

Fifth Year Report

for the

**New England Association of Schools and Colleges
Commission on Institutions
of Higher Education**

**University of Massachusetts Lowell
Lowell, Massachusetts**

August 2008

PROCESS FOR PREPARATION OF THE FIVE YEAR REVIEW

In fall 2007, Chancellor Martin T. Meehan met with Executive Vice-Chancellor Jacqueline Moloney and Interim Provost Donald Pierson to assemble a team to prepare the Fifth-Year Review report. They asked Pauline Carroll, Executive Director of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education (CSCDE), and Professor Melissa Pennell, Chair of the English Department, to co-chair the team; both Pennell and Carroll have served on prior NEASC accreditation teams at UML. After consulting with various campus constituencies, the Chancellor appointed other members of the Fifth-Year Review team, who would be charged with gathering information, drafting sections of the report, and offering feedback on the report as a whole. A list of all those who contributed to the preparation of this report appears at the end of this section. Working with the Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Interim Provost, and through discussions with the Chancellor's expanded Cabinet (which includes the Council of Deans), Carroll and Pennell identified goals for the campus in light of this opportunity for reflection and review. Among these were:

- To develop an overview of the many changes and accomplishments that had occurred on campus during the last five years and a forecast of future plans.
- To evaluate campus progress in addressing the seven areas for "special emphasis" identified by NEASC in its letter of March 19, 2004, following the accreditation site visit of October 2003.
- To review the Standards for Accreditation adopted by NEASC in 2005, paying particular attention to the changes that have been incorporated since UML prepared its last self-study and to identify actions that the campus must take in light of these changes in anticipation of its full self-study and accreditation visit in 2013.
- To use this review process as an opportunity to share information and invite input from a broad base of campus constituencies.

To ensure that the campus remained informed about the significance and the process of the NEASC interim report, Carroll and Pennell met regularly with the expanded Cabinet and made presentations to the Faculty Senate explaining the process and inviting anyone who wished to contribute information for the report to feel free to contact the Team. When a full first draft of the report was prepared, it was circulated to the members of the Team, the Expanded Cabinet, and the Faculty Senate for comment. Once input from these groups was collected and revisions made, a revised draft of the report was made available to the entire campus community through the University intranet web site. The NEASC committee invited comments and suggested revisions of this draft through announcements distributed in UML Today, the campus message system.

MEMBERS OF THE FIFTH-YEAR REVIEW REPORT TEAM
Martin T. Meehan, Chancellor

Co-Chairs:

Pauline Carroll, Executive Director of Academic Services, Enrollment Management, & Administration, Continuing Studies, Corporate & Distance Education
Melissa Pennell, Professor of English, Department Chair

Contributors:

Oneida Blagg, Director of Equal Opportunity and Outreach
Judith Boccia, Director, Center for Field Services & Studies
Alease Bruce, Professor of Clinical Laboratory Sciences
Cliff Bruell, Professor of Civil Engineering, Graduate Coordinator
Kathryn Carter, Dean, College Of Management
Michael Carter, Associate Professor of Economics, Department Chair
Partha Chowdhury, Professor of Physics, Interim Vice Provost for Research
Sean Collins, Associate Professor of Physical Therapy, Director of General Education
Nina Coppens, Professor of Psychology, Department Chair
Thomas Costello, Professor of Computer Science, Interim Chief Information, Technology and Facilities Officer
Alan Doerr, Professor of Mathematics, Vice President of Faculty Senate
Patricia Duff, Registrar
Rebecca Hall, Equal Opportunity Associate
Ann Marie Hurley, Professor of Mathematics, President, Faculty Senate
Janet King, Senior Records Analyst, CSCDE
Jill Lohmeier, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Education
Margaret Manion, Librarian IV, University Libraries
Paul Marion, Executive Director for Outreach
Patricia McCafferty, Chief Public Affairs Officer
John McKelliget, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, Department Chair
Marlowe Miller, Professor of English
Jacqueline Moloney, Executive Vice-Chancellor
Christopher Niezrecki, Associate Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Arnold O'Brien, Professor of Environmental, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Department Chair
Robert Parkin, Professor of Mechanical Engineering, President of MSP
Donald Pierson, formerly Interim Provost, presently Vice Provost for Graduate Education
Laura Prudden, Director of Reporting
Larry Siegel, Dean of Student Affairs
Richard Siegel, Professor of Psychology
Linda Southworth, Director of Graduate Admissions
Sherre Strickland, Associate Professor of Accounting,
Thomas Taylor, Dean of Enrollment and Student Success
Paula Telesco, Associate Professor of Music, Department Chair
Linda Williams, Professor of Criminal Justice
Special Assistant to the Committee: Catherine Hamilton, CSCDE

I. Introduction: Institutional Overview

Since the founding of its earliest predecessor institutions in the 1890s, UMass Lowell has been characterized by a balance of continuity and change. Often, change has been reflected in the various names of our predecessor institutions, including the Lowell Normal School; State Teachers College, Lowell; Lowell State College; Massachusetts State College at Lowell; and Lowell Textile School; Lowell Textile Institute; Lowell Technological Institute. Prior to becoming part of the University of Massachusetts in 1991, UMass Lowell was known as the University of Lowell, reflecting the creation in 1975 of a new higher education enterprise through the merger of Lowell State and Lowell Tech. Although the campus traces its history and antecedents back over 100 years, it is in many ways still a young University, its identity and traditions evolving as it refines its mission in the 21st century.

During its recent history, much of the continuity on campus was shaped by the long tenure of President/Chancellor William T. Hogan and the upper administration. Dr. Hogan had served the campus in various administrative capacities prior to becoming President of the University of Lowell in 1981. When the University of Lowell was incorporated into the UMass system, Hogan became Chancellor of the campus, shaping the direction of growth and development and responding to the various challenges that arose as the campus faced pressures from declining state support, an aging physical plant, changing demographics in the state, and the ever increasing cost of providing a quality education to its students. Chancellor Hogan's senior administrative team saw a few changes over this period, but until the last few years of his service, it remained relatively stable. The list of senior administrators from the 2003 NEASC self-study has now changed considerably, with only 11 of the 25 individuals listed still serving in the same or comparable positions. The fewest recent changes have occurred among the Deans of the Colleges, whose leadership has helped the campus negotiate the transitions it has experienced in the last few years. After 25 years as Chancellor, William Hogan retired in 2006, bringing to a close not only his academic career, but the first era of development for UMass Lowell. His parting word to the campus was, "Continue."

While the President's office determined the process and strategy of the search to name a new Chancellor, David MacKenzie, Executive Director of the UMass Building Authority, was named to serve as Interim Chancellor. During the year that he served in an interim capacity, MacKenzie worked to improve physical conditions on campus and to continue some of the initiatives that had been started during the Hogan years, especially what has come to be known as the Emerging Technologies and Innovation Center (ETIC), to be built on University Avenue at the gateway to UMass Lowell North. This center will house nano- and bio- manufacturing research as well as other cutting-edge research ventures. Chancellor MacKenzie also continued the Transformation Teams Project (details appear in later sections of this report), initiated by Chancellor Hogan in response to some of the NEASC concerns, to examine a number of campus programs and needs in order to make recommendations for innovations and improvements. Although his term of service on campus was brief, David MacKenzie's support for conducting a first-year convocation to welcome students to UMass Lowell helped to establish what is becoming an important tradition on campus. During MacKenzie's tenure as Interim Chancellor, a national search was conducted to

identify a new leader for the Lowell campus, and in the spring of 2007, Martin T. Meehan was recommended by the search committee to become the next Chancellor of UMass Lowell.

During this period of transition on campus, changes were also occurring in the UMass President's office and among the University Board of Trustees. At the time of the 2003 NEASC accreditation review, Jack M. Wilson was serving as Interim President of the UMass system and Grace Fey was the Chair of the Board of Trustees. In 2004, Wilson was named the 25th President of the University. A recognized leader in higher education reform and innovation, President Wilson has been working to enhance the profile of the University as a whole, while interacting with the individual campuses to define and/or refine the mission and contributions of each. The Board of Trustees, which consists of 22 (19 voting) members, has also undergone a series of changes to its membership and leadership. The most recent change is the election of Robert J. Manning, a UML alumnus, as Chair of the Board.

Building a New Vision Together: Excellence through Innovation

On July 1, 2007, Marty Meehan assumed the Chancellorship of UMass Lowell, returning to his alma mater after serving the Commonwealth as an Assistant District Attorney, a Deputy Secretary of State, and as Representative for the 5th congressional district in the U.S. House. Chancellor Meehan brings a new vision to campus, one shaped by his appreciation for the education he received and the opportunities it opened for him and by his understanding of the possibilities and challenges that will face the campus in the 21st century. Growing out of his belief that his education at then U Lowell provided the foundation for his career in public service, Meehan has called upon the campus community to dedicate itself to service as it carries out the mission of the University, and specifically of UMass Lowell. He has set forth an ambitious plan for the future while working with the campus leadership team to address concerns that face the campus at present.

A priority for any new Chancellor is the establishment of the campus leadership team, and Meehan has used his first year in office to initiate the process. He has taken a twofold approach to address this issue. First, he called upon seasoned members of UML's administration and faculty to assume new positions or interim leadership posts. Dr. Jacqueline Moloney, formerly Dean of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education (CSCDE), was appointed Executive Vice-Chancellor and Patricia McCafferty was appointed as Chief Public Affairs Officer. Among those currently or recently serving in interim positions are Dr. Donald Pierson, Vice Provost for Graduate Education (formerly Interim Provost); Dr. Partha Chowdhury, Interim Vice Provost for Research; and Dr. Thomas Costello, Interim Chief Information and Facilities Officer. The Chancellor immediately retained the search firm of Korn Ferry to conduct an international search for a Provost, who as chief academic officer, will set the standard for research and scholarship as well as make critical decisions on academic policy and priorities. After a thorough process that fully engaged the campus in the selection process, the Chancellor announced the appointment of the new Provost, Dr. Ahmed Abdelal, who comes to UML from Northeastern University, where he served as Provost and Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs. Dr. Abdelal's official appointment began on May 15, 2008. On March 28, 2008, searches were announced for a Vice Chancellor for Advancement and a Vice Chancellor of Administration, Finance, and Technology.

In addition to establishing his leadership team, Meehan has begun to address the issue of the campus physical plant. When he arrived on campus, he commented on the fact that UMass Lowell has not seen the construction of a new academic building since his own student days. He began work with the committee considering the location of the new Emerging Technologies and Innovation Center (ETIC) and has presented to various constituencies information on plans for constructing it as a green building and for locating the new construction on a highly visible part of

the UML campus. This will be the first new academic building opened on the Lowell campus since 1976. The Chancellor has also accepted \$4M in funding from the Governor and the Commonwealth for renovations to the Mass Medical Device Development Center located on UML East. He has urged the development of new student housing and succeeded in getting the UMass five-year capital plan amended by the Board of Trustees in December 2007 to include \$42.5M for a new residence hall facility on campus. The Chancellor has also identified the need for additional new academic buildings on both South and North campuses. The budgets of Governor Patrick and the House of Representatives both recommend funds for a new academic building to be located on South Campus.

While the campus has not seen construction of new buildings in many decades, portions of the physical plant did undergo significant renovation since 2003. The Allen House, a historic building constructed in 1854 overlooking the Merrimack River on UML South, was renovated and reopened in spring 2007. The re-opening celebrated a “Day of the Arts” during which the Spinola Gallery, an exhibit space for the visual arts within Allen House, was dedicated, as was the newly renovated Comley-Lane Theatre (formerly Mahoney Auditorium) located in Mahoney Hall. The Allen House, in which the Chancellor maintains his office, provides space for receptions and meetings. In addition, Dugan Hall, a mixed administrative office and classroom building, first constructed in 1962, saw the completion of major renovations that supported the relocation of Admissions, the Registrar, and Financial Aid to a single site to facilitate student services. This renovation also included reconstruction to make the building accessible for individuals with disabilities. The classrooms on the second floor of Dugan also saw major upgrades, making them “Smart” rooms featuring instructional consoles equipped with computers, document cameras, permanently mounted LCD projectors, network access, etc. Renovations were made to Cumnock Hall, primarily an administrative building, which also houses one of the campus’s auditoriums. The campus is committed to continuing renovations of existing space, both to upgrade classroom facilities and to improve access for the disabled.

In his comments, Chancellor Meehan speaks of “unleashing the potential for greatness” that exists on campus, affirming his belief in the future of UMass Lowell. Since the last NEASC review in 2003, a number of measures have been taken that have helped to generate this potential and to maintain UML’s commitment to its mission, especially to “enhance the intellectual, personal, and cultural development of its students through excellent, affordable educational programs” and to “meet the needs of the Commonwealth today and into the future.” In order to ensure the quality of its academic programs, UML maintains a policy of systematic program reviews. As stated in our 2003 self-study, all UML programs for which there exists a national professional accrediting agency are required to maintain such agency accreditation and since 2003 have been successful in doing so. In addition, those programs not covered by accrediting agencies are required to undergo a systematic review that is part of the University’s Performance Measurement System; this review, known as AQAD (Academic Quality and Development), includes external evaluation as well as self-study. The reviews are conducted on a regular schedule, which is publicized through the Academic Affairs web site.

From 2004 to 2007, in response to the concerns generated by the NEASC campus visit, UML engaged in a “Transformation Project.” The goals included: to provide students with the most creative, thoughtful and up-to-date curriculum possible; to allow faculty to expand their pedagogical, disciplinary, and interdisciplinary interests; to engage all staff and administrators in campus life and innovation; and to develop wide understanding – both on campus and across a broad public arena – of the innovations currently under way on the campus. The project involved approximately 160 faculty, staff, and administrators, who spent two years exploring issues across ten key areas, among them: improving the first-year experience, improving student advising,

expanding international programs, encouraging interdisciplinary research and teaching, continuing University-community partnerships, strengthening the research environment, advancing sustainability, and maintaining a safe and productive working environment on campus. As these teams conducted research, gathered information, and discussed options pertinent to UML, reports were posted on the University web site, so that everyone could view developments around these key issues and offer feedback to teams. At the end of the two-year process, each team offered a series of recommendations, reporting them to the new chancellor and to the campus at large. Additional discussion of this project and some of its initial outcomes appear below in the discussion of assessment and in the Standards section.

To offer our students a current and innovative academic curriculum, UML has introduced new options, courses, and programs at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Recently, the Faculty Senate, which reviews all programmatic additions and changes, approved offering an option in Green Chemistry at the doctoral level in Chemistry and a Bio/Cheminformatics option at the doctoral level in Computer Science. It also approved new graduate certificates in Nutritional Sciences, Disability Outcomes, Elastometric Materials, and Plastics Engineering Fundamentals. Medical Plastics Design and Manufacturing, Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies, and Behavioral Intervention in Autism. In spring 2008, the Board of Trustees approved a new Doctor of Nursing Practice degree to be offered on multiple campuses within the University system, including Lowell.

