years into improved retention and graduation rates and expanded academic and research programs. And we will be embarking on our 50th anniversary. The Implementation Design Team proposes that the university orchestrate a comprehensive marketing and development plan, culminating at our 50th anniversary, to impress the UMass Boston value proposition on prospective students, both within and outside Massachusetts, as well as faculty and staff; and that we target that fall for our first dramatic increase in out-of-state and international enrollment. In the meantime, much of our annual projected operating deficit can be made up by higher than projected fee increases from the Board of Trustees, aggressive and thoughtful use of differential fees, continuing the fight to increase the appropriation from the Legislature and/or to retain in-state tuition, aggressive scrubbing of the expense numbers contained in this budget, and if necessary careful delays of some strategic initiatives and other expenditures.

In the event that priority decisions do have to be made, the Implementation Design Team is clear that these priorities must not be compromised:

- planning for and acquisition of residence halls
- strategic investment in graduation rates and retention
- closing our tenure-stream faculty deficit
- addressing space and infrastructure deficits
- investing in research infrastructure

Any delay in those items will undercut the essential value proposition on which our economic model rests.

Working out the details of this approach to closing the projected operating deficits of the university and to dramatically increasing our out-of-state/international students will require a great deal more work, which we will be happy to be a part of in the event that this approach is adopted by the university.

Articulating the Value Proposition

We need to improve and better articulate the university’s “value proposition” to current and prospective students: a strong, defensible case for the present and future value of a UMass Boston education. This is particularly crucial if the cost of attending UMass Boston increases and in the face of declining public confidence in higher education's value as tuition and fees rise nationwide. The current reality is that a UMass Boston education is underappreciated. To change this perception, the university must further increase its stature and reputation such that it becomes a first choice, rather than being widely perceived as a second choice or temporary way station for students.

We believe that UMass Boston has (and will have) many great strengths that can be packaged into a compelling value proposition and a powerful marketing campaign. Envisioning the possibility of a major celebration for the university's 50th anniversary in 2014, we recommend considering this as an opportunity for a strategic marketing campaign designed to alter the perception of UMass Boston within Massachusetts and increase its appeal outside of Massachusetts.
A spectacular oceanfront location and improved facilities—including residence halls—are just one element of UMass Boston’s future value proposition. But to meet enrollment goals, we must acknowledge that prospective students (and their influencers) are more interested in knowing what “good” a degree from our institution will do them. Making the case for value therefore involves demonstrating how a UMass Boston education—in its mission to be “equal to the best”—prepares students to be competitive candidates, not just for the entry-level opportunities they will seek as fresh graduates, but for every new opportunity they will seek throughout their careers.

This means promoting UMass Boston’s uniquely diverse and exceptional learning environment. It takes only one look at the multi-hued sea of triumphant graduates (and their proud families) at commencement—nearly 60 percent of whom were the first in their families to earn a degree in 2011—to see the tangible outcome. One might consider that UMass Boston’s central value proposition begins when students with a strong work ethic and thirst for opportunity intersect with a passionately dedicated and talented faculty and staff (and each other) in pursuit of meaningful teaching and learning opportunities. Further, the true power of this intersection lies in its setting of exceptional diversity. UMass Boston students represent 139 countries and speak more than 90 different languages. Students, faculty, and staff are diverse not only in nationality, language, race, and culture, however, but also in generation and personal history. The skills, insights, and compassion our students gain at the nexus of these multiple influences extend well beyond “the mere imbibing of facts,” in Chancellor Motley’s words. The university is, in fact, producing local and global citizens of a high order.

With a broad communications strategy that addresses the big picture of institutional positioning in a comprehensive and cohesive fashion, the task of defining the university’s value proposition will become much more than a mere exercise. The communications strategy must be inextricably tied to a shrewd understanding of the UMass Boston value proposition, and its relevance to prospective students, faculty, donors, and funders.

VI. The Case for Change

UMass Boston is entering a new era requiring even deeper, broader, and more rapid change than that which has occurred in previous decades. Strong reasons compel us to meet this challenge as vigorously as possible, despite major obstacles. Providing our students with opportunities “equal to the best” takes more than merely trying to keep up with the complexities of an increasingly global urban experience. It takes even more than staying ahead of the curve. To be the best public urban university it can be, UMass Boston’s destiny is to define the curve. And that means expanding its intellectual capital by taking this institution to a higher plane with respect to research, academic richness, and international reach. We need to be strategic in our planning in order to build depth and reputation, take advantage of the impact our graduate programs and graduate students can make on undergraduate education, and connect the experience our students gain through research to the needs of the global workplace.

Raising our research stature will enable us to compete more favorably for larger research grants from major extramural funders—but the benefit does not end there. This in turn will make us more competitive in recruiting and retaining top faculty with respect to both teaching and research. Increasing the strength of our already strong faculty will further advance the scope and quality of the academic opportunities we provide. We need to realize our full potential so that we can prepare new generations of graduates to realize their full potential in a rapidly evolving global universe. For this is the endgame: to create and disseminate the knowledge and develop the
competencies that will chart new urban courses and blaze new urban trails from Boston to Baltimore, Chicago, and Houston, from Port-au-Prince to Nairobi, Mitrovica, Beijing, and beyond.

Growth and development in our academic enterprise are essential if we are to raise the value of a UMass Boston degree in a marketplace that boasts more than its share of high-profile universities. This means building on a diverse teaching and learning environment that already fosters qualities that are so sought after by employers because they are so rare: the ability to navigate intercultural settings, intellectual curiosity, the spirit of inquiry, an expanded worldview, and civic-mindedness.

