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I. Overview

History and Mission
The University of Massachusetts Amherst, founded under the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1863, is the flagship campus of the state university system. The University’s mission, as approved by its Board of Trustees is: “To provide an affordable education of high quality and to conduct programs of research and public service that advance our knowledge and improve the lives of the people of the Commonwealth.”

The 1463 acre Amherst campus has over two hundred major buildings with nearly ten million gross square feet of space. In Fiscal 2002, state appropriations accounted for 41% of the total campus operating budget of $575 million, while restricted funds—federal appropriations, gifts, grants and contracts—accounted for 17%. The remaining 42% was derived from student fees, auxiliary and other revenue operations. As a Carnegie Doctoral/Research-Extensive institution, the campus offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs, including bachelor’s degrees in 88 majors, the master’s degree in 69 programs, and the doctorate in 50 disciplines. In fall 2001 there were 1151 instructional faculty, 89% of whom were in the tenure system; 94% of the full-time faculty held the doctorate or appropriate terminal academic degree.

The Amherst campus ranks among the top 100 American colleges and universities for total research and development expenditures, has ten programs among the top third of doctoral/research programs as ranked by the National Research Council, and has nationally distinguished faculty who have demonstrated their dedication to the campus. In addition to research, the campus has strong commitment to teaching and faculty development that is supported by its nationally recognized Center for Teaching. Meeting its land-grant responsibilities, the campus serves the Commonwealth through outreach activities that, among other things, build business-community partnerships and enhance public educational opportunities.

In fall 2001, approximately 24,000 students were enrolled at the Amherst campus—18,500 undergraduates, including 300 in its two-year Stockbridge School of Agriculture, and 5,300 graduate students (3200 doctoral and 2100 master’s candidates). Three-fourths of undergraduate students were residents of Massachusetts, and the majority came from the greater Boston area. Approximately 5300 new undergraduates entered in fall 2001, about one-quarter of them enrolling as transfer students. One-third of all transfer students came from the Massachusetts community college system.

The undergraduate population is largely full-time with most students enrolling within one year of their high school graduation. The Amherst campus has one of the largest residence hall systems in the country and about three-fifths of undergraduate students live on campus. The undergraduate population represents the diversity of the state’s college-attending population, and 17% of are African-American, Latino, Asian-American or
Native American. The academic profile of entering first year students is strong—in fall 2001, more than 80% of students entered with high school grade point averages above 3.0 and combined SAT scores of over 1100.

Undergraduates are offered a wide range of curricular and co-curricular opportunities. The campus participates in Division I athletics and fielded 14 varsity sports for men and 15 for women in 2001-02. Students also participate in the Five College Consortium and can take courses at no charge at the other four colleges in the area: Amherst, Hampshire, Mount Holyoke and Smith Colleges. Programs like Commonwealth Honors College and the Service Learning program provide additional options for students. About one-third of entering students participate in residential academic programs designed to enhance living-learning opportunities.

**Senior Administrative Officers**

Since its last self-study there have been several appointments to senior administrative positions at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. The most important was the appointment in 2002 of John V. Lombardi as Chancellor. Chancellor Lombardi is the former President of the University of Florida and the former Provost of Johns Hopkins University.

Among those administrators reporting directly to the Chancellor, the following have taken office during the past five years: Charlena Seymour, Senior Vice Chancellor & Provost; Michael Gargano, Jr., Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs & Campus Life; Joyce M. Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance; and Elizabeth Dale, Vice Chancellor for University Advancement.

During the past year, two Vice Chancellor offices have been reorganized and their responsibilities shifted into Academic Affairs. These are the Vice Chancellor for Research, which has become Vice Provost for Research, and Vice Chancellor for Outreach, which has become Vice Provost for Outreach. Neither sets of responsibilities have been substantially altered but their affiliation with the academic core has been strengthened. Paul Kostecki has been named Vice Provost for Research and John Mullin, who was Vice Chancellor for Outreach, was appointed Vice Provost for Outreach.

There have also been several appointments to the deanships of schools and colleges at the University since 1999. They include: Leon Osterweil (Natural Sciences & Mathematics); Janet M. Rifkin (Social & Behavioral Sciences); and Andrew Effrat (School of Education). Eileen Breslin, Dean of the School of Nursing continues in that role but is also serving as Interim Dean of the School of Public Health & Health Sciences. John Mullin has been appointed Dean of the Graduate School, a position he holds jointly with his position as Vice Provost for Outreach.

The appointments of Chancellor Lombardi and Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Michael Gargano were both the result of national searches; all other administrative appointments in past five years have resulted from internal searches, and several of these appointees are serving as interim administrators.
II. Major Changes

Describe major changes or significant developments at the institution since the last comprehensive evaluation, 1998-99.

1. Financial Resources

Background
During the past five years the campus has coped with a variety of financial and operational challenges created when the state appropriation received by the institution steadily declined. The only state appropriation increase in the past five years was in Fiscal 2001 and it was received for the final year of multi-year collective bargaining agreements. Although subsequent collective bargaining agreements have been ratified and signed by the Governor, funding has not been appropriated and no collective bargaining raises have been issued since July 2001.

Over the past five years there has been a 23% decrease in annual state appropriations distributed to the Amherst campus, with an unprecedented $40 million cut in Fiscal 2004.

Recent Past: Fiscal Year 2000 to Fiscal Year 2003
In the recent past, Fiscal 2000 to 2003, the campus managed the decrease in state appropriations by selectively reducing expenditures and gradually increasing other sources of revenue to supplement the loss. The objective was to maintain and even improve the academic mission of the institution while accommodating lost revenues. Funding became more diversified than before the massive state funding declines. Growth in non-state funds, including student fees, became a necessity and now provides the campus with a larger percentage of total institutional revenue. The contribution of the state appropriation to total institutional revenue dropped from 41% to 29.5%; the contribution of tuition and fees increased from 23.1% to 31.8%.

Tuition at all public institutions of higher education in Massachusetts is set by the Board of Higher Education, not the University, and in the recent past the only increase has been a 1.9% increase in the tuition charged to out-of-state students. In the years Fiscal 2000-Fiscal 2003 all tuition revenue reverted to the state. Because the student body at the Amherst campus has not grown significantly, and because other sources of income, such as alumni donations, take years to cultivate, the Amherst campus has had to increase student fees to gain additional revenues quickly to accommodate for the loss of state dollars. With the approval of the University's Board of Trustees, the curriculum fee, the main student fee at the institution, increased 11.6% for in-state and 29.4% for out-of-state students over the five year period covered by this report.
Current Situation: Fiscal Year 2004

In Fiscal 2002 and Fiscal 2003, the Amherst campus lost 250 staff position due to budget reduction lay-offs and over 500 faculty and staff positions due to retirements (there were two early retirement incentive programs during this period). The total, 750 positions, equaled 14% of the Fiscal 2002 work force. In the short term, the campus has recovered as much of the savings as possible from the two retirement cycles. This allowed the institution to absorb the state budget reductions and reallocate savings to meet a portion of the institution’s requirements. Because the retirements occurred in response to employment chronology—not institutional mission or needs—the campus will reinvest retirement savings relative to its most critical needs. The priorities for reallocation focus on meeting the instructional obligations to students, sustaining the physical plant and other services essential for campus safety and operations, supporting the academic and other objectives of student services, and investing to sustain the institution’s research agenda.

While the operating budget has been churning during this period, the capital budget, which relies upon long-term bonds rather than annual appropriations, has been less turbulent. As a result, the campus has invested sizable sums in new construction, deferred maintenance, and both academic and administrative computing during this period.

The Future

The most basic needs of the University of Massachusetts Amherst are clear: replacing faculty and staff lost through the early retirement initiatives, continued renovations of academic facilities, restoration of the Library’s acquisition capacity, and basic support for increases in fixed costs.