New offerings have also been added to the undergraduate curriculum. Taking advantage of existing campus resources, a new cross-disciplinary option in Forensic Sciences (Chemistry and Criminal Justice) was approved for undergraduates. The School of Health and Environment has created a new four-year cross-disciplinary program, the SHE Scholars, with seventeen students currently enrolled in the first year. Additional cross-disciplinary/interdisciplinary courses, such as Artbotics, which combines art and computer science, and courses in Performamatics, which combine art, music, and theatre with computer science have also been developed. To strengthen the experience of first-year students, the English Department has introduced a Common Text program that runs through College Writing I and II; not only do first year students read a text in common each semester, they also have an opportunity to participate in expanded learning experiences, including field trips, a film series, and attendance at a performance at the Merrimack Repertory Theatre. To expand options for students interested in teaching math at the middle and high school level, the Senate approved re-introducing the B.A. in Mathematics.

Offerings through the award-winning Division of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education have also expanded during the past five years. Collaborating with the various colleges and departments on campus, Continuing Studies has migrated a number of graduate and undergraduate degrees and certificates online. Degrees include Master's degrees through the Graduate School of Education: Educational Administration, Reading and Language, Curriculum and Instruction; a Master's degree in Criminal Justice and a Master's of Business Administration. An online certificate in Behavioral Intervention in Autism in conjunction with the Eunice Shriver Center and a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study in Curriculum and Instruction are now offered. An innovative graduate certificate in Health Management and Policy is now being presented in a blended format at the University and area hospitals and a new blended RN to BS degree program for nurses is being introduced this year. A Bachelor of Arts in Psychology as well as several new concentrations in the Bachelor of Liberal Arts offer students opportunities to complete their degrees.

To assist adult learners in completing their degrees, CSCDE now offers courses in various formats: face-to face on campus, online, and blended. In this "Best of Both Worlds" approach, students can

mix and match these courses to complete their degrees in a timely manner. These programming efforts in collaboration with the departments, along with the Division's outreach efforts with regional business, industry and community organizations have created models for partnering with other entities, and have helped build creative inter-institutional collaborations and partnerships with universities, colleges and businesses. In addition, these efforts have benefited students and the region as well as heightened the university's profile.

The ability to offer many of these new opportunities to our students reflects the collaboration among different groups on campus and the benefits reaped from the number of new faculty hired since 2003. Since that time, the full-time faculty has grown by almost 20%, with new faculty hired across the disciplines. Their presence has also contributed to the increased level of funded research on campus, demonstrated in the growth of research awards from \$15.7 million in 2004 to \$51.8 million in FY2007. More information about faculty hiring appears below in the discussion of full-time and part-time faculty, diversifying our workforce, and Standard 5.

To further serve our students, changes were made in the structure of Student Affairs. In 2005 the two positions in Student Affairs, Dean of Student Services and Dean of Student Life, were re-evaluated, creating a Dean of Students and a Dean of Enrollment Management and Student Success. The latter Dean now manages Admissions, Orientation, and Financial Aid. The Dean of Students assumed a more traditional role within Student Affairs. With this change, emphasis was placed on the first year experience in the Enrollment Management and Student Success area. The Dean of Students Office increased its emphasis on the development of a student culture that emphasizes school spirit, participation, and outreach by student groups to the community. Among the benefits of this re-organization have been new student orientations in both June and at the start of fall semester, the fall convocation for first year students, the introduction of the STARS (Students at Risk) program, and the growth of student leadership opportunities and participation. Additional information on these and other changes that have improved the student experience can be found under the discussion of Standard 6.

One administrative reorganization step that is being reconsidered pertains to graduate programs. In 2006, the Graduate School as an administrative entity headed by a Dean was eliminated. Some of the functions formerly handled by the Dean's office have been transferred to Academic Affairs, Admissions and the International Students and Scholars Office. This administrative decision was opposed by the faculty, as represented by the Faculty Senate, who passed a unanimous resolution in March 2006 asking Chancellor Hogan and the upper administration to rescind this restructuring plan and to enter into a dialogue with the Faculty Senate on any restructuring plan for the graduate school. It is expected that the new administration and the new Provost along with the Faculty Senate will revisit this decision. In June 2008, a new Vice Provost for Graduate Education has been appointed to address some of these concerns.

As was the case in 2003-04, UML's public service continues to be wide-ranging; the University's commitment to serve the Greater Lowell community and the Commonwealth shapes its outreach activity in a variety of areas, from K-12 education, to health care and health services, to assistive technologies, to support of the creative economy. Among recent public service and outreach efforts, the University counts the Asperger's Intervention Program, the "Science of Small Things" Program, the STEMS (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) Pipeline Program, the Strings Program, the worker safety program in Lawrence (funded by a NIOSH grant), the Partnership for College Success (funded by a Nellie Mae grant), and the TEAMS (Technology, Engineering, Math-Science) program for high school juniors and seniors. This is just a small

sampling of the many public service projects undertaken by faculty and staff at the University to better the lives as well as the social and economic conditions of the residents of Greater Lowell and the region.

A key factor in Chancellor Meehan's vision of growth and success for UMass Lowell is his emphasis on the various constituencies on campus and in the community "working together" to make it happen. He identified his official inauguration ceremony and the related programs accompanying it as an opportunity to showcase and to strengthen the campus. He invited participation from the entire University, not just through attendance at the inauguration itself, but through involvement with the exhibits, forums, seminars, and lectures that were hosted across the campus. Chancellor Meehan also identified inauguration events as opportunities to raise scholarship funds for UML students, reflecting his awareness of the significant role financial aid plays in the lives of our students. He established the Music Education Endowment and the Chancellor Martin T. Meehan Educational Excellence Endowment Fund that will create an endowment to provide scholarships for deserving students as well as support for campus initiatives and areas of excellence, which include encouraging the invention and innovation needed to fuel the state's knowledge economy. Through fundraising for Inauguration Week, over one million dollars was raised for scholarships at UML.

II. Areas for Special Emphasis

In its letter to Chancellor Hogan in March 2004, NEASC reported that the CIHE continued the accreditation of UMass Lowell and that the campus should submit a fifth-year interim report for the fall, 2008. In addition, the Commission asked the campus to include in the report information that reflected its success in addressing the following special concerns:

- Maintaining fiscal stability in the context of substantially reduced state support;
- Adopting and implementing a comprehensive approach to the assessment of institutional effectiveness, including the assessment of student learning at both the graduate and undergraduate levels and the efficacy of the student advising system;
- Developing and implementing a process to assess the effectiveness and productivity of the University's research centers and institutes;
- Enhancing participation by campus constituencies in administrative decision-making;
- Ensuring that the University has an appropriate balance of full-time and part-time faculty;
- Further diversifying the faculty and staff, in keeping with the institution's own goals;
- Implementing the institution's facilities master plan.

Each of these items for special emphasis is addressed in this section of the report.

I. Fiscal Stability in an Era of Diminished State Support for Public Higher Education

At the time of the most recent NEASC accreditation, the University of Massachusetts system was nearing the end of several years of retrenchment in already lean state support of public higher education. The accreditation team noted details of this ominous trend and expressed concern over UML's ability to simultaneously maintain fiscal stability, access to all students of the Commonwealth, and the quality of its academic programs and research enterprise in the face of a decline in state appropriations for annual operating budgets combined with chronically low support for deferred maintenance and new physical capital expenditures. The accreditation team also noted that the extremely centralized, opaque nature of the budget process at UML was unlikely to serve

the University well in either allocating increasingly scarce resources or securing buy-in of affected constituencies to the hard choices that the University would face in the future.

In three of the four completed fiscal years since the time of the 2003 NEASC review the campus has experienced operating deficits, most noticeably a \$6.6 million deficit in fiscal 2006. The transition to an Interim Chancellor, David MacKenzie, in fiscal 2007 and a new Chancellor, Martin Meehan, in fiscal 2008 has been associated with a dramatic reduction in current and expected deficits. However, due to prior contractual agreements, it is unlikely that UML will return to operating surpluses until fiscal 2010. Despite the pattern of operating deficits since the last NEASC review, the University retained at the end of fiscal 2007 a positive financial cushion, which at 5% of operating expenses was nearly equal to its 5.3% level at the end of fiscal 2003. Unrestricted net assets, a measure of an institution's freedom to respond to unanticipated revenue shortfalls or to support spending initiatives, declined during the recent deficit years from a high point of \$13.31 million at the end of fiscal 2004 to \$10.8 million at the end of fiscal year 2007.

However, there are reasons to believe that the recent financial past is not a prologue to the future and that UML will be on a more stable financial footing by the time of the next NEASC review in 2013. The following paragraphs outline the reasoning and assumptions underlying cautious optimism in the currently challenging fiscal environment.

Since fiscal 2004, state support for higher education operating expenses has stabilized in real terms. This contrasts sharply with the series of real reductions in state higher education support in the fiscal 2001-2004 period leading up to the NEASC 2003 report. That is, increases in the annual state support appropriation have covered increases in labor costs associated with collective bargaining agreements and allowed for some rebuilding of full time faculty lines lost during 2001-2004 plus a small increase of about 1% in other operating expenses. Overall, state support has funded about 25% of the overall operating expenses at the University since fiscal 2004. Based on the Governor's budget for fiscal 2009 this pattern is projected to continue at least into the near future. While a severe recession and consequent reduction in state tax receipts might necessitate some retrenchment in state support, the current Governor is far more cognizant of the importance of public higher education to the Commonwealth's future than were his predecessors. He has filed a \$1 billion bond bill to fund capital expenses of higher education institutions in fiscal 2009-2014 as well as a \$1 billion dollar life science research initiative. Although over one half of the funds from the life science initiative will be allocated to corporations, taken together the two initiatives will increase annual state support for capital spending in the University by 3 to 4 times what was characteristic during the last 15 years. Passage of these bills is one key to the University's business plan as discussed below.

The stabilization of state support clearly does not in itself assure fiscal stability as indicated by persisting operating deficits during this period. To put this experience into perspective, it is important to note what was achieved in the period under review. In many respects the campus administration during 2004-2007, addressed concerns of NEASC about preservation of the quality of the University's research enterprise, its academic programs, quality of student body and its financial accessibility. All nationally accredited programs passed all accreditation reviews, full time faculty were increased and the trends towards substitution of adjunct for full time faculty were halted and even reversed in many instructional areas. Enrollments in the undergraduate day school were maintained without sacrifice in admissions standards in terms of SAT scores, high school class rank or GPA. Following sharp increases in the 2001-2004 period, increases in overall student costs (tuition + compulsory fees) were held in line with inflation (averaging 3% per year) in the period 2004-2007. Moreover, student scholarships and fellowships increased from \$584,000 in fiscal 2003 to \$3,799,000 in fiscal 2007. Externally sponsored faculty research during the 2003-

2007 period increased on a Total Direct Cost basis from \$18.42 million to \$20.98 million, while overhead billing to the University from this research increased 39% during this period. UML's Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education Division won national recognition for the excellence of its on-line programs during this period and experienced strong growth in enrollments and revenues. Revenue growth in CSCDE has been sufficiently strong that after funding its direct costs, including transfers to UMASS online, the division in 2007 contributed over \$5 million towards the support of the operating budget in the day school. In addition, the Division distributed funds to the departments and Deans of the Colleges for their collaboration in programming initiatives and corporate outreach.

However, despite stabilization in state support, growth in funded research and indirect cost recovery, and very strong growth in revenues from CSCDE, the campus has struggled in recent years to balance its budgets and earn a positive return on net assets. What changes in strategy and policies is the new administration under Chancellor Meehan implementing to restore UML to budgetary balance while funding the increased debt service associated with a major expansion in its physical capital, including several new signature academic buildings, new dormitory space and critically needed upgrades of existing facilities?

The answer involves: 1) a thorough reassessment of University budgets in an effort to redirect spending away from low value-added areas to high value-added areas as well as to charging for the use of University facilities; 2) a review of the curricula to grow enrollments in a number of areas including professional Master's degree programs; 3) a plan to coordinate growth in new signature academic buildings with growth in alumni and corporate giving and growth in on-campus housing and day school enrollments. Regarding the first of these challenges, Chancellor Meehan has already demonstrated in the few months he has been on campus his ability to think consistently and realistically in terms of prospective value-added when allocating scarce resources. He has renegotiated several contractual arrangements with the City of Lowell and Middlesex Community College, has imposed student and faculty parking fees and introduced an administrative assessment consistent with Board of Trustees policy on athletics and residence life for use of University facilities. He initiated a nationwide external search for a Provost to assist him in developing a strategic plan that will inform hiring and other resource allocation decisions so as to maximize the long underutilized value inherent in the University's geographical proximity to one of the world's leading concentrations of education intensive industry. In addition, he has moved in the direction of decentralizing the budget process in ways that increase transparency and build accountability among those with budget authority. In particular, he has instituted a budget review committee and made budget directors responsible for payroll in their areas as well as for operating expenditures.

Chancellor Meehan realizes that a rationalized budgeting process informed by a market driven strategic plan that builds on campus faculty strengths must be complemented by growth in the overall student body, especially growth in the population of out-of-state and resident students. Growth in enrollments and fee revenues from the day school population must complement the growth in CSCDE enrollments and revenues if the University is to thrive financially. The University's goal is to increase day school enrollments by 2.5% per year in fiscal 2009 through fiscal 2013. This is a fairly ambitious goal. Success in achieving this goal without reducing admissions standards requires the University to invest in new student housing (demand for which now exceeds supply), in new academic buildings, and in upgraded classrooms and labs in existing structures. While these capital improvements will add interest expense to operating budgets in future years, the need for campus bond funding of these capital projects is expected to be held down by the campus's share of the proceeds of Governor Patrick's unprecedented \$1 billion higher education bond bill together with substantial increases in alumni, foundation and corporate gifts. Towards this end, Chancellor Meehan amply demonstrated a talent for fundraising in his

congressional career. On the basis of early returns, this talent appears to have carried over to fundraising in the University environment. Alumni and corporate contributions in terms of both cash and commitments to UML at this point in his first year as Chancellor are up substantially over any previous year in the campus's history. New cash received as of December 31, 2007 was \$2.286 million from individuals and \$2.267 million from corporations. These numbers compare with the average over the past 4 years of \$1.61 and \$1.787 million raised by Dec 31, 2007. In addition, Chancellor Meehan has been instrumental in increasing scholarship funds. His inauguration raised over \$1,000,000 in donations for scholarships and Charles Hoff and his wife Josephine have donated \$3 million dollars towards establishment of a \$10 million dollar endowment for the Charles Hoff Scholarship Foundation. This is the largest private scholarship program in the history of the University of Massachusetts.

II. Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness; Assessment of Student Learning; Advising Effectiveness

In its standards, NEASC has made a clear commitment to the importance of a campus's assessment of its programs and services for students. In Standards 4.44 through 4.50, and elsewhere, NEASC describes how the goal of educational improvement is to be achieved by articulating specific learning objectives at course, program, and institutional levels; collecting relevant data and reviewing such data periodically; utilizing such data in its commitment to quality improvement and student success; and making its data on student success publicly available.