Undergraduate program development is a vital ingredient in the recipe for greatness. New offerings in teacher education, art history, Asian studies, population health, and entrepreneurship advance us in this area, as do the recently strengthened areas of environmental management and maternity and pediatrics training. Now we need to move ahead with undergraduate degree programs in the pipeline: communications, engineering, international relations, computer forensics, and non-profit/NGO management. Graduate program development is also vital, and not just for its own sake, but also for the benefit of undergraduates. Writes an Implementation Design Team member: “[I] benefitted personally as an undergraduate from my work with graduate students...watched undergraduates thrive in my research lab working with my graduate students, and watched the wonderful undergraduate teaching done by my graduate students.” This is the kind of experience—still far less common than it should be—that we must guarantee our undergraduates if we want them to have an educational experience “equal to the best.”

Ignoring these needs would be, in essence, a step backward. If we take a successful future for granted and content ourselves with standing still, we will rapidly be left behind as international urban populations, needs, and issues continue to evolve. Opportunities will slip through our fingers. Bright, energetic faculty will become disillusioned and leave to seek a more challenging and stimulating environment. Bold steps are necessary in order to secure the best possible future for this university, its faculty, its staff, its students, and its graduates.

**VII. Conclusion**

Where do we go from here? We recommend specific steps to ensure not only successful implementation of the plan, but also its ongoing refinement and evolution. To advance the plan’s implementation and to maintain accountability, the most critical need is to appoint an oversight team to collaborate at a senior level with the chancellor, provost, and vice chancellor of administration and finance. This team also must continue to pursue revenue opportunities, particularly those within the control of Academic Affairs, such as differential fees (program-specific surcharges reflecting higher demand and operating costs).

Advancement of the strategic plan will also require aggressive promotion through a multitude of channels, using bold, visible graphics as well as strong messaging to help emphasize transparency, bring clarity, educate, and inform. The goal is to unequivocally communicate a top-down commitment to this plan and infuse it into the culture and day-to-day activities of this campus to emphasize ownership of the plan at all levels. The Implementation Design Team’s Communications workgroup is currently focusing on ways to promote the university’s bold new strategic direction as outlined in this plan. The group is also looking ahead to the university’s 50th anniversary.
In addition, the Space Committee must continue to work aggressively to pursue its objectives with respect to near-term space allocation decision-making, rules and parameters for optimizing space utilization, and strategies to meet interim space needs—especially in light of information that the Integrated Sciences Complex and the General Academic Building 1 cannot accommodate as many functions and units as originally planned. We suggest reassessing the master plan with respect to timing the demolition of existing buildings.

We also strongly recommend:

- A standing Strategic Planning Committee (size and composition to be determined) to ensure the plan’s long-term durability from one administration to the next.

- Specific implementation proposals from those with expertise in each area (finance, enrollment management, student housing, academic support, instructional technology, pedagogy, and so on) that the oversight team, together with the senior leadership, can review and respond to.

- A working group comprising representatives from Administration and Finance and a subgroup of Implementation Design Team members to build a multi-year financial model that includes thorough strategic investments across the university. This would provide a baseline to use as a standard for revenue generation and a tool to manage year-over-year strategic investment. Among their tasks would be to compare the university estimates of the cost of strategic growth to the Gantt chart estimates, to determine whether the university estimates need to be modified to accommodate the specific targets of the strategic plan.

- A project manager to serve as the focal person for the plan: assess progress, facilitate integration across the various constituencies, monitor the schedule, integrate new initiatives as they emerge, and oversee the budget.

- A new working group to address ongoing concerns about maintaining UMass Boston’s strong focus on the teaching mission as we develop our research agenda. They would be tasked to ask the larger questions about how today’s students learn best, and how to adapt our pedagogy—and apply innovative learning technologies—to meet their diverse learning needs. Through this work, they could complement existing efforts to review and optimize class sizes. Their work could also dovetail with university efforts to improve retention and graduation rates.

- An associated group or subset of the above working group to look ahead to the students of tomorrow and envision the university that will be needed to serve them well. Ideally this group would include faculty who are early adopters of new instructional technologies—including younger faculty able to imagine being around in 2020 when today’s elementary school students are applying to college.

Additional suggestions include forming or expanding working groups to:

- Collaborate with Vice Chancellor Patrick Day to understand, design, budget, and implement the operational changes needed to convert the campus to 24/7 operations with the presence of residence halls by the fall of 2014 at the latest.

- Develop a comprehensive strategy to meet UMass Boston’s marketing needs, including (but not limited to) recruiting more out-of-state and international students in order to meet our strategic objectives by 2015.
• Oversee the faculty and staff hiring plan.

• Continue to refine undergraduate vs. graduate enrollment growth objectives, targeting which programs to grow by how much; also recommend the percentage of online vs. traditional growth, and the extent to which University College growth is to be included in our enrollment milestones.

• Make the Graduation and Retention Committee a permanent committee, headed by the existing chair and co-chairs, to oversee implementation and further development of its plan.

• Collaborating with the Implementation Design Team’s Communications workgroup to tie 50th anniversary planning to the university’s strategies for enrollment and revenue growth.

With broad involvement and strong commitment by all, members of the UMass Boston community will share both the effort and the rewards of implementing this long-term plan anchored firmly in the founders’ vision of “plunging into the heart of urban society...to prepare its students and faculty for the future, and to take a leading role in shaping that future.”