Looking toward the future, the campus is heartened by a pilot program for the retention of tuition paid by out-of-state students, a program contained in the legislature’s Fiscal 2004 budget. This allows the campus to plan for growth in out-of-state student enrollments as a financial strategy. Any growth in this area would be gradual, however, with an increase of about 200 students per year to ensure that in-state students are not adversely affected and that facilities can accommodate increased instructional and housing needs. The entering class in fall 2003 exceeded the previous year’s enrollment by about 750, an indication that student interest in the institution remains strong.

While the campus will continue efforts to have the state restore some lost funding and to provide resources for collective bargaining agreements, it is clear that the institution must rely more on its own initiatives to meet financial needs. The campus has begun an aggressive program to enhance non-state revenues and is confident that these will be successful. Future revenue generating strategies include increased fundraising, the commercialization of intellectual property, and enhanced summer and continuing education activities. Development efforts are going well, student applications are strong, and there is increasing demand for continuing education programs. Incentives are being
developed to encourage schools and colleges within the University to increase their non-state revenues. Most importantly, the faculty, staff and students at the University of Massachusetts Amherst believe in the quality of the institution.

2. Academic Affairs

**Faculty Size & Academic Program Changes**

Two early retirement programs and limited faculty hiring because of budget cuts have had their impact on the number of instructional resources on the campus since the last self-study. During this period there has been a loss of over 100 tenure system faculty which brings its total to 915 in fall 2003. In addition, approximately 55 faculty are expected to take early retirement at the end of the 2003 calendar year. Some of the loss in tenure system faculty has been compensated by an increase in non-tenure system faculty. At present there are 326 non-tenure system faculty, 152 of whom are full-time. This represents an increase of 23% in the FTE non-tenure system faculty and a 10% decrease in the FTE of tenure system faculty since fall 1998.

There have been relatively few changes in academic programs since the last self-study. During this period the Department of Consumer Studies was eliminated and the two undergraduate majors, Apparel Marketing and Family & Consumer Studies were suspended. Additionally, two applied management programs formerly affiliated with the College of Food & Natural Resources—Sport Studies and Hotel, Restaurant and Travel Administration—moved to the School of Management. They subsequently changed their names to Sport Management and Hospitality and Tourism Management to more accurately reflect the major. Similarly, the College of Food & Natural Resources was renamed the College of Natural Resources & the Environment. A new program in architecture is currently under consideration in the College of Humanities & Fine Arts.

**Academic Productivity & Resource Allocation**

In 2002-2003 a new initiative within Academic Affairs established a resource allocation model for academic programs that emphasizes the campus’s core mission of teaching and research. The model has two basic criteria: the need to meet reasonable student demand for instruction, and the need to improve faculty research and scholarship.

A. *Instruction*: In recent years, random attrition among faculty and shifts in student demand have created imbalances in instructional demand and supply. Recent early retirements provided approximately $3 million to meet current instructional gaps with non-tenure track instructors (lecturers and teaching assistants). Since this is not a satisfactory long-term solution, the Provost’s Office seeks to establish appropriate, long-term levels of instructional capacity for each college, then allocate resources to their base budgets for deans to make appropriate plans for instruction.

To establish the teaching capacity needed to meet instructional obligations over the next few years, the Provost’s Office examined student credit hours generated by each department over the past decade to determine patterns of instructional demand. Unmet
demand was also examined, viewing admissions data and other information to estimate how enrollments would shift if caps on the number of students admitted to a major were eliminated.

To determine appropriate levels of long-term instructional capacity, the campus will use the University of Delaware’s *National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity*, which provides data that can assist in developing disciplinary norms. These norms, combined with reasonably stable enrollment data, will provide dependable guides for establishing appropriate levels of instructional capacity.

B. Research: the resource allocation program also focuses on research quality, employing two levels of benchmarking. First, it asks each academic department to benchmark its past research achievements, then improve upon them over time. Second, departments will compare their research productivity and quality against research produced by leading departments in their discipline, then move toward the standards the leaders set. Each department will propose the criteria to use for its benchmarking, and these will predictably vary by discipline. Those departments that provide clear evidence of achievement and improvement will be eligible for increased support.

Overall, the resource allocation program will establish levels of need and capacity, productivity and quality. Using information that is measurable, consistent and based on nationally competitive comparisons, the program will enhance the institution’s mission by rewarding those programs that demonstrate their academic quality and productivity.

**Research Expenditures**

Total expenditures for research on the Amherst campus has increased about 20% over the past five years although its ranking among the top 200 American research universities has remained at or near that group’s median.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1998</th>
<th>FY 2002</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Research (in millions):</td>
<td>$89.9</td>
<td>$109.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Federal Research</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since sponsored research is conducted primarily by tenure system faculty, the recent early retirement programs, along with the consequent decreases among such faculty, ought to have decreased total research spending, but they have not: during this period total expenditures per tenure system faculty member increased 27%, from $84,242 to $106,874.

Despite budget cuts and reduced faculty size, the campus continues to compete well nationally for sponsored research. In October 2003 the National Science Foundation announced a $40 million award to the University’s College of Engineering for the development of an Atmospheric Sensing Research Center.
**Academic Computing & Distance Education**

During the past five years, the Amherst campus has invested about $4 million to expand and complete its campus computing network. There are now over 18,000 ethernet jacks available in classrooms, dorms and public areas. The Office of Information Technology has developed several dozen “hot spots” on campus, locations where wireless computer connections are available, and that number is expected to increase substantially within a year. Over six hundred public computers are available for use in areas such as the library, department labs and classrooms. The campus website has been expanded and improved, and it currently contains over 250,000 pages. The campus network conveys over 100 million email messages per year, and an estimated 60% of courses currently employ some aspect of information technology resources; that number is expected to reach 90% or more within the next two years. The percentage of students who bring their own computers to campus each year has increased significantly; at present, surveys indicate that over 90% of students do so.

The University of Massachusetts Amherst has been a regional leader in distance education, offering courses via satellite television, videotape and the internet since the mid-1970s. Three years ago it joined the other campuses of the University system to form UMass On-Line. By pooling resources and expanding marketing, the number of distance education courses offered by the Amherst campus has greatly increased: in the three years since its inception, UMass On-Line enrollments increased from 1028 to 3350 (225%) and gross revenues grew from $817,680 to $3,265,330 (300%).

As the largest provider of distance education in New England, UMass On-Line is positioned to continue growing since its accredited graduate programs in management, education, nursing and public health are attractive to many working professionals. Other state systems that provide good quality programs have developed large distance education programs: the University of Maryland, for example, enrolls over 30,000 students annually. In October 2001 *U.S. News & World Report* listed two Amherst graduate degree programs (management and public health) as among the best on-line programs in the nation.

3. **Student Services**

**Student Information Services**

As a part of the general upgrading of computing services on campus, a new Peoplesoft Student Information Services program has improved the access and quality of student interactions with the institution. SIS integrates and supports offices and information that serve students, including the Registrar’s Office, Continuing Education, the Bursar’s Office, Financial Aid, Admissions, and Housing. Through its web-based, self-service SPIRE program, it assists students by providing up-to-date information about everything...
from the status of their current applications for financial aid to their progress towards
degrees. Using its on-line course catalog and current semester course offerings, students
can search for available courses and, once they choose to enroll in one, SPIRE can
provide them with an immediate confirmed registration. SPIRE also allows students to
view their grades and class schedules and to print unofficial transcripts. It also provides
information about any outstanding “holds” on their registration as well as information
about how to resolve whatever problem has created the hold.