In its January 22, 2004 Report, NEASC expressed several concerns about assessment of student learning and student advising, with those concerns subsequently summarized and restated in the August 31, 2007 letter to Chancellor MacKenzie from Robert Froh: "2. adopting and implementing a comprehensive approach to the assessment of institutional effectiveness, including the assessment of student learning and the efficacy of the student advising system."

Since the Self-Study, the campus has made progress in addressing the concerns expressed by NEASC. With respect to student advising:

- The campus has introduced and established its new Inter-Campus Student Information System (ISIS), which provides students and their advisors with many self-service options for identifying and communicating with each other, accessing the course catalog, registering for classes, and using the "degree audit" feature that tracks the students' progress toward completion of all degree requirements.
- The Information Technology Department has established an extensive website that includes help aides, "how to" documentation and videos for faculty, students, and staff on using the self-service options.
- The Registrar's Office web pages have been redesigned and information such as semester schedules, student forms, and academic catalogs have become more easily accessible to students.
- In 2005, the Transformation Team on Student Advising was established as part of the "Transformation Project." This team, composed of the Associate Provost, the President of the Faculty Senate, faculty and staff, examined Undergraduate Student Advising at UML and surveyed department chairs and conducted a student survey. The Transformation group used the survey data to describe the status of Advising, identify areas in need of improvement, and make several recommendations to the Chancellor. It was found that faculty met with their advisees and also responded to their questions by phone and email, and conducted specialized

advising. Students were also using the self-service options made available by the new student information system.

- The Faculty are updated on changes that might impact advising by their departments and by the Centers for Learning, which conduct information sessions on subjects involving ISIS self-service.

In order to address the NEASC concerns regarding assessment of student learning, the following actions have been taken:

- The campus has strengthened its Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) system for departmental self-studies, with more emphasis on departments' articulation of program objectives.
- The College of Management, several programs in the School of Health and Environment, undergraduate Engineering programs, and several departments in the College of Arts and Sciences that hold professional accreditation, have gone through rigorous accreditation procedures by their external reviewing organizations that require evidence of assessment of student learning outcomes.
- Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education created its "Assessment for Excellence Project" in 2004 that brought together a group of faculty and staff who worked to create a course evaluation instrument that assesses the quality of a learner's experience. The Division has encouraged faculty to incorporate learning objectives in their syllabi to foster learning. The evaluation instrument asks the students for feedback on how clear those objectives were to them, and whether the evaluations of their performance were related to course objectives. The evaluation form is now routinely used every semester in all undergraduate and graduate on-campus and on-line CSCDE courses. In addition, a degree/certificate completion survey has been created that is now routinely completed by students as they finish their programs. Data from these surveys are compiled into readable course-by-course and departmental reports that are reviewed by program chairs and coordinators and by CSCDE's Executive team.
- Student evaluations that may be developed by individual faculty or departments are distributed to students each semester in at least one class taught by tenured faculty and in all classes taught by non-tenured and part-time faculty. The results are reviewed by the department chair, the faculty member and the Dean according to the guidelines set forth in the Faculty contract.
- The campus is making active use of several new classroom technologies designed to facilitate and assess student learning: (1) several faculty have adopted the "clicker" system that allows them to routinely assess student learning in real time in the midst of a class lecture by posting questions, collecting and displaying results, and then, as needed, taking additional time to go over material; (2) some faculty are using an automated lecture-capture system that allows for multimedia class lectures (video and sound coordinated with slideshows and overheads) to be recorded and made immediately available to students via the Internet.
- The recently reorganized Council on Teaching and Learning (CTL) has created a new Assessment Task Force, which will take an active role in helping the campus identify appropriate tools for the assessment of student learning and to develop a mechanism by which such assessment data can be used in on-going strategic planning.
- The Council on Teaching and Learning at UML has also recently been working with the National Council on Academic Transformation in a course-redesign program that will establish a model for the campus on how pedagogical and technological innovations can be incorporated into curriculum design and evaluated for their effect on student learning.
- Faculty in the College of Management have been involved in a two-year "eOutcomes" grant from the Davis Foundation to develop mechanisms that will make it possible to match

examples of student learning with specific course or program objectives to assess learning outcomes.

- The Administration has taken several steps to strengthen its commitment to student assessment: a Dean's-level position has been renamed "Dean of Enrollment and Student Success," with an expanded mandate; institutional reporting has been strengthened with the recent hire of a Director of Reporting and a Director of Institutional Research; and efforts are underway to create a database that will track students from the beginning to the end of their academic careers and that will allow for the identification of key variables that contribute to, or interfere with, student success.

The Inventory

In its September 2007 document "Becoming More Explicit in Looking at Student Success," NEASC identified several approaches by which a campus could become more explicit in identifying its efforts to assess student achievement. Lowell has chosen the "Inventory" method, both to better document how well all the various degree programs on campus are focused on the assessment of student learning through the completion of form E1A, and also to establish benchmarks by which programs' subsequent progress can be monitored and encouraged.

To this end, a survey was created and distributed to all program chairs and coordinators as well as to the Provost and the General Education Coordinator. Based on responses from 55 of 63 degree programs and from the Provost and the General Education Coordinator, the following is a summary of where the campus is at this point in time:

- At the institutional level, the University has established goals with respect to student retention and graduation and is collecting and reviewing hard data in these areas.
- The General Education program maintains a rigorous review process for the initial approval of General Education courses, including a review of learning objectives and course assessment strategies, to establish compliance with Gen Ed's broadly-defined goals. But there is no over-all process for identifying more specific General Education learning outcomes other than the evaluation forms that are distributed in courses as described above.
- Some form of program review is now well-established on campus, with only 9 of the 55 programs reporting that they have never gone through any form of program review; many programs follow the AQAD model of self-study established by the UMass President's Office, which requires comprehensive program review once every 6 years.
- Fifteen programs reported that they have a well-defined system in place for the assessment of student learning; all but 3 of these 15 are programs where such assessments are mandated by an external reviewing body.

With the survey's description of 5 ascending benchmarks in each of the 5 areas on Form E1A, a program could achieve a maximum score of 25. Again drawing on the responses received from 53 of 63 degree programs:

- Those programs (N=19) on campus that are subject to external accreditation demonstrate a strong commitment to evidence-based assessment of student learning and the use of evidence in an on-going process of quality improvement, achieving on average a score of 22.2.
- For the campus programs (N=21) that follow AQAD, which does not currently mandate any explicit focus on the assessment of student learning, much still remains to be accomplished, given an average score of 16.5.

- Some programs have defined specific learning objectives, and most have articulated general program goals.
- Departments do not always clearly communicate goals and objectives on program websites or in individual course syllabi.
- Most programs are engaged in at least some form of data collection, usually in the form of course evaluation surveys completed by students (and sometimes by alumni). These evaluations are made available to the instructor, chair and the Dean.
- Most programs report that their faculty are actively involved in program self-examination and quality-improvement efforts.
- Some programs reported that they have adopted a “transformative” process in which data directly tied to student learning outcomes are carefully reviewed, improvement strategies are chosen and implemented, and new data are collected to assess those improvement efforts.

Analysis and Next steps

The Inventory tells us that the campus is moving in the right direction but still needs to strengthen its assessment of student learning. To this end, the reorganized Council on Teaching and Learning Assessment Taskforce together with the administration and in conjunction with the Faculty Union and the Faculty Senate will develop and implement a comprehensive assessment approach by which all academic programs and concentrations will clearly state their objectives and learning outcomes, and relevant information will be collected and used in continuing curriculum review and reform.

III. Developing and Implementing a Process to Assess the Effectiveness and Productivity of the University's Research Centers and Institutes

The University's research centers and institutes continue to play a pivotal role in the overall research endeavor of the institution. They typically expand and transcend traditional academic boundaries of department and college, and forge interdisciplinary partnerships that are necessary requirements for research in the twenty-first century. The past five years have seen the emergence of new centers of excellence, notwithstanding major changes in the upper administration on campus. The Committee of Federated Centers and Institutes (CFCI), a self-governing confederation of research directors of almost all centers and institutes on campus, which was formed more than a decade ago, has remained a stable body that has provided key input for addressing issues regarding the research climate.

In addition, a separate Council on Research and Scholarship was formed to include non-center researchers, as well as scholars from the humanities, social sciences, and fine arts. In response to NEASC's concerns on the need to develop and implement a process to assess the centers and institutes, various groups have met on campus and have assessed the status of the centers. In addition, a campus-wide task force on research productivity was created and unanimously recommended that the administration appoint a Chief Research Officer (CRO) at the Chancellor's cabinet level.

An initial external search for filling the position of Chief Research Officer was unsuccessful in identifying a viable candidate. With the end of the search process coinciding with the retirement of Chancellor Hogan, it was decided to put the search on hold until a new administration was in place. Interim Chancellor MacKenzie, recognizing the urgent need for a CRO, appointed an Interim Vice Provost for Research, Dr. Partha Chowdhury, who continues to serve on the administrative

leadership team. Since the new Provost has assumed his duties, it is expected that a committee will be formed to search for a new Vice Provost for Research. The new Vice Provost for Research will continue the work begun by Dr. Chowdhury and his team. The expectation is that the new administrative officer will oversee and facilitate research and scholarship activities on campus, as well as be the spokesperson and champion of University research beyond campus confines. The office will also be the administrative entity that will take on the responsibility of administering and assessing the activities of all research centers and institutes on campus. Effectiveness, productivity and alignment of goals with the campus mission will be the primary benchmarks of the research centers and institutes.

Some of the key items investigated since the NEASC Self-Study include:

- Identification and characterization of active centers and institutes (both in and beyond CFCI) according to funding sources, genesis, mission, and/or other criteria, in order to obtain a better definition of what constitutes a center or institute.
- Research on best assessment and administrative practices for centers and institutes at other academic institutions, and adapting these practices to the needs of the University.
- Assessment of research productivity, measured through standard metrics, such as publications, conference presentations, internal and external research collaborations, as well as external funding.
- Independent assessment of financials, including annual research expenditure and net indirect cost recovery for research centers and institutes at the University over a multi-year period, as well as a business plan for each entity for a self-sustaining future.
- Review of criteria such as alignment with campus mission, level of interdisciplinary activity, student involvement, partnerships with industry and community, economic development and technology transfer and uniqueness.

Although more analysis is needed, the University has found that, in the absence of a centralized office in the administration in charge of research policy and assessment, CFCI has served the campus well in the governance of all centers and institutes in its membership. The CFCI bylaws can very well be modified and adapted as the University continues in evaluating the centers. The CFCI has processes in place for the approval of new member units. Each member unit undergoes an evaluation process every three years through preparation and presentations of written and oral reports and an independent annual financial report from the Office of Research Administration, is also required according to the bylaws. The CFCI collects and documents research performed by its member units through an annual progress report

(http://www.uml.edu/research/CFCI/annual_report_06-07.pdf). This annual report format could be expanded to include all institutes and centers at the University.

In April 2008, as a result of the input from the Transformation teams, the Interim Vice Provost for Research, the Chancellor's Cabinet, leaders of the current councils, and major faculty committees (Committee on Federated Centers and Institutes and Committee on Industrial Theory and Assessment), the new administration proposed a new Council structure, consisting of a reformulated Council on Research and Scholarship. It is expected that the newly reformulated Council on Research and Scholarship will work closely with the new Provost, and the Interim Vice Provost for Research in continuing the review, the assessment of productivity, and the reorganization of the centers and institutes at the University.

The Provost, the Interim Vice Provost for Research and the Council will continue to investigate the following questions and will formulate policy in consultation with the appropriate faculty groups:

- Is there an improved reporting structure for a center or institute?
- Is there is a well-defined process for the termination of a center or institute?
- Is there a formal written agreement between center and college, or Vice Provost office?
- Are there written agreements in dealing with faculty and research staff and students?
- What justifies the formation of a center, that is, could the research be done by an individual?
- To what extent is the research center-driven or center-dependent?
- What are the present administrative incentives to form or continue a center?

IV. Enhancing Participation by Campus Constituencies in Administrative Decision-Making

In 2003, William T. Hogan announced a ten year transformation strategic plan designed to improve “the way faculty teach and the way students learn.” Part of the ten year plan was an innovative three year “Transformation Project” guided by the Provost and a steering committee of deans and vice chancellors and composed of ten teams of approximately 160 faculty, staff and administrators who were representative of the university community. Members of the project spent two years exploring issues across ten key areas, among them: improving the first-year experience, improving student advising, expanding international programs, encouraging interdisciplinary research and teaching, continuing University-community partnerships, strengthening the research environment, advancing sustainability, and maintaining a safe and productive working environment on campus. As these teams conducted research, gathered information, and discussed options important to UML, reports were posted on the University web site, so that everyone could view developments around these key issues and offer feedback to teams. At the end of the process, each team offered a series of recommendations, and reported them to the Provost and the Council of Deans, the Chancellor’s newly configured Cabinet, and to the Chancellor and the campus at large. Important recommendations have been selected by faculty, deans, and the upper administration for implementation and further study, and some are being redirected to the newly reorganized Councils that will continue and enhance collaboration and participation by campus constituencies in administrative decision making.

While the transformation teams were making their recommendations to the new Chancellor and the campus, the Chancellor was also meeting with leaders of the Councils and major faculty committees (Committee on Federated Centers and Institutes, Committee on Industrial Theory and Assessment) to determine how to integrate the recommendations of the transformation teams with some of the existing structures.

This broad-based review was an essential component of the transition from a long-standing administration to a new one faced with serious financial, operational, and academic challenges. At the same time, the fresh look at existing structures opened up opportunities for positive change and new arrangements with the promise of better results for students, faculty, staff, and the public. In considering new models of governance, the administration has been mindful of the need to be inclusive and transparent in University affairs. With the continued stress on resources, the administration is intent on conducting University business in ways that will be most efficient, effective, and responsible and with fostering participation of the various constituencies.

After reviewing all data from the various planning groups and study teams, the administration proposed a new University Council structure, consisting of re-formulated Councils on Teaching & Learning and a separate Council on Research & Scholarship, plus a new Council on Outreach & Engagement. These councils will replace the Councils on Teaching, Learning and Research as Scholarship, the Council on Diversity and Pluralism and the Council on Sustainable Regional

Development. The work of the newly reformulated Councils will support the mission of the campus and represent deliberate interdisciplinary collaborations designed to complement, energize, and further engage the efforts of the traditional academic units in (1) a continual review of the campus vision and mission and (2) the effective execution of the strategic objectives through excellence and innovation.

The University Councils will empower faculty and staff in building a vision of the future together by:

- Targeting strategic innovations that will advance the campus mission across the pillars of scholarship;
- Cultivating external funding to support innovative initiatives;
- Assessing the effectiveness of the innovations and targeting initiative to mainstream;
- Imbedding a commitment to a diverse campus culture as reflected in personnel, curriculum, research, programs, and partnerships; and
- Fostering interdisciplinary collaboration to advance the University's mission.

Each council will have a distinct charge and conduct its work through task forces organized each year around strategic initiatives identified by council members. Certain initiatives will cross council and task force lines and will require close consultation between or among councils and task forces. Diversity priorities will be imbedded in the work of each council.