**Undergraduate Admissions Policies**
Responding to a court ruling involving the Boston Latin School’s admissions policies in
2000, the Amherst campus revised its admission procedures. Applicants who presented
strong academic record as measured by high school grade point averages and SAT scores
were given a “file review” and usually offered admission without any further scrutiny.
Applicants with lower GPAs and SATs were identified for a “point review.” For this
review, applicants were assigned up to ten points: for high school GPA (up to 7.5 points),
for Massachusetts residency, for different kinds of achievements and honors, and for the
applicant’s ability to contribute to the diversity of the campus. Under this system, race
and ethnicity constituted only one of a number of factors used to assess the applicants
potential to contribute to diversity.

In June 2003, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional the University of
Michigan’s undergraduate admission policy which also awarded points for diversity. In
October 2003, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Michael Gargano announced that the
University would continue to value diversity, but its admissions procedures would no
longer use any point system. A new procedure would employ a more holistic approach,
one that included many factors, but assigned no specific weight to any one of them.

Since 1998, the campus has seen fluctuation in the number of applications, acceptances
and enrollments in the entering first year class, some of which have been driven by
various enrollment goals (e.g., increase or decrease the size of the entering class and/or
balance of in-state and out-of-state students). The number of applications has ranged
from approximately 16,400 to 20,400. Similarly, acceptance rates have ranged from a
high of 82% to a low of 58%. The percentage of students who accepted offers of
admission has varied as well, from 28% to 30%. Nevertheless, the academic profile of
entering students remains strong: high school class rank has remained within the top 30%
throughout the period, high school grade averages have hovered around 3.3, and the yield
among students admitted has remained relatively constant at 30%. The most significant
change during this period has been an upward trend in SAT scores, which rose from 1127
in 2000 to 1137 in 2003. One-year retention of these students has improved, and 84% of
students return for the second year.

**Financial Aid**
Between 1999 and 2003, annual student tuition remained constant for in-state students
($1714) and increased less than $200 for out-of-state students ($17,085 in 2003).
Mandatory student fees, however, have increased considerably. For in-state students,
annual required fees have increased 86% since 1999, from $3,498 to $6,518, and this increase has had no small effect upon financial aid.

During the past year nearly 14,000 students applied for financial aid and 12,500 awards were made. On average, financial aid at the Amherst campus meets 88% of student need for in-state students and 80% for out-of-state students. Applicants have been reporting less assistance available from their families, due in part to the weak economy, and this, combined with increased costs, has created a serious challenge. To minimize declines in need-based support for in-state students, the proportion of aid for out-of-state students, as well as the proportion of merit scholarships awarded, has declined.

Reorganized Support Services
A. Cultural Programs: programs that serve African-American, Latino, Asian-American and Native American students have traditionally provided students with support services, personal counseling and advocacy. Until recently these programs also provided substantial academic advising, but this function has recently been consolidated into the Undergraduate Advising and Academic Support Center, a comprehensive advising program located within Academic Affairs. This move was implemented to provide improved, consistent and comprehensive advising services for all students on campus.

The cultural centers continue to provide personal counseling and advocacy as well as training in study skills, ESL and other tools that can contribute to their students’ success. Within Student Affairs, they have been moved from Campus Activities to Enrollment Services, thereby enabling them to work more closely with academic support services. A new program, the Native American Student Center, was begun three years ago and now serves approximately 100 students each year.

B. Disability Services: in the past, students with different kinds of disabilities were served by different offices on campus. In fall 2003, all services for students with learning or physical disabilities were consolidated into the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity and report to Associate Chancellor Esther Terry, the campus compliance officer for all issues involving the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Residential Life
The success of residential education programs that offer students the opportunity to join living-learning communities within the campus housing program have been assessed and enlarged. Clear evidence indicated that these smaller communities, within one of the largest university housing programs in the country, have yielded improved student satisfaction and increased retention. Residential education programs now enroll well over 1,000 students, an increase of nearly 30% in recent years, and they include a language house, as well as nearly two dozen learning communities organized around specific disciplines and interests.

Alcohol & Drug Policy
During the past five years, in response to national trends towards increased substance abuse among college students, the Dean of Students Office, working with the Student
Affairs Judicial Issues Committee, revised policies and stiffened sanctions concerning alcohol and drug violations. These revisions have been published widely and are currently available on the campus website (www.umass.edu/dean_students/policies). The campus has also enhanced its alcohol and drug education programs and, working with Student Activities, has increased the number of alcohol-free campus events, particularly on weekends. Library and recreational facilities have also extended their hours of operation to provide more options for students during their free time. Students also have an option to live in residence halls designated as “wellness” areas where fitness and healthy lifestyles are encouraged.

In fall 2003, the Task Force for the Prevention of Alcohol Abuse recently made several recommendations. Overall it urged the Amherst campus to increase communication of its official position regarding the use of alcohol: in student orientations, in academic courses and in student-to-student educational programs. It also urged the campus to create more alcohol-free residential options, to provide more security staff in residential areas, and to increase alcohol-free extra-curricular activities. Finally, it recommended increased enforcement and sanctions for violators of the campus alcohol policy, urging, for example, that parents or guardians of students found guilty of violating campus alcohol regulations be notified.

**Athletics**

As a consequence of budget cuts, six of the twenty-nine team sports at the University were dropped in recent years: men’s and women’s water polo, volleyball, men’s and women’s gymnastics, and men’s tennis. To compensate for budget cuts, the Athletics fee has been increased and the Athletics program has continued a vigorous fundraising program. In the past five years, private giving to Athletics has totaled about $4.5 million.

In terms of achievements in athletics, recent years have shown some impressive results. Perhaps the most prestigious was being named to the *U.S. News & World Report’s* College Sports Honor Roll in 2002. This award is made to only twenty institutions nationwide, and the criteria used include gender equity, graduation rate, sports sponsorships and win-loss records across the board. The graduation rate for the University’s student athletes remains extremely impressive. Since the early 1990s, its students have maintained graduation rates 5.4% higher than NCAA average. They have also maintained a higher graduation rate (66%) than the overall student body (61%) at the Amherst campus.

**4. University Advancement**

The University of Massachusetts Amherst’s capacity to raise private support has been clearly demonstrated during the past five years. In December 2001, the campus completed its first capital campaign with a total of $130.7 million raised, exceeding the campaign goal of $125 million. Philanthropic investments between Fiscal 1999 and Fiscal 2003 increased 47%. The Annual Fund, which seeks gifts from alumni and parents
by telephone and mail, has grown steadily over the past five years, increasing 25%, from $1.6 million in Fiscal 1999 to over $2 million in Fiscal 2003.

Under the leadership of Chancellor Lombardi, the campus received a record $35.2 million in Fiscal 2003, far surpassing the previous year’s total of $20.1 million and exceeding the previous record high of $30.2 million made during one year of the capital campaign. This new record high is particularly significant since alumni giving across the country declined by 13.6% that year, largely as a result of a weakened economy.

This success in Fiscal 2003 owes no small debt to the creation, early in that year, of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Foundation, an entity related to, but separate from, the University system’s Foundation. It provides the Amherst campus leadership with increased autonomy to shape and support private giving to the campus. Its volunteer Board of Directors includes more than 25 alumni, parents and friends, as well as five principal administrators and a faculty member. The size of this Board is expected to increase as ambitious plans for another major campaign take shape. The system Foundation remains the “investment banker” for the campus endowment which now totals more than $63.3 million.

At present there are approximately thirty professional development officers on campus, thirteen of whom are Directors of Development within the ten schools and colleges, Athletics, Extension, University Libraries and the Fine Arts Center. They will all continue their work to cultivate donors for significant gifts. Potentially, as the campus development efforts expand, additional development professionals may be added.

In preparation for this increased concentration on private giving, key campus units have been reorganized to assist in the effort. The campus Communications Office has been incorporated into University Advancement with this charge: to focus more on development and alumni relations; to provide advice about the content and design of development and alumni publications, including campaign themes, messages and promotional materials; and to provide expertise on expanding website communications.

Similarly, the Office of Alumni Relations and the University of Massachusetts Amherst Alumni Association have been encouraged to build a network of alumni clubs across the country, to expand membership programs, to orchestrate events and to enhance publications that further engage alumni interest and connections.
III. Areas of Emphasis

The following four pieces respond to requests from the Association that were based upon the recommendations of the Visiting Team in 1999.

1. The Flagship Status & University Governance

Assure governance relationships between the system’s Trustees and the University that both support the mission and flagship status of the University, and respect proper roles.

Whatever previous concerns may have existed about the status and delegated authority to the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts, these no longer exist, and the current administration of the Amherst campus is fully satisfied with the autonomy and authority that the President and Trustees of the system have provided to sustain the campus and its flagship status for public higher education in Massachusetts.

Following the announced resignation of Chancellor David Scott early in 2001, the University’s President and Board of Trustees created a task force to examine the future of the Amherst campus and appointed Aaron Lazare, Chancellor of the University’s Medical Center at Worcester, as its chair; Grace Fey, the newly elected Chair of the Board, was also among the seven individuals appointed to the task force. The charge to the task force clearly stated the assumption “that the success and stature of the University System depend to a significant degree on the achievements of its campus at Amherst.” The task force was charged to “assess the opportunities and barriers to success, and to promote more effective functioning of the campus” so that “the report of this task force will inform and guide the search committee that will be charged with selecting a new Chancellor.”

Among other topics, The Report of the Task Force on the Future of UMass Amherst focuses on the flagship status of the Amherst campus (pp.44-45). The Report asserted that the Amherst campus “bears the heritage of being the flagship campus of the university system” and added: “Many of the faculty...are uncertain of its meaning or whether the governance of the current five campus university is committed to this designation. There is, furthermore, the concern on campus by many faculty that there has been a ‘homogenization’ of purpose, or a lack of differentiation among the four undergraduate university campuses of the University of Massachusetts” (p.44)

Finally, the Report concludes with the recommendation “that university governance reaffirm its designation of the University of Massachusetts Amherst as the flagship campus of the university system” (p.45). Meeting in October 2001, the Board of Trustees accepted the task force Report, urging the search committee for a new Chancellor at Amherst to incorporate its recommendations into its selection of candidates.
Since the *Report* was published in 2001, the state legislature again asserted the flagship status of the Amherst campus. The current Fiscal 2004 budget legislation, section 219, amends Chapter 75, the University’s enabling legislation, and obliges the University system to “provide a clear indication of the different missions of its campuses and...provide national benchmarks that demonstrate each campus’s success in competing with peer institutions....As the flagship research campus of the University system, the Amherst campus shall structure any such proposal [the legislation requires each campus to propose a planning document] to demonstrate how its adoption will serve to support the institution’s effort to achieve parity with its peer institutions and enhance its ability to compete with them for students, faculty, and research funding”.

In spring 2002, the Board appointed John V. Lombardi Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Lombardi had served as President of the University of Florida, that state’s flagship institution, for ten years. In interviews with both the Trustees and with the faculty and staff at Amherst, Lombardi addressed the question and the meaning of “flagship” status. In summer 2003 he published some of his thoughts in *UMass Magazine*: “Research defines the flagship university in every state in the nation. The research imperative for these institutions also sets a standard of nationally competitive performance in teaching and outreach, and it creates an academic environment that constantly incorporates both the process and the results of research into the undergraduate program.”

Earlier that year, in a paper entitled *Competing for Quality: The Public Flagship Research University*, Lombardi provided even more detail concerning “flagship” status and what it means: “Many states with multiple public university campuses organize them into systems and then designate or at least recognize the largest and most competitive research institution as the flagship for the state. This status implies that the flagship university will compete on behalf of the state in the national marketplace of premier public research universities.” He then describes the marketplace where these institutions compete: “about 2,500 public and private institutions in the United States offer four-year programs. Of these about 650 report any federally funded research at all. Of these 650, about 165 spend $20 million or more of federal research money a year, and these 165 institutions control about 90% of the federal funds competitively awarded.”

The challenge for the Amherst campus as the flagship of public higher education in Massachusetts is clearly stated in the Chancellor’s closing comments in *UMass Magazine*: “This university’s academic imperative requires that our students, faculty and staff all measure the success of what we do against the best in the nation. While we struggle with issues of resources and similar practical matters, nothing we do has more importance than the constant comparison of our undergraduate, graduate and research performance against our competitors among America’s top research universities.” In these public statements on the subject, Lombardi has presented a clear definition of what the term, flagship institution, means; he has also articulated ways for assessing and for guiding the campus in its role as the flagship institution of public higher education in Massachusetts.
The peer group for the University of Massachusetts Amherst that has been approved by the Board of Trustees is the top 200 American Research Universities, both public and private institutions, with at least $20 million in federal research expenditures in fiscal 2000 (as listed in *The Top American Research Universities: An Annual Report*). The percentile rank of the Amherst campus is shown with respect to these institutions. In some instances, not all of the 200 institutions are used within a reference group. For example, SAT scores are reported for a subset of this group because some institutions are graduate level only.

Another step the University’s Board of Trustees has taken provides increased autonomy to the Amherst campus: the establishment of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Foundation in 2002. Its express purpose is to locate the initiative and responsibility for campus-based fundraising, capital campaigns and other private giving related to the Amherst campus. While cooperating with the system’s foundation and working closely with President and the Trustees, the drive and direction of fundraising are now clearly located on the Amherst campus, and the Chancellor is directly responsible for the success of this effort. In its first year of operation, the campus foundation raised over $35 million, breaking all previous fund-raising records.

In conclusion, the designation of the Amherst campus as the system’s flagship institution has been confirmed by formal vote of the system’s Trustees and has been affirmed by the legislature in the current budget legislation. Any ambiguities about the meaning of the term—either among University faculty, officials, alumni or the public at large—have been addressed and clarified by Chancellor Lombardi’s public statements, all of which are available on the Amherst campus website. The peer institutions for the Amherst campus are the strongest research universities in the country, which further distinguishes the Amherst campus from other campuses in the University system. The autonomy granted to the campus in the establishment of its own foundation is clear evidence that the Trustees and the President have confidence in the new leadership of the Amherst campus. The success of the foundation in its first year of operation (described above in *University Advancement, II.4*) has only confirmed that confidence.
2. Assessing Student Learning Outcomes

Assess undergraduate student learning outcomes, including those achieved through the general education curriculum and in the major.

During the past five years the University of Massachusetts Amherst has built upon its strengths in course-based and “student life cycle” assessments to create tools and strategies to advance its program-based and institution-wide assessment efforts. As a result, the campus has developed one of the most extensive student assessment programs in the Northeast, and it continues its efforts to imbed assessment into the institutional culture.

Since its last self-study the campus has made progress with its assessment efforts, implementing additional components, engaging more individuals and departments, and improving its capacity to assess the quality of the student experience. In all these efforts, the campus has placed particular emphasis on building faculty capacity which, according to all research on the subject, is an essential part of any successful assessment program. The progress the campus has made in course, program and institution level assessment is described below.

Department and Program Assessment

Faculty, chairs and deans must first have a clear understanding of what the task of assessment entails and have the necessary tools available for conducting assessment. To accomplish this, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment (OAPA) developed a Program-Based Assessment Handbook to provide faculty and academic administrators with step-by-step information on assessment and examples of assessment activities they might implement. This Handbook has been widely disseminated on campus and is also available at the OAPA website (www.umass.edu/oapa/top_assessor).