The administration has engaged the Deans' Council and Chancellor's Cabinet, and will seek input from the current council leadership, Faculty Senate, and the campus community in a dialogue about the governance structure, scope and funding for the councils.

To begin the discussion, the administration proposed that each council will feature tripartite leadership, with one dean and two co-chairs representing the range of disciplines and professions on campus. The administration sought volunteers to serve on the councils. Faculty and staff members of the councils have just been appointed to one- and two-year terms initially, with two-year terms to become standard after the first rotation. Council work will be conducted by the members in collaboration with others from the campus community who have a strong professional or personal interest in the tasks at hand. The Councils will be asked to create proposals for action plans that can be implemented in FY09. The proposal will be made to the Chancellor's cabinet and the Chancellor will approve final plans and award funding.

The new administration's effort to solicit input from and involve the campus community in restructuring is clear. Deans, faculty, staff, and students have all been regularly invited to assist in the process. The Chancellor has held many meetings with faculty and students to hear their concerns. In addition, members of the administration have met regularly with council chairs, directors of centers, deans and department chairs, to solicit ideas for restructuring and to encourage involvement at all levels.

V. Ensuring the Appropriate Balance of Full-time and Part-time Faculty

At the time of the NEASC self-study and campus visit, the number of full-time faculty at UMass Lowell had fallen to 359. This decrease was the result of a series of early retirement incentives offered to public employees at a time when state support for public higher education was declining, reducing the opportunity to fill replacement lines. Since the low of 359 in FY2003-2004, the

University has worked to address this issue and has increased the full-time faculty by 18% to 425 in FY2008. At the same time, the number of part-time faculty employed in the day school is now 252, compared to 211 in FY 2003-2004.

The full time faculty, who will also be increased with the new hires for FY2009, are committed to the institution and are “sufficient to assure the accomplishment of class and out-of class responsibilities essential for the fulfillment of institutional mission and purposes.” The University supplements the full-time faculty with part-time faculty who normally teach one or two courses each per semester. Part-time faculty provide instructional replacements for tenured and untenured faculty sabbaticals and for reduced teaching loads for faculty with buyouts from grants. They also allow the campus to continue offering small class sections so that students have the opportunity to interact with faculty. They also teach specialized courses that enhance the curriculum. For example, in the School of Health and Environment, the part-time faculty teach some clinical courses; in Fine Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, the part time faculty teach some studio classes (Art), provide individual lessons (Music), and participate in the first-year writing sequence (English). The part-time faculty offices are often housed in the respective departments and this location provides a venue for interaction among full and part time faculty. In addition, faculty development opportunities are offered to all faculty at the institution. Many of these development opportunities are offered by the Faculty Development Center and include: Fridays with Faculty, Faculty Institutes, and Conversation Dinners. Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education, provides training in learning management systems, including support on web-enhanced teaching.

The campus plans to continue strategic faculty hires to support program development. The Deans of the Colleges will work in cooperation with the Provost to identify the areas in which faculty hires are needed.

VI. Diversifying the Faculty and Staff, in keeping with the Institution’s Goals Overview of Workforce Representation*

*(Based on data from affirmative action plans and updates, 2003-2007)

To expand the diversity of the campus workforce and to implement best practices in recruiting among underrepresented groups (African Americans, Latino/a Americans, and Native Americans) and in diversity management, two critical questions were asked:

- Did an appropriate infrastructure exist to facilitate minority recruitment?
- Was the image that the University conveyed to minority communities about its interest in recruiting minority faculty and staff appropriate and effective?

To address the issue of infrastructure, the Affirmative Action office was reorganized and renamed Equal Opportunity and Outreach. As part of the restructuring, certain functions were shifted to Human Resources, so that EOO staff could focus its efforts on implementation of best practices by consulting more closely with colleges and departments in relation to affirmative action procedures, to prepare and deliver diversity training to administrators, faculty, and staff, and to provide a range of intake services such as complaints of discrimination and requests for reasonable accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act. In the process of reorganization, diversity management was also repositioned as a responsibility that colleges and departments shared with administration. This represented a shift from the operational model of an affirmative action office as the university entity solely responsible for minority recruitment.

The question of image related directly to the type of outreach necessary for effective recruiting and hiring. In the past, there had been little use of minority recruitment ads in minority publications. Those that did appear were indistinguishable from general job ads compared to advertisements placed by other institutions designed to attract minority candidates. It was clear that a more focused approach was needed to attract minority applicants.

To respond to the two questions posed above, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Outreach, with input from the campus community, developed new goals for two key areas: recruitment/hiring and campus climate, with specific action steps outlined for each.

Recruitment and Hiring

Workforce data are broken down respectively for faculty and staff by gender and race/ethnicity, which identifies the percentage of minorities in the university workforce who have voluntarily identified this information. This percentage is compared to the availability of groups in the relevant recruitment area. For faculty the recruitment area is nationwide, whereas for most staff positions the recruitment area is local or regional. The comparison result indicates the degree of “shortfall in persons” for the various University work groups. Where the percentage of a given race/ethnicity within the University’s workforce is equal to or higher than the corresponding percentage in the recruitment area, parity is achieved. This is the case for Asian Americans (particularly in the faculty). However, where the University percentage of any group is lower than what exists in the recruitment area, under-representation exists. At UML, under-representation currently applies to African Americans, Latino/a Americans and Native Americans. UML’s goal is to reach parity or better.

Full-time Faculty and Staff

Minority representation for Asians (including Pacific Islanders), Blacks, Native Americans and Latinos/as in the faculty and staff in March 2007 increased to 14.3%, up from 12% in March 2003. The largest growth appeared in the number of Asian faculty who increased from 11.8% in 2003 to 15.6% in 2007.

Hispanic participation in the workforce has returned to 2.8%, an increase ranging from 3% - 3.2% in 2004-2006. The participation of Blacks is currently at 1.9%, a slight increase from 1.7% in 2003. For both ethnic groups, the highest participation in workgroups is in the professional/non-faculty occupations. Faculty participation has also increased.

Given that parity has been achieved for Asians as whole in the University workforce, hiring goals since 2005-2006 have focused on increasing the representation of Latinos/as, Blacks, and Native Americans particularly in the executive/administration positions and in the faculty.

The overall number of adjunct instructors (including Continuing Studies) decreased from 528 in 2003 to 513 in 2007. Hispanics increased in 2005 with no attrition to date. Asian/Pacific were and remain the most highly represented ethnic groups even though this group has decreased in actual numbers from 32 in 2003 to 19 in 2007. The lowest representation is for Blacks and Native Americans. In order to address this, the University will be advertising for adjuncts in a regional African American publication in early summer following the guidelines on recruiting and hiring that are being developed.

Actions to Date

For some time, the percentage of minorities applying for positions has not been optimal. In order to address the situation, the following actions have been taken:

- Diversity Team formed (faculty and staff) to assist with minority recruitment.
- EOO identified 108 minority serving institutions and key campus administrators at these institutions.
- On-going research to identify publication venues for recruitment advertisements and new recruitment ad campaigns, with ads developed depicting minority faculty and staff from the campus. These ads appeared in such venues as *Chicago Sun Times* (hard copy, video, on-line), *The Hispanic Outlook in Higher Education*, *Indian Country Today*, *El Mundo* and *The New York Times*, *Diversity Boston*.
- Interim Provost announced requirement for all search committees to demonstrate evidence of minority recruitment in their searches.
- Chancellor wrote to key administrators and department chairs at several minority institutions to recruit diverse candidates for the Provost position announced in October 2007
- EOO contacted various organizations who received copies of UML job announcements to invite them to partner with UML in our diversity recruitment efforts and hosted a campus forum for these groups.
- Mandatory training implemented for chairs of faculty search committees.

Changing Climate

The focus on climate has centered on civility, respect, and cultural competence. These issues have been highlighted in diversity education sessions, including the “Be Part of the Solution Series,” in EOO newsletters, in the policy statement on non-discrimination, through the inclusion of diversity in the University mission statement.

In addition to the work accomplished by Equal Opportunity and Outreach, the Council on Diversity and Pluralism has also influenced the campus climate through a variety of projects, including The Diversity Spaces Initiative and various Conversation Dinners open to faculty, staff and students at which attendees engaged in dialogue on diversity related topics.

Individual colleges have also developed programs to address campus climate and diversity. For example, the School of Health and Environment (SHE) has formed a Cultural Diversity Working Group. Their work reveals that the undergraduate population in SHE is more diverse than the faculty, staff, and graduate assistant populations. The working group has identified several barriers that may contribute to the lower diversity among the faculty, staff, and graduate students and has prepared strategies to overcome these barriers. These strategies include offering mentoring programs for students and for new faculty; and creating on-going peer education discussions regarding race, culture and gender issues.

Analysis and Next Steps:

UML remains committed to improving its track record in the recruitment and hiring of administrators, faculty, and staff from underrepresented groups. While changes have been made to the administrative infrastructure to support this goal, work remains to be done. The campus needs to continue building its recruitment credibility in minority communities, to make hiring allocations

in a more timely fashion in line with hiring calendars in the disciplines, and to continue to shape a campus climate conducive to retaining a diverse population.

VII. Implementing the Institution's Facilities Master Plan

Shortly before his retirement, William T. Hogan announced a \$266 million dollar campus renovation plan, designed to bring the University's facilities to the next decade. The plan included an \$80 million dollar center for biotechnology and nanotechnology. Input on the plan was solicited from the campus community and by the time that Chancellor Hogan announced his retirement, plans for the new building were underway. While many were excited by the new ventures, some on campus felt that other aspects of the renovation plan should be re-examined. When Martin Meehan assumed the Chancellorship of UMass Lowell, he recognized that "We need the very best facilities to meet the 21st century needs of teaching, research and service and that we must have them if we are going to put Massachusetts in a position to compete and succeed both nationally and globally." He immediately began to scrutinize the new biotechnology and nanotechnology building and to address the issue of the campus physical plant.

He recognized the importance of the new Emerging Technologies and Innovation Center (ETIC) that had been proposed by Dr. Hogan, and after careful evaluation of six proposed sites, the recommendation from the site selection committee, and feedback from the UMass Lowell campus, the surrounding neighborhood and the city, he proceeded to select a highly visible location for the building. The Chancellor believed that if the University is investing \$80 million in state, federal and University funds, that the building be a cornerstone and a scenic gateway to the campus. The 97,000-square-foot Emerging Technologies and Innovation Center will house nano and bio-manufacturing research along with other leading-edge work in a green facility. The center is expected to spawn entire new industries, particularly in nanomanufacturing, as well as move companies in the life sciences fields from research and development toward full-scale production. The advanced research center's location in a high-tech region will foster collaboration in the business world as well as improve the academic experience of students. Representative Kevin Murphy, House Chair of the Joint Committee on Higher Education recognized that, "The students who attend UMass Lowell deserve new facilities, like the Emerging Technologies Center, to expose them to cutting-edge research."

Governor Deval Patrick's capital plan for higher education proposes \$9 Million for renovations to the Institute for Plastics Innovation (IPI) Building on East Campus. That facility, also a planned innovation center, will house M2D2, the Massachusetts Medical Device Development Center, a collaborative effort with the UMass Medical School in Worcester that is helping companies turn ideas into products. The Chancellor has already accepted \$4 million dollars in funding from the Governor and Commonwealth for renovations to M2D2 and he expects support from the state representatives and the Governor to fund some of these other initiatives.

In recent years, the campus has attracted a large number of new and productive research faculty who have successfully been awarded major, competitive grants, particularly large grants in the College of Engineering, and the School of Health and Environment, and the Division of Sciences. These successes have, in turn, created challenges to fashion modern spaces to house faculty offices, research and teaching areas, including some very sophisticated laboratories, in buildings that are at least 30 years old. In addition, substantial growth in many disciplines, including Engineering, Health, and the Arts and Sciences; the decision to increase the number of undergraduates living on campus by approximately 50%; the dramatic growth in community outreach and partnerships; aging buildings and infrastructure; and a deferred and annual maintenance backlog convinced

Chancellor Meehan and the campus community that the University needed a more rational, full-scale master plan to bring the university and its buildings to the 21st century and to help fulfill his vision of “Excellence through Innovation.”

As a result, the campus decided to contact the Commonwealth’s Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) to help the University develop, fund and coordinate a new comprehensive Master Plan. In recent years, DCAM has performed similar coordination for the UMass Boston and Dartmouth campuses.

While the University is in preliminary organizational and program definition stages, it is likely that the planning will initially begin with two parallel studies: one a Master Plan for the North and South campuses and the second, a Master Plan for the East campus, the primary residential and recreational location.

The University’s own and external surveys have demonstrated a clear preference among most undergraduates to live on the East campus. East campus already hosts a large population of students, is the location of the very popular recreation center, the LeLacheur Baseball Park, and the Tsongas Arena, and offers convenient proximity to downtown Lowell. Plans are underway to construct 170 additional beds in Fox Hall. In addition, the University would like to add new residence halls to this area as well as enhance the quality of living and the environment.

Simultaneously, the University will be moving forward with the broader and more challenging Master Planning for the North and South campuses. These areas contain the university’s primary academic and administrative buildings and also include some smaller residential buildings and recreational facilities. DCAM and the University are already seeking expert professional services for a two phased effort that will include the preparation of a South Campus Implementation Plan and a Certifiable Building study for a new academic building on South Campus.

Within the campus community, there has been an expressed interest in a more open and participatory planning process and Chancellor Meehan is committed to such a course of action. The open decision-making process is already apparent in capital allocations and in identifying and setting priorities for both deferred maintenance and annual/planned maintenance projects and expenditures.

For example, as a step toward early assessment of operational needs and customer perceptions of the Facilities Department, Chancellor Meehan charged a five member Facilities Review Committee, to evaluate all aspects of the facilities department. The committee submitted a report in late December. The findings and recommendations in the report identified a number of very positive aspects of the department and its employees. It also suggests a number of operational and organizational modifications and increased staffing in several areas. Some recommendations have already been implemented: merging of housekeeping staff; moving to “green” chemicals, where available, in all campus housekeeping; reorganizing the Facilities Department reporting structures; implementing automated time clock and automated work order systems.

A national search for a Vice Chancellor for Administration, Finance and Technology, who will oversee Facilities, Information Technology and Administration and Finance is underway and a search for a new Executive Director of Facilities will begin soon. In addition, a Green Team is being formed to develop a comprehensive Reduce, Re-use and Recycle program that supports the University mission toward sustainability through waste minimization and maximizing the usefulness of all materials expended within the University community.

III. Review of the Standards

Standard One: Mission and Purposes

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard One focuses on the institution's mission and purposes as the factors that guide and define its activities, assessment, and measures of effectiveness. Two elements in the new standard are particularly relevant to UMass Lowell: from 1.3 "the institution endeavors to enhance the community it serves" and from 1.5 "the institution periodically re-evaluates and the content and pertinence of its mission and purposes."

Current Status

The mission statement was revised in 2007 as a result of a campus-wide review of policies and operations led by the new chancellor. Senior administrators, deans, campus leaders and faculty participated in the discussion about new mission language. The revised mission reflects UML's desire to more explicitly express its commitment to student enrichment, growth, and success; its special responsibility to the people of Massachusetts; its focus on the school's tradition of applying knowledge through new technologies, processes, and services; and its understanding that sustainability must inform economic and social development to ensure a desirable quality of life for everyone. All of this is to be accomplished in the context of UML's responsibility to offer excellent and affordable educational programs.

The mission statement, revised in 2007, now reads as follows: *The mission of the University of Massachusetts Lowell is to enhance the intellectual, personal, and cultural development of its students through excellent, affordable educational programs. The University seeks to meet the needs of the Commonwealth today and into the future and supports the development of sustainable technologies and communities through its teaching, research, scholarship, and engagement.*

The mission of the Lowell campus is expressed on the Campus Profile web page (<http://www.uml.edu/about/profile/default.html>), as well as in related forms in publications ranging from catalogs to the annual Commencement program.

Evaluation: The new mission statement has already begun to influence planning and decision-making. Since the revisions were made during this academic year, the full impact of this new statement will be more readily evident by the time of the 2013 accreditation report.

Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard Two establishes the connections between the institution's mission and the planning and evaluation necessary to ensure the appropriate allocation of resources to achieve the mission. Evaluation tools that reflect both quantitative and qualitative measures are to be employed on a regular basis to guide planning and to assess the effectiveness of that planning.

Current Status

In March of 2007, the Board of Trustees announced the selection of Martin T. Meehan as the Chancellor of the UMass Lowell campus, to begin July 1, 2007. From the outset, Chancellor Meehan has committed himself to working closely with the faculty, staff, and administration to

build a new vision and strategic plan for the University. To that end, Chancellor Meehan and his Senior Executive Team have been working closely with the deans, campus leaders, faculty and students, to foster an open dialogue about the future of the University.

To initiate the transition process, Chancellor Meehan, requested that the President's Office conduct a review of UMass Lowell's financial situation and an audit of its organizational structure prior to his official start. The Chancellor was aware that the campus was projecting a \$3,000,000 deficit for FY2007 and a \$1,641,000 deficit for FY2008. The previous administration had made investments in strategic faculty hires in the hope that the new faculty would increase the campus returns on research expenditure. This strategy did not realize the kind of financial return projected which led to budget deficits for 4 out of the 5 years prior to Chancellor Meehan's appointment. Chancellor Meehan appointed an Interim transition team to oversee the audits and to begin planning for the FY2008. A hiring and expenditure freeze was put in place by the incoming-chancellor in April of 2007 and the budgets were reviewed. As a result, the budget deficit for FY2007 was reduced to \$1,500,000 and it is expected that the FY2008 budget deficit will be reduced to \$1,300,000. Based on the dramatic progress thus far, the campus aims to reduce its deficit to \$653,000 for FY2009 and achieve a balanced budget by 2010. In addition, an Audit Review Committee of faculty and administrators was established to review the auditors' reports and to make recommendations to the Chancellor regarding restructuring the organization and the budget. In addition to the Audit Review Committee described above, special committees on facilities and housing were formed to elicit faculty and staff views in these critical areas.

In 1998, UMass Lowell initiated a 1998-2005 Development Plan. One part of the Plan emphasized efforts to develop new financial streams for the University. Three directions were identified: fundraising through the Advancement Office; intellectual property development through what was then the Research Foundation; and increases in revenue from courses and programs offered by the Division of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education. The most significant return on investment came from Continuing Studies which underwent a major redesign in the period, and realized extraordinary financial gains for the campus in non-state and non-student fee revenue. The Chancellor and his staff recognized that there was a need for strategic planning that assesses the viability of the other two projected revenue streams and efforts.

To ensure continuity in planning, the Chancellor created a process for completing the Transformation Plan, a strategic planning process initiated in 2004 by the previous administration. The Provost oversaw this in-depth process which involved a series of meetings with the ten planning teams of the three-year Transformation Project. Each of the teams presented their recommendations to a newly configured Cabinet made up of the Chancellor, the senior management team, the Deans and key Directors on campus. The Cabinet, working with the Teams, identified a number of key strategic initiatives that could be moved forward. However, the administration had to identify existing pools of funding that could be shifted to cover the costs of the new initiatives. Therefore, the Cabinet also met with leaders of the current councils and major faculty committees (Committee on Federated Centers and Institutes, Committee on Industrial Theory and Assessment) to determine how the University could integrate these various initiatives with the recommendations of the transformation teams. This entire process resulted in the emergence of a new Council structure, described in Special Emphasis II.4 above.

This broad-based review was an essential component of the transition from a long-standing administration to a new one faced with serious financial, operational, and academic challenges. At the same time, the fresh look at existing structures opened up opportunities for positive change and new arrangements with the promise of better results for students, faculty, staff, and the public. In considering new models of governance, the administration has been mindful of the need to be

inclusive and transparent in University affairs. With the continued stress on resources, the administration is intent on conducting University business in ways that will be most efficient, effective, and responsible.

Many of UMass Lowell's planning benchmarks are set by the UMass system. The University continues to guide the planning process by comparing UMass Lowell with two groups of similar institutions: "Peer Institutions" and "Aspirant Peer Institutions." For the past decade, many University-system policies have been formulated and promulgated in the form of UMass Board of Trustees actions. These are concise statements of directions and required actions to be undertaken by each campus in the five-campus UMass system. Among the most significant evaluative programs to have been designed and implemented are the Performance Measurement System (PMS), the Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) review, and the Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR) of tenured faculty. As reported in 2003, these evaluation tools continue to be used at UMass Lowell to guide planning and assessment of institutional effectiveness. In addition, the campus administers surveys, such as NSSE (National Survey of Student Engagement), the results from which were used to guide the work of Task Forces and Transformation Teams on Advising, the First Year Experience, and Retention.

Evaluation: A university-wide, multi-year financial plan will assure long-term financial sustainability for academic and non-academic programs. An updated master plan will let UML gain the most value from campus buildings and grounds. To deliver student and financial services more efficiently, UML will attempt to adopt best practices and use state-of-the-art technology. The University recognizes that it is critical that UML stands for excellent service and supports continuous learning and professional development for faculty and staff. UML realizes that it must maximize long-term investment strategies and increase external funding through grants and contracts, individual gifts, and continuing studies and corporate education programs.

Once the new administrative structure is fully staffed, the institution will begin a comprehensive planning process that engages all levels of the institution in developing a strategic plan for the next decade. This process will ensure continuity with previous planning and evaluation that is systematic, broad-based, interrelated, and appropriate to the institution's mission and circumstances. Organizational structures that define the campus will be reviewed regularly and modified when necessary to accommodate new opportunities and challenges. The participation of faculty, staff, and students in the planning process will encourage a broad base of participation. Lines of communication used to disseminate information across the campus will remain active, so that assessment and ideas for improvement will travel up and down the organizational structure.

Standard Three: Organization and Governance

Review of the 2005 Standard: The roles and interrelationships of the various governing bodies are more clearly delineated; for UMass Lowell, the lines of authority between the system office and the campus are clearly drawn.

Current Status

UMass Lowell has an organizational structure that supports its mission in accordance with the strategic plan. Its system of governance ensures ongoing accountability for performance and mechanisms for policy review.

The Board of Trustees

The University is governed by a Board of Trustees, which is responsible to the citizens of Massachusetts for the institution's ability to articulate its mission and to develop policies that will advance it. Trustees are charged to ensure public accountability and to protect the institution from undue political influence or control.

The Board of Trustees promulgates policies usually after its committees have had extensive discussion and communication with the campuses. Trustee policy encourages shared governance by clearly acknowledging the right of faculty and students to initiate recommendations in areas where they have expertise or special interest.

Board of Higher Education

While the Board of Trustees has overall responsibility for the University, the Board of Higher Education—formerly the Higher Education Coordinating Council, established in 1991, with its name changed in 1996—oversees all public higher education in Massachusetts. The University's President's Office maintains the liaison between the Board of Higher Education and the University.

The President's Office and University System

In addition to leadership in working with the Board of Trustees, the Board of Higher Education and state government, the President's Office also provides a number of common services for all five campuses of the University system. These include the General Counsel's Office, University Treasurer's Office, the University Auditing Department, the University Comptroller and University Information Systems (administrative computing).

Campus Organization

The chief administrative officer for UMass Lowell is the Chancellor. Currently, the Executive Vice Chancellor, the Provost, the Interim Chief Information and Facilities Officer, the Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, the Executive Director for University Advancement and Chief Development Officer, and the Chief Public Affairs Officer report directly to the Chancellor. The Director of Athletics and the Director of Equal Opportunity and Outreach also report directly to the Chancellor. The Chancellor reports to the President of the University and routinely meets with the President and other campus Chancellors at the President's Council. An organizational chart, which includes all campus departments and their reporting lines, is included in the appendix. There are five schools and colleges at UMass Lowell: College of Arts & Sciences (Division of Fine Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and the Division of Sciences); College of Management; College of Engineering; the School of Health and Environment and the Graduate School of Education. Each is headed by a dean, and the deans meet regularly with the Provost, both individually and as a group in the Provost's Council.

Campus Governance

There are currently three governance groups on the Lowell campus that provide opportunities for faculty and students to express opinions and make recommendations concerning campus policies and activities. These are the Faculty Senate, the Graduate Student Association and the Student Government Association.

- The Faculty Senate and meets monthly during the academic year. Senators are faculty members and librarians who are elected with proportional representation by their respective departments. The work of the Senate is organized through four standing committees; Academic Resources, Graduate Policy and Affairs, Undergraduate Policy, Research and Development.
- The Student Government Association (SGA) is elected by the students and works for the students to improve all aspects of life at the University.
- The Graduate Student Association Serves as the representative body for graduate students to the University administration.

In addition to these formal governance bodies, faculty, staff, and graduate employees at the Lowell campus are represented by seven collective bargaining groups.

Evaluation: The governance system is working effectively, fostering collaborative relationships among its many levels and inviting input from campus and community constituencies.

Standard Four: The Academic Program

Review of the 2005 Standard: The new standard has been revised to underscore a focus on the institution's academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The modifications to this standard include shifting discussion of Admissions and Retention to Standard 6 and of both Scholarship and Research and Instruction (now titled Teaching and Advising) to Standard 5. The new Standard 4 has subsections focusing on Undergraduate Degree Programs, General Education, Graduate Degree Programs, Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit, and Assessment of Student Learning.

Current Status

To fulfill the University's mission of providing an affordable, high quality education and assisting regional economic and social development, the campus offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate degree programs as well as graduate certificates. Undergraduate degrees are offered through the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Management, and Engineering and the School of Health and Environment. These four colleges and the School of Education offer doctoral and masters degree programs. Via the active participation of the faculty and academic administration, the campus demonstrates an effective system of academic oversight, ensuring the coherence and high quality of these academic programs. Each academic department is responsible for the structure, content, and instructional methods of its academic programs and for assessing student learning. The University has a consistent history of campus-wide planning and evaluation initiatives. These initiatives have input from faculty and staff through committees and task forces that study pedagogical and programmatic issues and make recommendations. The campus provides sufficient resources to sustain and improve its academic programs.

The programs of study as developed by individual departments demonstrate continuity, sequential progression, depth, and synthesis of learning. There is a close alignment between degree requirements and program goals and purposes. Each undergraduate program requires students to complete the institution-wide General Education program as well as an in-depth study in their major area. The general education requirements ensure breadth and integration of knowledge in the arts and humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences through coursework directed at further developing critical thinking and clear communication skills. The learning outcomes of diversity, ethics, self-direction and collaboration, and information literacy are embedded in the curriculum as a whole and reinforced through the major program. The General Education

Coordinating Committee oversees the General Education program and reviews courses for their relevance to the goals of the general education mandate.

Incoming freshmen students are tested in English, Math, and Reading. This program measures essential skills and places students in appropriate first-year courses. All of the baccalaureate degree programs require two college writing courses taught by the English Department. The development of oral and written communication skills are an essential component of University and Program requirements. Graduate programs build on knowledge and skills obtained from prior degrees and include core material and specialized offerings. Use of information resources and technology are an integral part of undergraduate and graduate level education. Each college has a liaison librarian who serves as a resource for instruction and support. The library's media services center also provides assistance in this area. Emphasis has been placed on technologically upgrading classrooms and computer labs to provide faculty and students with necessary resources.

Department faculty on a regular and systematic basis review program and course descriptions to ensure that they are current and complete. They also review curriculum, instructional methods, procedures, resources, and student learning and achievement. All programs demonstrate that they are meeting or exceeding basic quality standards through a self-study and external review process. Programs are reviewed by national accreditation agencies if available or by the Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) process. The review process validates the program's worth to the campus in fulfilling the mission and is helpful in the identification of additional resources needed to strengthen programs. Ongoing, systematic reviews are very productive, resulting in the upgrading of programs, the elimination of some, and the introduction of new programs on a selective basis. Additions and deletions of programs are consistent with the University's mission, faculty expertise, student needs, and the availability of sufficient resources required for the development and improvement of academic programs with the assurance that quality standards are being met.

A committee structure exists through the Faculty Senate to review departmental requests for new courses and programs, policies and procedures, undergraduate and graduate affairs, and general education mandates. The development of any new program begins with the research of the faculty of the initiating department(s) taking into consideration needs, the possible pool of students, the program's relevance to the campus mission, existing resources and those needed, and the impact on the campus. The proposal is submitted to the following for approval at each level before continuing to the next: department, college committee and dean, and the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate Undergraduate Policy Committee and the Graduate Policy and Affairs Committee reviews undergraduate and graduate program proposals, respectively, prior to presentation to the entire Faculty Senate for consideration and vote. Approvals are sent to the Provost and the Chancellor of the University. If a program needs further approval it is sent to the Board of Trustees or the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education. When programs are eliminated or requirements are changed appropriate arrangements are made for students to complete their education.

Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education has a unique relationship with the academic departments on campus. All of the academic programs, degrees and certificates offered through Continuing Studies are under the jurisdiction of the colleges and departments, who are responsible for the academic integrity of the programs. The curricula for the programs are developed collaboratively by departments, CSCDE Faculty Coordinators, who serve as liaisons to the Colleges, and CSCDE professionals. The Faculty Coordinators also provide academic oversight of the undergraduate curriculum, supervise the faculty, and advise students. Proposals for new programs undergo market and student demand analysis and follow the guidelines established by the

Undergraduate Policy Committee and the Graduate Policy and Affairs Committee, the Faculty Senate, and other entities.

One major objective of the Continuing Education unit is to assist adult learners in completing their degrees. To help students meet that goal, CSCDE now offers courses in multiple formats including: face to face on campus, online, and blended (a combination of face to face and online). By offering these options to students, CSCDE has increased degree completion rates for students.

The Undergraduate Program and General Education

All undergraduate majors have a planned course of study published in the University catalogue, in advising check sheets, and in the degree progress report. The plan identifies the courses that are required and the sequencing of those courses that the department faculty determined to be most effective in meeting the objectives of the program. Each major incorporates the general education requirements into this course of study. Course numbering identifies the increasing depth of study in the discipline, and all undergraduate majors are required to present a significant number of credits earned in intermediate and advanced courses.