The annual Senior Survey, another tool designed to support departmental self-assessment, collects information on students' learning experiences in their major; it also collects employment and graduate school outcomes. Graduating seniors are also invited, via open-ended questions, to make recommendations about how their department or major might be improved. With a 65% response rate, this survey assists departments in understanding strengths and weaknesses as perceived by their graduating students: the Economics Department, for example, revised its undergraduate advising program based upon Survey information; the Sociology Department is using Survey data to assess the impact of large classes on their students’ learning.

In addition to these tools, the University also provides individualized assistance to departments and schools/colleges. For example, OAPA conducts student focus groups and assessment workshops for interested departments. Both OAPA and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) help departments develop assessment strategies and survey instruments. The Isenberg School of Management is undertaking an extensive
assessments of learning outcomes among its seniors: the School is collecting portfolios of students' course work from a random sample of seniors and using them to assess its curriculum and methods in meeting intended learning outcomes. Other departments are exploring different methods for understanding their students' learning experiences better: the Biology Department has developed explicit, discipline-related learning outcomes and is reviewing its curriculum to determine where and how these outcomes can be addressed most effectively. The College of Engineering surveys recent graduates each year to assess how well their educations prepared them for the world of work.

The University has also developed a program review process called *Academic Quality Assessment and Development* (AQAD) that requires each department to engage in a self-study every seven years. It specifically asks each department to identify and assess its intended learning outcomes and to describe how assessment information it collects informs curricular reviews and other program elements. AQAD was launched shortly after the campus's re-accreditation five years ago; it is now more than halfway through a full cycle of program reviews. The procedures for AQAD reviews are available at: www.umass.edu/oapa/aqad_procedures.pdf

**General Education Assessment**

A basic component of general education assessment at the University of Massachusetts Amherst is the quadrennial review cycle for all courses designated as satisfying a general education requirement. Each year the Faculty Senate General Education Council reviews one-quarter of all general education courses to determine whether they meet the learning objectives established for the relevant general education designation (e.g., Analytic Reasoning, Social and Cultural Diversity). Two years ago, the Council began using an assessment scoring rubric in its review process to enhance consistency and ensure thoroughness.

A recent general education assessment activity focused on assessing third-year students' writing and critical thinking skills campus-wide. A faculty-staff Assessment Advisory Group developed this pilot project that involved a timed essay test administered to a sample of upper division students. It then compared the results with samples of students' in-class writing, course-based portfolios, and writing samples from freshman writing and writing-intensive general education courses. The project provided some insights into assessment strategies appropriate for a large and diverse campus, and information about this project is available on the OAPA website (www.umass.edu/oapa).

Another project involved faculty working as an interdisciplinary team to develop cross-disciplinary learning goals for required junior year writing courses. As part of its work, this group assessed samples of students' writing, using the emerging cross-disciplinary learning objectives, and refined those learning goals based on their findings. These objectives have been widely disseminated throughout the campus Writing Program, and a handbook the team compiled provides examples of how courses and assignments can address cross-disciplinary learning objectives.
In its effort to build faculty capacity for conducting program-based assessments, the campus has developed successful teaching communities with the support of its Center for Teaching. One such community, the Hewlett General Education Fellows, involved faculty members who teach large general education courses. They focused on ways to improve student learning in such courses and experimented with ways to assess learning outcomes, both in their individual courses and in the general education curriculum at large. From their efforts the assessment scoring rubric that is used by the General Education Council in its quadrennial course reviews (described earlier) was developed.

OAPA has also supported campus-wide assessment workshops in recent years. Both through workshops and teaching communities, as well as supporting faculty participation at assessment conferences, the campus is developing a cadre of faculty well informed about learning assessments.

**Campus-wide Teaching and Learning Assessment**

As noted by the NEASC Visiting Team five years ago, the University of Massachusetts Amherst has an extensive history of systematically collecting data on its students’ experience. In addition to data gathered by other offices, assessments are also included in the Project Pulse polling operation which collects data on the quality of a wide range of student experiences and student-focused services. Several new initiatives have been added in recent years, among them the National Study of Student Engagement (the NSSE Survey).

Since 2000, the campus has participated in the NSSE Survey, much of which focuses on students’ learning experiences (e.g., writing, critical thinking, undergraduate research). These results are disseminated widely and are used specifically by the newly formed Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education to inform their recommendations concerning curriculum and students’ overall campus experience. The results have confirmed success in some components of the undergraduate general education curriculum: students at the Amherst campus report more writing experience in their course work than students at comparable institutions; they also report more opportunities for learning about diverse cultures in their courses than students at other comparable institutions. The results also point to areas for improvement: Amherst campus seniors report fewer opportunities for capstone learning experiences than students elsewhere.

Finally, the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment has increased the visibility of assessment activities on campus by disseminating information widely. Twice yearly, the OAPA publishes a newsletter, Faculty Focus, which describes the efforts of faculty and departments involved in assessment activities. Copies of these newsletters are available at the OAPA website (www.umass.edu/oapa/top_assess).
3. University Library

*Increase support for collection development, for staffing, and for the physical facilities housing library and information resources in keeping with the institution’s Research I status.*

Campus plans to increase support for the University Library during the past five years have been profoundly undercut by the decline and then elimination of the state appropriation for the Board of Higher Education’s library budget, the line-item entitled *Educational and Reference Materials*. As a result, neither collection development nor staffing have increased. Because resources for physical facilities draw upon the capital budget rather than operations, some improvements in the Library facilities have been made, however.

In December 2001, the *ERM* appropriation that supports the twenty-nine public higher education libraries in Massachusetts was reduced from $14 million to $5 million. For the current year, FY 2004, the *ERM* appropriation was reduced to zero. Since Fiscal 2000, the University Library has lost $4.4 million in state appropriations. In response to this, the Amherst campus administration, despite unprecedented cuts in its state appropriation, has reallocated more support from general operating funds to the Library than to any other unit on the campus. Since December 2001, the administration has provided the Library with $3.5 million, enabling it to maintain current spending levels through the end of FY 2004. Support for the University Library has been—and will remain—one of the highest campus priorities, and the administration’s decision to expend scarce resources for this support has been met with widespread approval from both faculty and students.

Among the Library’s staff, these dire circumstances have prompted them to ask new questions and to challenge themselves to new thinking. Harnessing technology, creativity and innovative reallocation have allowed the Library staff to protect a strong core from which to eventually rebuild services, resources and staffing.

*Collection Development*

The goal of the University Library is to supply information for the campus and to do so using a combination of strategies that allow for the most effective use of resources. A restructuring of the acquisitions budget, prompted by the elimination of *ERM* support, has provided an opportunity to redefine collection building. Two major components of this restructuring are:

- *An active program for providing access to information resources that have not been physically acquired.* This includes: (a) subsidizing document delivery from CISTI (Canadian Institute for Scientific and Technical Information) for graduate students and faculty; (b) using RAPID (a group of fourteen research libraries around the country) to provide quick turn-around for requested journal articles; (c) implementing a server that provides internet retrieval for journal articles requested through Interlibrary Loan; and (d) supporting the Virtual Catalog, which allows users in Amherst to request books from the Boston Library...
Consortium collections and have the books delivered by UPS instead of the traditional, slower courier service.

- **An emphasis on building electronic full-text information collections.** Changing information technology and user-demand are driving a move to increase the availability of electronic full-text information resources. By participating in various consortial purchases, the University of Massachusetts Amherst libraries now have access to over 15,000 electronic journals and almost two hundred online databases in disciplines across the curriculum. In addition, the University of Massachusetts Amherst Libraries Digital Library ([www.library.umass.edu](http://www.library.umass.edu)) provides an evolving collection of internet resources, reference and instruction services, resource guides and other tools that Library staff have selected to help users find, evaluate and understand diverse scholarly information. This move to electronic collections removes barriers of time and geography for students and faculty alike.

**Staffing**

Although the Visiting Team for the Amherst campus’s comprehensive re-accreditation five years ago recommended increasing staffing for the University Library, staffing has, in fact, decreased. This is, of course, directly related to recent budget developments. The combination of early retirement programs and requirements to freeze open positions has resulted in a net loss of 28 positions of the permanent staff.

Yet, despite these reductions in staffing, the Library has managed to increase some of its service profile. This has been accomplished by consolidating service points and realigning staffing to allow for more targeted ways of serving Library users. These efforts have been facilitated by harnessing technology, by the increased use of digital resources and digital access.

Materials and service points in the W.E.B.Du Bois Library (the main library on campus) were relocated in 2002 to improve access, to streamline staff workflow, and to prepare for the anticipated renovation of the Library’s deck in 2004. Current periodicals, recent bound periodicals, music listening facilities and the government documents reference collection were among the collections and services moved. Reserve reading services for the Biological Sciences Library and the Physical Sciences and Engineering Library were merged into the W.E.B. Du Bois Library. The consolidation of the reserve services into one location increased the hours in which materials are now available to users, and these changes allow fewer staff to provide the required services.

As it faces the future, the Library will focus on areas of specialization and expertise as the campus profile for research is redrawn in response to changing circumstances. The Library will model itself carefully upon the campus’s new priorities and revised focus in order to be the best library possible.
Physical Facilities
Campus capital budgets and planning have been less adversely affected in recent years as
its operating budgets, several of the Library’s problems with its physical facilities,
described as a serious concern by the NEASC Visiting Team in 1999, are being
addressed. The Physical Sciences and Engineering Library is undergoing a major
renovation, rewiring and general refurbishment at a cost of over $800,000. It will
incorporate the biological sciences and be renamed the Integrated Sciences and
Engineering Library. The Library deck area, scheduled for replacement in 2004, will
involve $4.7 million in exterior work. A second phase of this project will repair interior
damage, replacing mechanical systems, adding sprinklers and upgrading the main floor
for an estimated additional cost of $4.4 million.

Other significant improvements to the Library’s physical facilities in recent years have
included the following:

• Fire Prevention Systems Upgrade: this major upgrade of fire detection and
  prevention systems in the W.E.B. Du Bois Library included the creation of a
  command center for fire response personnel, securing the lobby, stairwells and
  elevators, installation of smoke detectors and heat sensors on every floor, and
  improving warning systems for those with sight or hearing disabilities.

• Improved Accessibility: restrooms in the Du Bois Library were renovated for
  ADA compliance and handicapped parking spaces were created near the
  northwest corner of Du Bois Library.

• Music Library Reserve: with the opening of a music library reserve lab in the
  Fine Arts Center, critical services have been returned to the Music
  Department, providing listening stations and computer access to the Library’s
  catalog and databases.

• Additional Space: rental space in the Bunker relieves crowding at Du Bois?

• Reserve Reading Room Improvements: the Class of 2000 directed their Senior
  Gift to the refurnishing of the Library’s Reserve Reading Room.

• Wireless Computing: the campus Office of Information Technologies installed
  wireless computing capabilities on the main floor of the Du Bois Library and
  will do likewise in the renovated Integrated Sciences and Engineering Library.

Conclusion
The campus in general assumes that the Library will have the opportunity to rebuild in
coming years. It has maintained a core of staff expertise—staff losses having been more
numerous among para-professionals than among professional librarians—and its user
services remain strong. The shift towards utilizing more electronic materials, as well as
improved provisions for accessing materials from other libraries, has helped to ease the
impact of diminished acquisitions. The facility improvements currently underway or
being planned offer encouraging prospects for the future. Last but not least: the
University Library has expanded its private fundraising. Since the beginning of FY 1999,
the Library has received gifts from over 11,000 donors for a total value of nearly $1
million.
4. Physical Facilities

Address substantial deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs to assure the accomplishment of the institution’s mission and purposes.

Since its last self-study, the University of Massachusetts Amherst has expended nearly $140 million on new facilities, building renovations, infrastructure improvements, utility upgrades and improvements to the campus landscape. While much remains to be done for its aging facilities, the past five years have clearly shown the campus taking major steps to address deferred maintenance and infrastructure needs. They include:

**New Buildings and Additions: $65.6 million**
- **Animal Care Facility:** $7 million new building and associated renovations to meet current research needs and to comply with the latest regulations.
- **Computer Science Building:** $14 million new building for research and teaching.
- **Engineering Laboratory:** $25 million new building to house research in chemical and civil engineering.
- **Alfond Management Center:** $15 million addition to the Isenberg School of Management to provide classrooms, computer lab, offices and support space.
- **Fine Arts Center Lobby:** $2.4 million project that enclosed an exterior deck, creating a large lobby and reception space for the concert hall and theaters.
- **New Softball Field & Rudd Soccer Field:** $2.1 million construction that involved substantial infrastructure improvements.

**Building Renovations: $11.3 million**
- **Housing Facilities Renovations:** $7 million in the renewal and improvement of student dormitories, including carpeting, roofs and lighting upgrades.
- **Bezanson Recital Hall:** $1.2 million renovation of this teaching and performance space.
- **ISOM Auditorium 120:** $1.1 million renovation of a major teaching auditorium, including major upgrades to its teaching technology capacity.
- **Classroom Improvement Program:** $2 million improvements in lighting, computing and audio-visual capacity, flooring and furniture to classrooms across the campus.

**Building Infrastructure Improvements: $10 million**
Projects to improve facility infrastructures have been undertaken in more than ten major locations on campus. These include:
- Goessmann (mechanical renovations and electrical upgrades); Morrill (electrical upgrades); Physical Plant, Du Bois Library, Herter and
Lederle (fire protection systems); Campus Center Garage (structural repairs); McGuirk Stadium (structural repairs), Arnold, Fine Arts Center and Morrill (elevators).

Roof Replacements: $8 million
Nine building have had roof replacements:
Whitmore, French, Lederle, Chenowith, Curry Hicks, Thompson, Fine Arts Center, Holdsworth and Tobin.

Utility Infrastructure: $8 million
More than $8 million has been invested in steam line replacements. Work accomplished insures reliable heating for student residences and key academic facilities as well as increasing the system capacity to support new buildings. At each location where work was done, the opportunity was used to improve the adjacent campus landscape after new lines were installed.

Science Facilities Renovations: $4.9 million
Renovations were made in six major science laboratory locations:
Goessmann (chemistry), Morrill (geosciences), Lederle (biochemistry), Morrill (isotope laboratory), Morrill (biology), Cranberry Research Station.

Campus Beautification: $3 million
The campus has undertaken reconstruction projects that enhance its appearance. Two major projects—the Student Union Plaza renovation and the Fine Arts Center Plaza renovation—also involved infrastructure improvements, such as improved utility lines and public lighting.

Buildings Decommisioned
During the past five years four facilities have been either demolished, mothballed or partially closed. These include the Foundry Art Studio, the Old Chapel, the University Apartments Complex, and the third floor of Clark Hall.

Facilities Audit
Five years ago, the University of Massachusetts Amherst Self-Study briefly mentioned a new initiative, the Facilities Audit, a project in which, with the assistance of facilities consultants, the campus began an assessment database that archived deficiencies in the physical plant as well as the cost for correcting them. This set of data has been updated, again using external consultants, and it assists in the accurate estimating the cost of new work to be scheduled.