The General Education Program at UMass Lowell fosters active learning by asking students to think critically, communicate effectively and embrace cultural diversity. Courses approved for General Education credit are designed to provide students with a foundation that prepares them for continued work within their major and minor fields, as well as endowing them with the intellectual habits that will enable them to become lifelong learners.

There are seven learning outcomes addressed as part of the general education program; these are: 1. breadth of knowledge; 2. critical thinking; 3. clear communication; 4. diversity; 5. ethics; 6. self direction and collaboration; and 7. information literacy. The first three learning outcomes are initially fulfilled through the course distribution requirement; the remaining four learning outcomes are fulfilled through courses provided by the major department. Learning outcomes 2) and 3), which are central to the course distribution requirement, are also reinforced throughout the student's major program. A student's first exposure to a particular goal may be in general education courses, but students should find the principles behind these goals reinforced repeatedly throughout their undergraduate experience.

The distribution requirements that initiate the Breadth of Knowledge outcome consist of a year of college writing; a semester of mathematics; and three courses in each of three areas: Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science and Technology; in addition, students fulfill diversity and ethics requirements through courses within the General Education program or within the major.

Before a course can be offered as meeting the General Education Program requirements it is reviewed by the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC), a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Policy Committee. The GECC ensures that the General Education Program contains content for learning outcomes and a breadth of coverage for all students. The GECC review syllabi for proposed General Education courses to determine whether the learning outcomes are covered in these courses and to be sure courses contain explicit plans for the assessment of learning in these outcome areas.

Graduate Degree Programs

UMass Lowell offers diversified graduate programs in business administration/management/manufacturing, education, engineering, health professions, work environment, music, science, criminal justice, psychology, and regional and economic and social development. All UMass Lowell programs for which there is a national accrediting agency hold such accreditation and all are in "good standing." The process of accreditation review helps ensure the quality and rigor of graduate programs. Each graduate program publishes its description, requirements, and course information in the graduate catalogue. The Graduate Policies and Affairs Committee (GPAC) is body of multi-disciplinary faculty members and staff that review the graduate programs and proposed changes to existing programs and/or proposals for new programs.

Graduate courses begin at a level of performance that assumes mastery of the subject matter at the undergraduate level by students who are demonstrably qualified for advanced academic study. A course of study is designed for each graduate program (at times responding to the requirements of accrediting bodies) and require a minimum of 30 credit hours of graduate work (from core material and specialized offerings) including a thesis or project in the student's chosen field. While the general and minimum degree requirements are established at the campus level and are specified in the Graduate Catalogue, departments may impose additional requirements. All graduate students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average in courses taken at the graduate level. In addition to successful completion of coursework, a written or oral examination may be also required for the completion of the master's degree. Doctoral students must have academic courses and research proposals approved by an advisor must pass a qualifying examination, and must pass an oral dissertation defense of their original research. For the clinical Doctorate in Physical Therapy, students must complete required coursework, a research project and nine months of clinical education experience.

In professional programs, faculty are engaged in clinical practice or in professional leadership roles and contribute to professional publications that are used by programs throughout the country. In addition, these faculty have obtained certification by specialty organizations. The MSP Agreement has designated specific student-faculty ratios in professional disciplines to allow for the close supervision of students who are acquiring knowledge and skills needed at advanced practice level.

Intercampus programs are developed and implemented to use the expertise of faculty located throughout the UMass system. Such programs include the collaborative Ph.D. in Nursing offered with UMass Boston, the Intercampus Graduate School of Marine Science and Technology offered with the UMass campuses of Amherst, Boston, Dartmouth and Worcester, and the Ph.D. in Biomedical Engineering and Biotechnology program offered jointly with the UMass campuses of Worcester, Boston, and Dartmouth.

UMass Lowell offers several professional (practice-oriented) degrees at both the master's and doctoral levels. These include degrees in engineering, business, computer science, nursing, physical therapy, education, and music. They emphasize the sequential development of professional skills and are often offered in partnership with firms or agencies.

Integrity in the Awarding of Academic Credit

UMass Lowell has a policy, consistent with Board of Higher Education guidelines, that prohibits the awarding of graduation credit for pre-collegiate level or remedial work. Types of experiences for which credit may be awarded include: classroom courses, internships, co-op experiences, clinical practice, and practice teaching. The University recognizes two types of course equivalency

for which credit is awarded. These are (1) AP and CLEP examinations and (2) Departmental Examinations. Credits granted through course equivalency procedures are so noted on the student's permanent record. The purpose of course equivalency procedures is to provide credit for existing competencies. Departmental examinations, Transfer Credit, Advanced Placement Policies, including College Level Examination Program (CLEP tests) and Advanced Placement Exam information, are clearly detailed in the Undergraduate Catalogue.

A major project undertaken with the introduction of ISIS as the student records system has been the rebuilding of the transfer dictionary to provide accurate, consistent, and public information about equivalencies for transfer courses. Transfer courses have been evaluated by appropriate department chairs to determine UML equivalents; a provision is in place to assign courses "elective" status when an exact match does not exist, i.e. xx.199, 299, 399, and 499. A new designation "UC" for University Credit has just been approved by the Senate to be used for transfer courses that meet University transfer requirements, but that do not have a departmental or program "home" at UMass Lowell. This designation will allow courses to be posted for credit as electives in a student record. The Undergraduate Policy Committee and the Registrar will meet periodically to review courses recommended for UC designation.

Evaluation: The academic programs at UML undergo regular review in order to maintain current, relevant, and meaningful curricula. The introduction of new courses and programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels reflects the institution's commitment to fostering new knowledge, enhancing the intellectual growth of students, and supporting the development of sustainable technologies and communities. As noted in our discussion of areas of special concern, the campus will need to do more in terms of identifying specific learning outcomes and in collecting data to ensure that our programs enable students to achieve those outcomes.

Standard Five: The Faculty

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard Five addresses the various roles that faculty carry within the University, from teaching and advising to research and creative activity. It sets forth statements that pertain to adequate numbers of faculty to meet these obligations, adequate support for faculty endeavors in these areas, and the importance of regular and systematic evaluation of faculty effectiveness in these roles. It also establishes the importance of integrating part-time faculty into the departments in which they teach.

Current Status

At UMass Lowell, the MSP (Massachusetts Society of Professors) contract articulates policies governing the roles of the full time faculty, including visiting faculty. In defining the criteria for appointment, tenure, and promotion, these policies highlight the interrelationships among the three areas of activity and evaluation: research and scholarship, teaching and advising, and service and outreach. In addition, the contract provides details on workload, and on FTE ratios, which vary by College.

Methods and schedules of faculty evaluation are also defined in the contract. Untenured faculty members are evaluated annually. Faculty who apply for tenure and/or promotion undergo a multi-level review that includes the department, college, and university level committees as well as the dean. Tenured faculty members participate in the Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR). PMYR is distinct from annual faculty reviews and provides a broader time frame within which the interests, capabilities, and performance of tenured faculty and librarians may be examined and assessed.

These reviews provide opportunities for faculty to outline new avenues of professional development and for departments to encourage new initiatives to benefit academic programs. Part time faculty are evaluated according to the procedures described in areas of special emphasis: Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness.

As discussed in Special Concerns II.5, the full-time faculty has increased by 18%, from 359 to 425, over the last five years. In fall 2007, 66% of the 425 full time faculty held tenured positions, a little over 30% of the full time faculty members held tenure-track contracts, and 4% held one year visiting appointments. A large percent of the part-time faculty also enjoy continuing employment with the University.

The faculty recruitment process is informed by the campus mission, the University's commitment to diversity, and stated requirements within the union contract. The search processes are open and orderly and Department chairs and members of hiring committees receive training from Human Resources and Equal Opportunity and Outreach to ensure that searches comply with current laws and best practices.

Faculty workloads are broadly defined by college within the MSP contract. As no two academic units are the same, the actual mix of individual faculty time devoted to instruction, research and outreach varies based on the mission-related needs of the respective academic unit. Faculty workloads are periodically reviewed by the Chairs, Deans and Provost for appropriateness in terms of total workload and mix of teaching, research, and service.

A variety of support and faculty development opportunities exist on campus. These include a new faculty orientation and a recently developed faculty handbook. The MSP contract also provides for an annual professional development stipend to support faculty research, conference travel, and resource acquisition. The Faculty Development Center (formerly Faculty Teaching Center) continues to offer workshops, institutes, and discussion sessions on topics of interest, such as teaching with technology, using learning-centered syllabi, incorporating learning outcomes and assessment into courses and curricula. Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education also offers semi-annual convocation dinners, that are open to all faculty, on topics such as assessment, online learning, corporate outreach, and trends in education and the workplace. The Division also offers training on learning management systems and web-enhanced courses. All events and workshops offered by the FDC, Continuing Studies, and the Council on Teaching and Learning are open to full-time and part-time faculty. Within the colleges and departments, various seminars, colloquia, and lecture/performance series run on an annual basis. These, too, are open to all interested faculty.

A fundamental strength of the University of Massachusetts Lowell is its faculty. Their accomplishments in scholarship and research, their commitment to teaching excellence and innovation, and their extensive service and outreach to the greater Lowell region and beyond define the intellectual character of the campus.

Evaluation: The administration is currently reviewing faculty sufficiency and allocation across existing programs. The strategic faculty hires allocated for fall 2008 were based on an initial analysis of our upcoming needs and directions. New faculty lines are not automatic as replacements for faculty departures or retirements. Resources to support faculty have also undergone recent review and strategies have been adopted to allow a more informed allocation of these resources.

Standard Six: The Students

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard 6 reflects changes in content that treat the student experience as a coherent entity from admissions through graduation. The sections on admissions, retention, and graduation are now addressed under this standard, along with student services and campus life.

Current Status

Admissions

Applicants for UMass Lowell's undergraduate programs come from all ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Admissions requirements based on the Board of Higher Education standards vary for: 1) high school seniors and individuals who have graduated from high schools within the past three years, 2) nontraditional students, or 3) transfer students. The University has rigorous requirements for admission, continuation, termination and re-admission. In addition, each college and many departments further refine and tighten their requirements. The Undergraduate Admissions office adheres to the standards of good practices set forth by the National Association for College Admission Counseling. The policies and procedures for admission are contained in the three on-line catalogues: the Undergraduate Catalogue, Graduate School Catalogue, and the Division of Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education Catalogue.

For high school seniors, the University continues to adhere to a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 as the standard for admission established by the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education in 1996. In addition, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions also reviews students' combined (math and verbal) SAT* score, establishing a score of 960 as the absolute minimum. In more competitive majors, higher admission standards are required and these are reviewed and adjusted annually. Admissions counselors and policy makers are sensitive to the factors that may result in accomplished students having a lower-than-expected GPA or SAT score. The applications of students who do not meet the standards outlined above, but who appear to be a good match with the University, are reviewed individually by the Dean of the College.

The University requires standards of preparation and objective evidence of the student's potential for success and additionally provides access for a diverse student population that includes traditional and non-traditional students, students with physical and learning differences, and students with superior talent. All incoming freshmen students are required to complete assessment testing as mandated by the Board of Higher Education. The goal of the assessment testing is to properly place students in first year math and English courses so that all students may experience academic success. Because the University is prohibited from offering remedial courses, the University partners with the local community college to provide at no charge to the student a reading comprehension course for students with a reading deficiency.

To maintain the academic integrity and consistency of the graduate admissions process, a set of standard procedures has long been in place to ensure that only highly qualified applicants are admitted to the Graduate Programs at the University of Massachusetts Lowell. The University, as do all members of the Council of Graduate Schools, uses multiple admissions criteria to assess the applicant's potential for success in a graduate program. Faculty members in each graduate program evaluate applications and communicate results to the Graduate Admissions office.

Retention and Graduation

The University annually reviews its admissions policies and standards to ensure that students have the qualifications to be successful in the various programs.

Undergraduate students initially receive support through the Smart Start orientation programs. The majority of first year students attend a two day program that includes writing assessment, some general-focus workshops, and course advising and registration. One-day programs for students transferring into the University are offered during the same periods. An early registration program, characterized by one-on-one faculty advising, is offered during the months of April and May for transfer students (and repeated again November and December for spring semester admissions). All students are assigned a faculty advisor and are asked to schedule appointments with advisors at least once a semester before registering for courses. The degree audit available through ISIS helps ensure that the courses selected will meet graduation requirements. This also allows for advisors to counsel students about various options within their academic programs. All students also have access to career counseling and internship/practicum opportunities through the Office of Career Services. In this way, students also begin to develop job skills and perspectives. In addition, the formal welcome of freshmen into the UMass Lowell academic community is held in early September at Convocation, a two- to four day period of orientation programs.

The University's requirements for continuation in, termination from, and readmission to its academic programs are articulated in detail in the Undergraduate Catalogue. A 2.0 grade point average overall is necessary for graduation. Some majors require higher than a 2.0 grade point average in the major field for graduation. Standards for satisfactory academic standing are integrated into the student record system, named "ISIS", and applied systematically at the conclusion of each semester. Students who fall below the required 2.0 semester or cumulative grade point average are notified in writing and a warning or an academic service indicator is placed on their ISIS account, preventing them from registering until they meet with the appropriate faculty and/or staff member.

New programs are being introduced this fall to enhance student academic performance and to improve student retention. The College of Management will introduce a first-year seminar to increase the rate of retention for first-time full-time students. Under the leadership of the new Provost, learning communities for freshmen in undeclared liberal arts will be established and students will enroll in a coordinated block of classes including a freshman seminar, College Writing I, and psychology. The new learning communities will benefit both students who have declared a major and those who have yet to declare a major. The latter can explore various disciplines and also receive mentoring. These programs will be a welcome addition to the first year seminar established by the College of Engineering and the residential living/learning communities that have been established for students with common interests. The Centers for Learning, in collaboration with the departments, will offer increased tutoring support to students. The Honors House at Eames Hall, modeled on the Harvard University House System will integrate academic and enrichment activities into residential life for students enrolled in the honors program. It is expected that the new Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education will oversee the initiatives relating to student retention.

The Office of Institutional Research annually compiles retention and graduation rates, along with other measures of student success. The Office of Enrollment and Student Success works with the Office of Admissions, the college deans, chairs, and other program heads to assist in the development of programs that will best serve students.

Student Services

UMass Lowell provides a wide range of services and programs to meet student needs and to fulfill the University mission of contributing to the “*intellectual, personal, and cultural development of its students.*” Many of these services and programs fall within the Division of Student Affairs, while others are housed in the Centers for Learning and Academic Support Services (CLASS) and in the Athletics Department.

Student Affairs is composed of: the Dean of Students Office, the Counseling Center, Career Services, Disability Services, Residence Life, Student Activities and Multicultural Affairs, Student Development and Campus Conduct, Campus Ministry, Student Health Services, Student Mailrooms and Transportation. Through these departments and programs, and in collaboration with the University and the community at large, Student Affairs seeks to promote student development and to provide the resources to help students identify and accomplish personal and professional goals with the objective of graduating citizen-leaders who will be agents of positive social change. These interrelated components work to create a co-curricular component of the educational experience at UMass Lowell that encourages value-based learning outside the classroom, promotes personal health and wellness, and encourages interpersonal relationships with peers, faculty, and staff, and interaction with the community at large. More than 80 campus-wide and residence hall programs are offered each year. Workshops and presentations are prominent in orientation programs and available to both resident and commuting students. The Office of Student Activities and Multicultural Affairs is home to more than 100 student-run organizations representing diverse groups and a wide range of interests.