The success of the Facilities Audit has prompted the campus to expand its assessment of the physical plant. In 2003, the campus contracted with consultants to another major assessments, a space utilization study. This initiative is described below in the “Institution Effectiveness” section of this report.
Improved Design and Construction Procedures
Several legislative changes have been enacted over the past five years that serve to increase the efficiency of the design and construction process for major new projects and renovations/additions to existing facilities. Revisions to the designer selection process in 2000 now permit the design consultants involved in a feasibility study to continue as designers for the construction project. These changes have resulted in potential savings of time and money by eliminating transfers of background and design thinking from one firm to another, and by providing continuity in an inherently complex process.

Planned Facilities Improvements, 2004-2008

New Buildings: Planned major new construction include: a $63.5 million Integrated Sciences Building for teaching and research in the biological and chemical sciences, a $85 million central co-generation heating plant, and a $14 million Art building.

Because enrollments are expected to grow modestly over the next several years, additional student housing is also being planned. Over the next five years the campus plans to add about 2000 new student beds in apartment-style housing.

Renovations: The campus plans to renovate Skinner Hall at a cost of about $14 million to house the School of Nursing. There are also plans for major renovations in Morrill Science Center (microbiology laboratories), the Campus Center for teaching and research in Hospitality and Tourism Management, and Marcus Hall for the new Engineering Research Center, the latter supported by a major grant from the National Science Foundation. To support student life and services, major renovations are planned for the Berkshire Dining Hall and a new food court for the Campus Center.

Infrastructure Improvements: Over-taxed and obsolete building systems will be addressed in several locations: major planned projects include new electrical service, fire alarm systems, and fume-hood upgrades in Morrill Science Center, and building envelope restorations for Bartlett Hall, Goodell Building, the Campus Center and the Lederle Graduate Research Center. Elevator upgrades are scheduled in a number of other campus facilities. Work is also proceeding on a $2 million project to create a fiber-optic fire-alarm loop around the campus, a project that will greatly expand the system’s capacity, supporting new construction and renovation work being undertaken.

The campus has recently developed a $71 million energy services contract with Johnson Controls to reduce campus utility costs by more than $8 million per year over the twenty year term of the contract. The overall effort is comprised of 44 energy improvement projects that will include, among others, the replacement/retrofit of over 100,000 light fixture, the replacement of 5,000 plumbing fixtures with more water-conserving models, the replacement of six chillers and the upgrading of ventilation in several major buildings.
IV. Enhancing Institutional Effectiveness

The institution should assure that it assesses its effectiveness to verify and enhance the fulfillment of its mission. The assessment process requires the gathering and analysis of evidence of congruence between an institution's stated mission and the actual outcomes of its programs and activities. In order to inform its planning and resource allocations, an institution needs to determine how well and in what ways it is accomplishing its mission. Moreover, the institution needs documentary evidence to support assertions of quality made in its communications with its constituencies.

Performance Measurement System
As mandated by the state legislature five years ago, the Amherst campus has annually participated in a system-wide Report of Annual Indicators that assesses its institutional performance in response to ten broad objectives. These include: ensuring the quality of academic programs; promoting student access and affordability; recruiting well qualified students; promoting student success; pursuing research and creative activity; contributing to the economic development of the Commonwealth; supporting K-12 education programs; providing public policy research for the state and its communities; ensuring cost-effective use of resources; and maximizing private giving. The Report provides Trustees, legislators and the public with information by which they can assess the University of Massachusetts Amherst as compared to its peer institutions as well as its own past performance. (Peer institutions for the University of Massachusetts Amherst are described above; see Part I, section 1.) Because different campuses within the system have different missions, certain indicators have been identified for each, and for some indicators, such as service to the Commonwealth, the University system as a whole is assessed.

For Amherst, as the flagship campus, the academic indicators include the following: the academic profile of entering first year students; pass rates for licensure and certification examinations; research expenditures, federal research support, and national ranking in total research and development; doctorates awarded; national academy members and national faculty awards; and postdoctoral appointees.

For measuring student success and satisfaction, the Amherst campus criteria are: freshman one-year retention rate; freshman six year graduation rate; student assessments of their educations; alumni satisfaction; and student satisfaction with their major studies (senior survey).

For measuring the campus's financial health, the following indicators are reviewed: endowment and endowment per student; annual growth in endowment; private funds raised annually; operating margin and financial cushion; debt service to operation (ratio); and age of facilities.
A second, major part of performance measurement is a comprehensive assessment of all academic programs on campus. The Academic Quality Assessment and Development program, which satisfies that requirement, is described above (see Department and Program Assessment, Part I, section 2).

Post-Tenure Review
Prior to the inauguration of the Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty in 2000, there were two kinds of evaluations of faculty performance. Annual Faculty Reports that reviewed faculty performance in three mandatory categories (teaching, research and service) were completed by all faculty and reviewed each year by their department personnel committee, their department chair and their dean. This review system has the obvious limitation of reviewing only one year at a time. Within that time constraint it has worked very well for the campus, and it has a principal role in the post-tenure review process.

The most significant multi-year reviews of faculty performance traditionally occurred at the time of a major personnel actions, such as the awarding of tenure or promotion to full professor. Reviews at these times evaluated faculty members’ performances in the same mandatory categories, and the review covered the period from the most recent major personnel action—whether the person’s original hiring or the awarding of tenure or promotion. The review also included some longer-term assessments and expectations by colleagues and administrators about the individual’s continued professional development and performance. The limitation of this review process, however, was that, once faculty members became tenured full professors, there were no formal multi-year reviews of their performances or assessments concerning their goals.

The Periodic Multi-Year Review was negotiated with the faculty union to address this issue. By expanding the window of annual reviews into a longer-term overview of a faculty member’s interests, abilities and performance, this review can assist academic administrators in developing plans. Such periodic reviews can also provide timely interventions and assistance that can stimulate professional development, new initiatives, or other changes in direction that benefit both the faculty member and the institution. Except in circumstances clearly described in the faculty contract, the post-tenure review is conducted every seven years and, since its inception, 279 tenured faculty have participated in reviews.

Post-tenure reviews are based upon several principals. They should include both self-assessment and peer review as well as assessments by the department chair and the dean. They should include standards of evaluation that are fair and consistent with campus past practice. They should recognize that faculty interests and abilities may change over time, and that faculty may discharge their responsibilities to the institution in varied and changing ways.

The foundation of the post-tenure review program are brief statements submitted by faculty members that summarize activities during the period covered and plans for future teaching, research or service. They also submit a current curriculum vitae. The
department chair supplies all evaluations of the faculty member’s teaching performance during the previous six years as well as copies of the faculty member’s Annual Faculty Reports for the period.

This information is then reviewed by the department personnel committee, and a recommendation is made and sent to the dean. The review material may be accepted as is, accepted with comments, or the committee (or the dean) may request that it be revised. A recommendation to revise is made when the individual’s past performance or future goals suggest that a significant change is recommended in order to promote the individual’s progress at, or contributions to, the institution. (There is an appeals process for anyone dissatisfied with results of a review.) Requests for revisions may also include recommendations for institutional support for the faculty member. By contract, the campus sets aside a pool for supporting such faculty members each year. Opportunities for professional development may include, among other things: consultations with colleagues in problem areas; changes in departmental duties; new equipment; a summer grant; the design of a sabbatical leave; or a referral to the Center for Teaching.

Quality of Student Life
Project Pulse is a series of polls conducted weekly by the Student Assessment, Research and Evaluation Office (SAREO). For each survey, interviewers telephone a random sample of at least 400 students and administer a brief series of questions that asks them to evaluate their experiences with campus programs such as health services, academic advising, student housing or financial aid. Each year the Office of Information Technology uses this survey to collect information about students’ use of and satisfaction with campus computing services.

Originally founded in 1972 and housed within Student Affairs, SAREO now assesses a wider range of services and was moved to the School of Education. In 1999, NASPA, the national association for student affairs professionals, honored Project Pulse as “a national model for other institutions striving to provide...effective educational services to students.”

Facilities Condition & Utilization Analysis
The Office of Facilities Planning maintains an assessment database that archives documented facility deficiencies along with the cost for correcting each problem identified. Begun in 1996, this audit was updated in 1999 and continues to serve the campus well for accurate planning by identifying problems, their urgency and the cost for addressing them.

The success of the facilities audit program prompted the campus in 1999 to undertake a similar audit of its infrastructure. This audit inventories and assesses underground utilities (steam, water, sanitary and storm sewers and electrical systems) as well as roadways, sidewalks, parking lots, site lighting and general landscaping. In addition, the campus has recently developed with Johnson Controls a $71.6 million Energy Services Contract that involves over forty energy improvement projects that range from replacing
or retrofitting 100,000 light fixtures and 5,000 plumbing fixtures to upgrading ventilation systems and replacing chillers.

In 2003 the University engaged consultants to complete a space utilization study. This study, currently underway, will assess the space needs of all campus constituencies and compare this data with actual space occupied. The study will include a comprehensive classroom analysis along with a benchmarking study with peer institutions. Once completed, it will assist the campus administration in allocations of space and provide an opportunity for it to maximize the effectiveness of physical resources.

**Issues of Community**

Campus assessment initiatives also include investigations into the quality of the campus work climate. The campus is currently assessing responsiveness to issues of community, diversity and social justice. In 2002 teams of staff, faculty and students, representing the principal administrative units on campus, administered a survey and, combining the results with other information-gathering methods, are developing an overall assessment of the experiences and perceptions of students and employees. Issues of race, ethnicity, gender, class and sexual orientation were addressed in the study. The results are currently being analyzed and a report describing them and proposing strategies to address problems will be published later this year.
V. Summary Appraisal & Plans
## CIHE DATA FORM III
### STUDENT ADMISSIONS DATA (Fall Term)
Credit Seeking Students Only, Including Continuing Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Apps</td>
<td>19915</td>
<td>19499</td>
<td>18625</td>
<td>20449</td>
<td>16428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>13727</td>
<td>13127</td>
<td>13518</td>
<td>11783</td>
<td>13462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>4060</td>
<td>3731</td>
<td>4203</td>
<td>3335</td>
<td>4078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Indicator of Aptitude of Enrollees used by Institution (describe below)</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfers - Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Apps</td>
<td>3079</td>
<td>3142</td>
<td>3124</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>3039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Apps</td>
<td>3912</td>
<td>3687</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>4775</td>
<td>4914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>1252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Professional Degree - All Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Apps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doctoral Degree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Apps</td>
<td>4674</td>
<td>4855</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>5750</td>
<td>6332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of statistical indicator of aptitude of freshmen enrollees (average combined SAT, average rank in high school graduating class, etc.)

**AVERAGE COMBINED SAT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MONTH June Day 30th</td>
<td>$140,989.00</td>
<td>$147,527.00</td>
<td>$158,037.00</td>
<td>$175,791.00</td>
<td>$213,624.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>$219,914.00</td>
<td>$247,338.00</td>
<td>$220,659.00</td>
<td>$219,893.00</td>
<td>$175,809.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Appropriations</td>
<td>$84,017.00</td>
<td>$86,055.00</td>
<td>$91,931.00</td>
<td>$99,361.00</td>
<td>$102,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$21,417.00</td>
<td>$19,295.00</td>
<td>$21,868.00</td>
<td>$18,398.00</td>
<td>$22,401.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Gifts, Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$112,453.00</td>
<td>$99,334.00</td>
<td>$107,958.00</td>
<td>$94,180.00</td>
<td>$94,606.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$430.00</td>
<td>$280.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$222.00</td>
<td>$903.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>$602,349.00</td>
<td>$622,338.00</td>
<td>$620,879.00</td>
<td>$628,542.00</td>
<td>$630,433.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$169,726.00</td>
<td>$182,534.00</td>
<td>$177,910.00</td>
<td>$173,878.00</td>
<td>$178,815.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$68,783.00</td>
<td>$73,843.00</td>
<td>$81,020.00</td>
<td>$87,631.00</td>
<td>$97,376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>$19,186.00</td>
<td>$20,060.00</td>
<td>$19,623.00</td>
<td>$13,492.00</td>
<td>$14,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>$41,886.00</td>
<td>$45,914.00</td>
<td>$41,777.00</td>
<td>$38,611.00</td>
<td>$39,339.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$31,066.00</td>
<td>$39,766.00</td>
<td>$38,072.00</td>
<td>$34,145.00</td>
<td>$36,708.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>$41,559.00</td>
<td>$41,234.00</td>
<td>$36,173.00</td>
<td>$39,551.00</td>
<td>$38,664.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation, Maintenance of Plant</td>
<td>$38,911.00</td>
<td>$39,419.00</td>
<td>$40,768.00</td>
<td>$40,071.00</td>
<td>$38,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships &amp; Fellowships</td>
<td>$41,661.00</td>
<td>$43,598.00</td>
<td>$45,884.00</td>
<td>$46,179.00</td>
<td>$51,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>$11,315.00</td>
<td>$10,247.00</td>
<td>$16,312.00</td>
<td>$26,512.00</td>
<td>$29,137.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>$25,047.00</td>
<td>$34,145.00</td>
<td>$36,214.00</td>
<td>$29,832.00</td>
<td>$23,026.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$102,308.00</td>
<td>$84,456.00</td>
<td>$84,286.00</td>
<td>$85,673.00</td>
<td>$92,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$599,048.00</td>
<td>$615,216.00</td>
<td>$618,039.00</td>
<td>$615,575.00</td>
<td>$638,621.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Less Expenditures</td>
<td>$3,301.00</td>
<td>$7,122.00</td>
<td>$2,840.00</td>
<td>$12,967.00</td>
<td>($8,188.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Less Expenditures Not Incl Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>($99,007.00)</td>
<td>($77,334.00)</td>
<td>($81,446.00)</td>
<td>($72,706.00)</td>
<td>($100,753.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and Fees Charge for Full Time Undergraduate Student</td>
<td>$5,212.00</td>
<td>$5,212.00</td>
<td>$5,707.00</td>
<td>$6,482.00</td>
<td>$8,332.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CIHE DATA FORM V
### PROJECTED FINANCIAL, TUITION and ENROLLMENT DATA FOR NEXT THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Years</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Financial Data (000s omitted)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Revenues</td>
<td>$670,540</td>
<td>$679,096</td>
<td>$691,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Fund Expenditures (including Mandatory Transfers for Principal and Interest)</td>
<td>$644,517</td>
<td>$651,923</td>
<td>$663,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues less Expenditures</td>
<td>$26,023</td>
<td>$27,173</td>
<td>$28,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transfers</td>
<td>$25,337</td>
<td>$26,487</td>
<td>$27,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in Current Fund Balance</td>
<td>$686</td>
<td>$686</td>
<td>$686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Tuition and Fees Charge for Full-Time Student</strong></td>
<td>FY2005</td>
<td>FY2006</td>
<td>FY2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Tuition and Fees Charge for Full-Time Student</td>
<td>$9,732.00</td>
<td>$9,732.00</td>
<td>$10,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projected Enrollment - Fall Term</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Credit Seeking Students Only, including Continuing Education)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Headcount</td>
<td>17,410</td>
<td>17,615</td>
<td>17,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Headcount</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>1,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>18,925</td>
<td>19,150</td>
<td>19,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>18,070</td>
<td>18,290</td>
<td>18,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Headcount</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Headcount</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>3,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Headcount</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>5,590</td>
<td>5,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total FTE</td>
<td>4,270</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>4,270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>