To assist undergraduate students in achieving academic success, the University maintains the Centers for Learning and Academic Support Services (CLASS). CLASS coordinates the following programs: the Advising Center, Computing Services, Tutoring Services, the Study-Aboard Program, the Degree Audit, and Strategies for Success. The Advising Center provides students with the information and advice they need to make informed decisions about their academic careers. Staff members provide ISIS support to students and faculty. Within Computing Services, CLASS maintains labs for drop-in use and teaching labs with projection systems for instructional purposes. Strategies for Success, a one-day program presented each August by the Centers for Learning, is designed to provide first-year and transfer students with skills that will assist them in making a successful transition to UMass Lowell. This collaborative program combines the expertise of faculty, professional staff, and current students to give incoming students practical advice and insight that will improve the quality of their academic experience.

Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education maintains a Faculty and Student Support Center for faculty teaching and students enrolled in the Division. Students and working professionals can access Orientation Programs, Information Sessions, advice on classes or degree programs, and can meet with their Faculty Program Coordinators and advisors or arrange for online or phone-in interviews. Members of the corporate staff, along with Faculty representatives, interface with the corporate and health community and others, to make student services available off campus. The Division has also provided online students access to events via web-streaming.

The Office of Financial Aid assists students in meeting financial need. During the 2007-2008 school year, the University awarded over \$55 million in grants, scholarships, waivers, loans and on-campus employment to qualified students. UMass Lowell is striving to meet 100 percent of the determined financial need of all qualified applicants. Through its web page, the Office of Financial Aid provides links to scholarship databases as well as to government agencies.

The University provides many athletic and recreational opportunities that are designed to promote general health, welfare, leadership qualities, and development of the participants. UMass Lowell has six men's and six women's varsity teams, all of which (with the exception of men's ice hockey, a Division I team that competes in Hockey East) play in the Northeast 10 Conference, NCAA Division II. The Department of Athletics prides itself on the academic achievements of student athletes. Student athletes are held to the same admissions and academic standards as other Lowell students. A faculty athletics representative oversees the department's compliance with academic requirements and encourages athletes to achieve their educational goals. The six-year graduation rate of student athletes is 66 percent. In addition to the varsity program, Recreational Sports offers a range of activities for all students, faculty, and staff. These include more than 20 intramural sports, nine sport clubs, group fitness and wellness programs, instructional programs, personal training, and workout facilities and equipment available throughout the day and evenings.

Evaluation: UML is committed to supporting a diverse and dynamic student body. It will continue to use evaluation tools, such as the NSSE survey and other measures, to ensure that programs and services continue to meet the needs of students and foster their intellectual, personal and cultural development. As noted earlier, the newly-reorganized Council on Teaching and Learning includes task forces specifically focused on enhancing the student experience and on improving student retention, areas that have been identified as high priority by the Administration.

Standard Seven: Library and Other Resources

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard Seven now places greater emphasis on instructional and information technology; it focuses not only on library resources, but on information literacy and the programs in place to ensure that students achieve competency in research and information evaluation appropriate to their degree levels.

Current Status

Since the last accreditation review in 2003, there have been significant changes in University Libraries, including the implementation of the 2004-2007 strategic plan for the Library, which emphasized information literacy, outreach, technology, and resource development.

In 2007, the Library developed a long-range plan covering 2008 through 2012, with six major goals, each with specific objectives, and an annual action plan for 2008. A major feature of the long-range plan is the creation of an Information Learning Commons to promote collaborative learning, acquisition of advanced technical skills, and literacy for information consumption and learning. The Information Learning Commons will facilitate collaboration and individual learning by uniting information resources, technology, materials, equipment, and services needed for users to locate, use, manage and create information in a myriad of forms. Other goals and objectives involve: information literacy, collection development and digitization projects.

Providing students with the means to achieve Information Literacy remains a primary goal. In 2006, the Library participated in a pilot run of the Educational Testing Services ICT Literacy Assessment Survey. The number of information literacy instruction sessions has risen in recent years. These sessions include classes for first and second semester freshmen, as well as more specialized discipline-specific instructional sessions. The Library website was redesigned and expanded in 2007 to make locating and accessing information more intuitive and advance self-directed learning. Librarians developed many web-based resource guides ([Libguides](#)) and other

tutorials to increase Information Literacy and inform users about resources in their fields. A faculty member has served each year since 2006 as a Faculty Library Fellow responsible for educating faculty regarding Information Literacy and promoting its incorporation across the curriculum. In collaboration with faculty and the university community, the media center has developed a unique Home Movies Archive on DVD. Faculty in various disciplines use the collection with their students as class project and starting points for further research.

Wireless access became available in the Library in 2006. The expansion of the Virtual Catalog has greatly increased the number of items that can be borrowed using patron initiated interlibrary loan. The Library has made a special effort to reach out to transfer students from all academic departments in the previous few years. Outreach and service to distant learners remains a major focus, with plans to develop an online course in Information Literacy for distant learners, parts of which could be incorporated into other courses. Most Library resources and services are now available off-campus 24/7, and the installation of a new proxy server has made access to them quicker and easier. Through participation in the Boston Library Consortium and the Northeast Regional Library System, students and faculty can directly request books from a total collection of over 20,000,000 items from the two Virtual Catalogs. The Library will implement RAPID ILL expedited resource sharing this year, further increasing efficiency.

The Digitization Committee is working to establish UML Libraries as a “Trusted Repository” to create guidelines and procedures for digitizing special collections and creating a repository of faculty publications. The Database Manager will work with the Digitization Committee and the Project Archivist to create a portal for the Fifth Congressional Archives. The portal will showcase the digital collections of Martin T. Meehan, Chancellor and former member of Congress, as well as other members of Congress from the 5th district. As a Boston Library Consortium member, the Library is participating in the Open Content Alliance to build a freely accessible library of digital materials from all nineteen Consortium institutions. As part of this project, the Library will submit microfilm of newspapers from the early 1800s, which are no longer under copyright protection.

The number of Librarians and paraprofessional staff has increased to 22.5 FTE. The library has been able to add the following professional positions: a Database Manager, who is a professionally qualified Librarian; a Project Archivist, who is a half time professionally qualified Librarian. The Library expects to hire a new Head of Systems and a new Administrative Assistant during spring 2008.

Collections and Funding

Due to the need for 24/7 and off-site access to resources, collection development efforts have emphasized electronic rather than print resources. The book collection has undergone continuous review to insure the currency of the collection. The number of bound journal volumes and books number 390,614. The number and scope of electronic resources has vastly increased in the past few years; the Library has access to over 48,891 electronic journal titles including close to 15,000 current titles, and over 13,000 electronic books.

	2004	2005	2006	2007
Databases	\$873,327.01	\$863,269.07	\$987,978.03	\$1,093,376.80
Serials	\$121,049.70	\$478,512.68	\$556,441.71	\$609,172.53
Databases + Serials Subtotal	\$1,467,254.00	\$1,341,781.75	\$1,544,419.74	\$1,702,549.33
AV	\$9,467.00	\$8,100.00	\$8,188.00	\$ 8,000.00
Books	\$181,622.29	\$71,598.57	\$71,061.95	\$59,485.44
TOTAL	\$1,658,343.29	\$1,421,480.32	\$1,623,669.69	\$1,770,034.77

Projected spending for the 2008 fiscal year is estimated at \$1,485,000.

Using criteria developed by the Research Libraries Group, Librarians analyzed the book collection in 2007 and prepared a detailed conspectus for each subject area in which the Library collects, indicating a target level for each area based on the curriculum and research activity. This study assists the library make decisions as it acquires new resources to support teaching and learning.

Evaluation: The Libraries continuously monitor the concerns and suggestions of the University community through various quantitative and qualitative methodologies. In April 2005, the UML Office of Institutional Research conducted an online survey of students and faculty members, eliciting over 900 responses, including specific comments about information literacy, print collections, the electronic library, staff, service, hours, study space, and technology. The results of the survey are being used to improve services to faculty and students.

Standard Eight: Physical and Technological Resources

Review of the 2005 Standard: The changes in Standard 8 reflect the increased use of technology in teaching, as it addresses the availability of technological resources in classrooms as well as in dedicated labs and media centers. It also encourages ongoing evaluation of physical and technological resources as a “basis for realistic planning and budget allocation.” UML’s active participation in teaching with technology programs, its leadership in on-line delivery of courses, and its continuing implementation of data management systems makes technological resource management a priority for the campus.

Current Status:

The Lowell campus has been at the forefront of the Information Technology revolution since the mid 1980s, when it recognized the importance of the emerging technology and the significant role IT would play in all aspects of University life.

The campus IT infrastructure has been significantly enhanced since the 2003 NEASC report. Areas that have been addressed include communications, record systems, computer and network security, physical security, emergency notification, green computing, upgrades to computer labs, increased

use of site licenses, and greater flexibility in faculty computer choices. Of particular note are the 85 technology enhanced classrooms (10 added in 2007-08). The University is committed to adding at least 10 additional enhanced classrooms per year; these upgrades include: permanently mounted LCD projectors, network access, speakers, and document cameras.

At the beginning of the decade, the UMass campuses at Boston, Dartmouth and Lowell agreed to a partnership implementation of a shared ERP system provided by PeopleSoft. This new system was envisioned to provide an integrated system for Human Resources, Finance, and Student Records. For several years as the new system was being defined, refined and populated with data, the campus maintained an existing production system while it was engaged in the migration challenges to the PeopleSoft environment. Aspects of the migration moved to the central office or University Information Technology Services (UITs) that was charged with providing University-wide leadership for the planning, design, and provision of high quality, customer-oriented information technology services to the campuses and the President's Office. A number of campus staff were delegated to UITs for substantial percentages of time and were engaged in the cross-campus discussions for the establishment of a shared project. The three year period for the initial major module implementations created some stress on aspects of the campus operational infrastructure. The primary concerns across all academic and financial systems have been the quality of the reporting features, but these are presently being addressed both on the campus and by UITs. By the 2006-2007 academic year, faculty and staff had become better acclimated to the new environment and improvements are now being made to the system.

As the economy, and consequently campus budgets, began to improve in the mid-2000's, and as the migration focus turned to production, the campus turned more of its attention to the IT infrastructure which was included in capital planning and budgeting for the first time in many years. Capital enhancements and re-engineering of an aging network infrastructure commenced; the campus PBX was upgraded; modernization of the e-mail system and associated authentication and security issues were implemented (VPN, Network File Shares, Exchange Server & Active Directory, Library Services); security / virus protection for all campus clients were identified as priorities (site licensing and S/W distribution were instituted, advanced Antivirus and Antispam protections were installed, a secure file transfer drop box was installed) and a plan to periodically upgrade all University computer systems on a 4 year cycle was initiated and funded each of the past 3 years.

All academic buildings and residence hall rooms were provided with dual ports with either category 5 or 6 cabling; the internal campus network capacity is at 1 Gb with plans for upgrade to 10Gb in the near future. Firewalls (physical) are installed at 8 campus locations on an entirely switched campus network. Network management software is installed, maintained at current release levels and monitored with alarms sent to network managers in the event of after-hours events.

During this time, wireless communication moved from a background technology to a dominant ingredient in a communications environment and, became an essential component of any campus communications system. We were late in starting but eventually moved with good speed to establish our inside building wireless access. In the Summer and Fall of 2007, major strides were made to substantially expand high quality access from our exterior, public access areas and with specific attention to areas in which students were likely to expect access.

A first stage emergency notification (ClearText) system was purchased in Fall 2006 and a substantially enhanced system (DCC) was purchased in the Fall of 2007 with implementation in March, 2008.

To address the clearly increased loading on and expectations of the IT infrastructure, we dramatically expanded physical storage, UPS capacity, backup and off-site storage for system backup files. A Help Desk was created and staffed with full-time employees; software (HEAT) was purchased and enhanced to support our major campus demands. We finalized Business Continuity / Disaster Recovery Plans and have begun the implementation process.

The campus created two content management positions and installed a Content Management System as one step in ensuring that our presentation to the public of programs, offerings and requirements have passed through an internal review process. Web Services provides a centralized control on critical programmatic and institutional information.

Evaluation: The UML campus has made significant strides in enhancing the technology infrastructure to support teaching, research, data management, and campus security. It will continue to build on this foundation to ensure that appropriate resources are available to meet the needs of students, faculty and staff.

Standard Nine: Financial Resources

Review of the 2005 Standard: Standard 9 has expanded from 6 sub-sections to 14 with increased emphasis placed on the budget process, contingency planning, and risk assessment. It also promotes transparency and disclosure by requiring that “all fiscal policies . . . are clearly stated in writing.”

Current Status

The University of Massachusetts Lowell is financially stable. State appropriations (in dollars) have increased every year since fiscal year 2004. These increases cover funding of collective bargaining salaries and a nominal increase for operating costs. This is in contrast to significant reductions in state appropriations prior to FY 2004. Based on Governor Patrick’s 2009 fiscal-year budget, the state appropriation for UMass Lowell should increase 1.2% plus funding of collective bargaining salaries. The percentage of the Annual Massachusetts State Budget allocated to Public Higher Education has remained stable at 1.5% to 1.6% since FY 2004. With the current governor’s publicly stated commitment to higher education, it is believed that future appropriations will maintain this percentage.

UMass Lowell has experienced operating losses since FY 2004 despite the turnaround in revenues, especially from Commonwealth appropriations. These deficits are due in part to significant investment in faculty. Tenured/tenure-track faculty increased from 360 in Fall 2004 to 405 in Fall 2006. Total faculty FTE increased by 43 from Fall 2004 to Fall 2006. An additional 25 new tenured/tenure-track faculty were hired in FY 2007.

UMass Lowell continues to remit tuition to the Commonwealth. Tuition rates did not change from FY 2004 to FY 2008. Curriculum support fees increased annually approximately 4% for resident students and approximately 5.5% for nonresident students. Projected tuition and fee increases for FY 2009 to FY 2013 are approximately 3% annually. There is expected to be no negative impact on enrollments from these increases. In fact, it is the intent of the University to increase enrollments by 2.5% a year. There will be no lowering of current admissions standards to obtain this goal.

Dormitory room rates are increasing at approximately 9.5% in an effort to build a fund balance for future dormitory expansion. Current room rates at UMass Lowell are low compared to other campuses.

Additional fees have been introduced. Students and faculty are charged \$12 per month for parking. This is a new fee for FY 2008 mandated by the Board of Trustees in line with the other campuses. The revenues from the parking fee and tickets do not cover the costs of parking facilities at the present time. In FY 2009, the general curriculum fee will be increased and certain college specific fees will be introduced. UML is aware of the impact that these increases in fees will have on many students. The Deans have pledged transparency by reporting to students how the college fees are used to provide enhanced services to students. The Chancellor has pledged that 25% of the increase in revenues from the curriculum fee will be earmarked toward student financial aid.

As stated in the 2003 Report, UMass Lowell began to supplement State appropriations with three non-state, non-student fee revenue streams. Chancellor Meehan and the leadership team recognize that additional resources, other than state appropriations, are needed to fulfill the scope of the University's mission and purposes. The Chancellor and the Cabinet continue to review and analyze existing sources of revenue as well as attempt to identify new ones. The revenues from commercial ventures continue to be modest. Efforts will be made to increase revenues from licensing, private industry, and the commercialization of technology. Total research dollars have shown steady growth from \$22.6 million for FY 2004 to \$27.5 million for FY 2007. The average overhead rate is 34% for FY 2007. This percentage has increased each year since FY 2002. The University expects research activity to increase from 5% to 6% per year until FY2011 when the opening of the ETIC faculty on campus will spur an increase in research activity. Continuing Studies, Corporate and Distance Education continues to grow and generate additional revenues. Contributions to operations have increased from \$3.86 million in FY 2004 to projected contributions of \$5.86 million in FY 2008. Major efforts are being made to increase funds generated by University Advancement. Progress has been made in establishing and increasing scholarship endowments and increasing donor giving. It is expected that a new Vice Chancellor for Advancement who possesses an entrepreneurial spirit, will execute a capital campaign, provide leadership (vision, strategic direction, and operational management for development), increase the level of individual support, and help build development programs and infrastructure. These efforts will undoubtedly contribute to the development of a steady stream of funds and enlarge the base of support for the University.

UMass Lowell has continuously demonstrated its financial capacity to graduate its entering class and maintain its educational quality. This is evidenced through accreditations and various statistics. All professional accreditations remain in good standing. Freshmen retention rates and graduation rates are comparable to our peer institutions.

From the time that Chancellor Meehan assumed his office the budgeting process has evolved "from a highly centralized, top-down budgeting system, to a decentralized, bottom-up approach that will allow those managers closest to the implementation of University policies the ability to have input on the allocation of resources needed for those implementations." The budget was restructured to provide greater accountability in both cost control and strategic initiatives and investments.

The budget document is distributed to various managers, who are given more information than in the past and that includes instructions, guidelines and relevant data. For example, in the past employee salaries were not detailed by center/department. Now managers are aware of and accountable for the number of employees and total salaries for the unit. Presentations are made by

each manager to a budget committee and recommendations are made to the Chancellor. The Chancellor issues the final budget allocation which is approved by the Board of Trustees.

PeopleSoft is used to generate monthly reports for each manager. The Budget Office continuously monitors non payroll spending. The Interim Vice-Chancellor for Administration and Finance and the Budget Director meet quarterly with senior management to discuss quarterly budgets and to take appropriate action, if necessary. The quarterly budget is then reviewed by the Chancellor and presented to his Cabinet.

There are continuous efforts to insure compliance with written fiscal policies. A “Policies for the Management of University Funds” manual is provided each manager. Policies covering purchasing, travel, business expenses, accounts payable and consultant services are included. PeopleSoft provides web-based access to policies and guidelines promulgated by the University System. Seminars are held for managers and other individuals with any responsibility in the aforementioned areas each semester to encourage understanding and adherence to these policies.

The University System continues to centralize and standardize functions and policies. Payroll and investing of University funds have been centralized for years. The accounting structure for each campus is evolving into a standardized University structure and the University internal audit department is expanding in an effort to give more attention and feedback to each campus.

Chancellor Meehan is committed to process and internal controls. As an example of his commitment one of his first initiatives was the hiring of consultants to review top level controls. An ad hoc advisory committee of faculty and staff assisted in the review of the auditors report and made recommendations to the new chancellor. A control environment review, ethical standards and behavior review, and travel and entertainment and purchase card expense review were conducted. In addition, UMass Lowell is subject to audits and reviews by public accounting firms, federal and state agencies, and the UMass system. Recommendations from these audits and reviews are implemented.

Every year, Chancellor William Hogan issued the “Blue Book” that assisted “this Campus as it pursues the University Mission, the Strategic Priorities of the University and as it responds to requirements of the University’s Performance Measurement System.” Interim Chancellor MacKenzie suspended the preparation of the Blue Book. Chancellor Meehan opted to begin a campus-wide strategy dialogue. Currently the discussion is designed around three pillars – instruction, research and outreach and there are deliberations about whether to adopt a modified Blue Book in the future.

Evaluation: UMass Lowell is financially stable. The financial future appears more positive considering the current state leadership, increasing student enrollments, increasing student fees, and increasing revenues from non-State, non-Student sources. Prospects for increased state funding, however, may be diminished by a recession. Nevertheless, the University aims to balance the budget by FY2010. The University plans to continue making strides in shaping a collaborative, transparent budget process and implementing management processes that will ensure informed decision-making.

Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

Review of the 2005 Standard: The University is expected to provide sufficient information for various audiences, especially prospective and current students to make informed decisions, in light

of cost, debt load, and time to graduation. More information about learning outcomes and student success as well as easier public access to information is now a focus of this standard.

Current Status

University Website, Web Content Management, and Electronic Catalog

Since the 2003 Self-Study Report, UMass Lowell has made strides in improving its presentation of campus information via the web. New software (Serena Collage Content Management System) was installed in February 2005, and the catalog began to be built online. By August 2005, the Office of Public Affairs, which oversees Web content, began to systematically pull in all department and campus unit sites. The administration informed all departments, research centers, and administrative units that each must appoint a site maintainer to keep information fresh and act as liaison to the Office of Public Affairs. Two consultants were hired to help with the import process. By March 2008 approximately 75 percent of the more than 125,000 individual web pages had been redesigned and updated. The goal for completion is December 2008.

The web consulting firm Big Bad, hired in August 2006, completed the web strategy report in February 2007. In March 2007, the University also hired a usability consultant, Carolyn Snyder, specifically for the catalog. She delivered her report in April. Two part-time consultants in web content management were contracted through the end of March 2008. After that time, web content management is being performed by department web content editors.

Policy and procedures are published on the Web Services site, <http://www.uml.edu/it/webservices/Procedures.html>. Once a site is in the Content Management System, a department maintainer is trained by the Information Technology staff and changes are submitted through a workflow process. Changes are deployed to the live site every four hours for the main site; catalog changes are deployed weekly.

Academic Information

The Office of Academic Affairs oversees the academic catalog. Individual departments ensure the accuracy of information about faculty and courses that appear in printed materials (brochures, admissions view-book, and catalog) or on the UML website. All published information is reviewed by the Office of Public Affairs, which provides design and copy-editing services.

Administrative Information

The Office of Public Affairs publishes information about the campus administration, including the Chancellor's Office, Administration and Finance, Facilities and Information Technology, and others in the campus leadership. Information about the governance of the UMass system (President, trustees, etc.) is available on the University of Massachusetts President's Office site (www.massachusetts.edu).

With the arrival of a new Chancellor in July 2007, a new Chancellor's Office website was created with a means of contacting the Chancellor to ask questions or offer comments.

Institutional Information

The Office of Institutional Research (IR), which reports to the Interim Chief Information and Facilities Officer, has seen two retirements since August 2007. However, a new director was hired

in Spring 2008. All external reporting deadlines have been met during this period of personnel transition. IR's current Director of Reporting has a strong background in IR.

Financial Information

Information about the total cost of education, including the availability of financial aid and the typical length of study is available on the web through the Office of Admissions and Office of Financial Aid. This is addressed under Frequently Asked Questions for undergraduate and graduate admissions.

Evaluation: UMass Lowell is working to ensure consistency and accuracy of published materials, both in electronic and hard copy; it is continuing to add to the information readily available through the www.uml.edu website and to provide site navigation that allows easy access to that information. With the addition of staff in the Office of Institutional Research, the campus plans to be more intentional in its collection and analysis of data in a variety of areas, including student success and achievement, student satisfaction, and alumni feedback.

Standard Eleven: Integrity

Review of the 2005 Standard: Few changes have been made to this standard, but it now incorporates the statement on the responsibility of the institution to ensure that conferences, workshops, and institutes that carry its name are appropriate and related to its mission and purposes.

Current Status

The integrity of the academic enterprise of any institution of higher education requires honesty in all aspects of its endeavor. Maintaining academic integrity is therefore the responsibility of all faculty, staff, and students at the University of Massachusetts Lowell.

Legal and Ethical Requirements

Established as an educational institution by the state of Massachusetts, UMass Lowell's degree-granting authority is derived from the state's Board of Higher Education. As a public, state-funded institution, UML is committed to fulfilling all its legal and ethical obligations.

- **Disabilities:** UMass makes every effort to comply with both the letter and spirit of laws, such as the *Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)* as well as Sections 503 and 504 of the *Rehabilitation Act of 1973*. Reasonable accommodations are provided for students, faculty and staff with disabilities. The campus supports compliance by insuring that work-related and academic accommodations for staff and students are provided. The Office of Student Disability Services provides support for students with disabilities. Equal Opportunity and Outreach provides service and accommodations for faculty and staff and provides consultation for accessibility issues. Facilities are also under constant review to determine current needs and priorities for projects. Information and assistance regarding accessibility services at UMass Lowell is available at: <http://www.uml.edu/student%2Dservices/disability/adaservices/>
- **Privacy:** The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (Part 99 of Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations) allows students access to their educational records, as well as basic protections for privacy of their records. The law does not apply to applicants seeking

admission, but it does apply to educational records, defined as those records directly related to a student and maintained by an educational institution.

- Sexual Harassment: UMass Lowell is committed to providing students, faculty and staff with an environment where they may pursue their studies or careers without being sexually harassed. Sexual harassment is: a violation of *Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act*, *Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1991*, and *Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972*. Equal Opportunity and Outreach provides both training and consultation in this area. They also field complaints of discrimination from faculty, students and staff.
- Institutional Review: The IRB implements basic protection of human subjects. The board bases its protections in four basic principles: respect of persons, minimizing harm, maximizing benefits, and justice. The IRB is composed of 12 members appointed by the Chancellor.

Teaching and Learning

UMass Lowell is committed to the promotion of scholarly research and creative, artistic achievement. It seeks to create new knowledge in the belief that an atmosphere of original inquiry supports both the instructional and public service goal of the University. It acknowledges its special obligation to provide quality teaching in all academic programs and continually seeks more effective methods of imparting knowledge and understanding.

Recognizing its role as a public institution, UMass Lowell is committed to active involvement in community service through instruction, research, consulting, cultural events and continuing education. Finally, the University recognizes its responsibility for implementing the principles of equal opportunity and affirmative action and is committed to ensuring that all students and employees, particularly those in protected designations, are guaranteed the benefits of a just and equitable system.

All students are responsible for complying with the pertinent rules, regulations, policies and procedures of the institution. These are contained in a variety of campus publications, including the online academic catalog [undergraduate, graduate and continuing studies], and student handbooks.

Campus policy requires that students demonstrate their own learning during examinations and other academic exercises, and that all other sources of information or knowledge be appropriately credited. Since scholarship depends upon the reliability of information and documentation, no form of cheating, plagiarism, fabrication or facilitating of dishonesty is condoned at UMass Lowell. In Summer 2007 a new Academic Integrity Policy was implemented:

http://www.uml.edu/catalog/undergraduate/policies/academic_dishonesty.htm

<http://www.uml.edu/catalog/graduate/discipline/default.htm>

<http://continuinged.uml.edu/policies/academicintegrity.htm>

The University Academic Integrity Policy is intended to establish and enforce uniformly just and equitable procedures for resolving allegations of dishonesty. All members of the campus community are expected to support a climate conducive to academic honesty. While the faculty members, because of their role in the educational process, have the responsibility for defining, fostering, and upholding academic honesty, students have the responsibility of conforming in all respects to that standard.

There are academic grievance procedures designed to provide students with an equitable and expeditious process to resolve complaints in which a student alleges that some member of the campus community has caused some specified harm related to an academic matter. The Ombuds Office also assists in administering these Policies.

UMass Lowell also has a comprehensive and well-established grievance system in place for faculty and staff. The EOO (Office of Equal Opportunity and Outreach) investigates grievances alleging discrimination. The Ombuds Office provides an additional contact to ensure the fair and equitable resolution of grievances or concerns. The seven union contracts also outline grievance procedures that may be applicable.

Evaluation: Policies and procedures to ensure appropriate student and faculty conduct regarding academic honesty, grading and a protection from false accusation are in place. These policies and procedures are under constant review by the appropriate governing bodies. UMass Lowell will continue to adhere to all applicable legal requirements that affect its operation and will maintain an honest relationship with the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. It will comply with the Commission's Standards, and the standards of other appropriate governing bodies.

IV. Future Plans

The UMass Lowell campus has undergone a major transformation since the appointment of Chancellor Meehan and a new campus leadership team. During the 2007-08 academic year, the chancellor and cabinet, by working with faculty, staff, students and community leaders have identified several themes that will serve as the basis for a strategic plan for the University.

In particular, the campus will:

Address student learning as a top priority:

- By recruiting and retaining qualified and diverse graduate and undergraduate students, seeking to increase enrollment while adhering to University standards for admission;
- By working toward a comprehensive system of assessing student learning, using both qualitative and quantitative measures of student success;
- By increasing the availability and application of technology in the classroom to enhance student learning and instructional effectiveness;

Ensure that the University's academic programs and research profile are of the highest quality and stature:

- By using input from professional accreditation visits and AQAD reviews to maintain the effectiveness of academic programs;
- By promoting cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and teaching;

Contribute to the sustainability of the physical, economic and social well-being of communities near and far:

- By expanding access to study abroad and international exchange programs for students and faculty;
- By supporting and sustaining community partnerships, particularly those linked to K-12 outreach;
- By strengthening our ties to alumni and friends of the University, inviting their input and participation as the campus undertakes new initiatives;

Strengthen the University's institutional image and further develop a university known for its educational excellence, noteworthy research and scholarship, deep community engagement, broad diversity, vibrant student life, and outstanding service:

- By making more readily available, through web and print sources, information about UML, so that all requirements for public disclosure are well and fully met.

Develop a comprehensive plan to guide the University's efforts to strengthen the University's long term financial condition and physical resources.

- By additional development of the physical plant, expanding sources of financial support, and enhancing appropriate academic programs.

During the coming academic year, the University will use these five goals to begin a strategic planning process that will engage the campus in an extensive community dialogue about the future of the University. The University has already made dramatic shifts and has reduced the deficit and increased enrollments. A design firm has been retained to build the first academic building in 30 years and the Commonwealth's Division of Capital Management is assisting the University develop a master plan for the entire campus. As part of the master plan, another academic building will be built on the University's south campus. In addition plans for two new residence halls will complement the new academic buildings and bring added vibrancy to student life. The University's research program and academic programs have already benefited from the appointment of the new Provost.

As the campus looks ahead to 2013 and its full self-study for NEASC accreditation, it plans to complete its strategic planning process and continue the implementation of many of the initiatives described in the preceding sections of this report. At the midpoint between accreditation reviews, UMass Lowell is well poised to pursue its path to excellence.