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Strategic planning is an adaptive process, matching our capacities to what we see as our essential purpose. It can only succeed if that purpose rings true, and if those capacities are understood and nurtured. This document begins a campus conversation on both counts, and proposes a blueprint for our way forward — the manifest for our strategic planning.

I. VISION AND CONTEXT

Impact and Innovation: An Enduring Vision

Planning must begin with a vision. UMass Amherst is a great public research university, manifesting a vision that is true to the tenets of our founding, and one that still resonates with our many stakeholders. The Morrill Land Grant Act, our founding covenant, defined our mission as innovation in service to the public good and the consequent impact we have on society.

Impact — the demonstrated capacity to provide value to the society we serve — and innovation — the essential process by which that value is formed — are therefore the recurring themes in the development of public research universities. We are celebrating the sesquicentennial of the Morrill Land Grant Act and our founding. Although today passage of the Act is accepted as visionary, at the time the idea that academic research could assist the agricultural and mechanical arts was a radical notion that failed in its first launch, and was slow to catch on in many states. But over time the impact of the early Land Grant colleges became indiscernable. Eighty years later, as World War II concluded, the initial model was severely tested. The growth of the industrial economy, the demand for professional qualification in many fields, and the emergence of systematic federal support for research — not to mention the need to educate the GI Bill students — caused much soul-searching at public universities. But as the nation’s needs shifted, the Land Grant institutions innovated to meet them, producing the basic public research university model that still dominates today. A generation later, the maturation of the Baby Boom required another major adjustment, vastly expanding the teaching component of the public university mission and setting the stage for the delicate and difficult balancing of research and teaching.

Through the generations, then, creating impact for the public good through innovation has been our guiding vision. It remains so today. But what is required keep that vision fresh as we open another chapter in our development?

Renewing the Vision: Forging a New Model for Success

While celebrating 150 years of serving the public in exemplary fashion, we recognize that we, like society at large, face economic, demographic, and technological imperatives that demand innovative solutions. But one of the greatest challenges we face is that our basic organizing model — the convergence of immersive, residential undergraduate and graduate education in a rich research environment — may not be sustainable if it cannot adapt. That is a threat not only to us but to society as a whole.

There are many organizations devoted to higher education, with new variations springing up every day. Similarly, organizations of various kinds engage in basic and applied research, and technological advancements in information distribution and processing promise further to expand the playing field for teaching and research. But research universities do something special at the intersection of education and research. They bring together a group of scholars who infuse their teaching with the fresh perspectives of the researcher, who introduce their students to the important questions and emerging methods in their fields, and who multiply their personal impact by training the next generation of specialists and assembling teams essential for advancing the frontiers of knowledge. And public research universities add another dimension: they provide access to this rich educational environment to a broad spectrum of students at a relatively affordable cost.

This is what is at stake. By adapting once again, we will assure the continued success of the unique institution upon which society relies and which we value so highly.
Successful adaptation involves two challenges. First, we must become more effective at rallying public support for our institution and the impact that it makes. We must continue to make sure that the public understands and believes in what we do, and in that way continue to inspire their confidence. This is primarily the task of demonstrating value to those who hold a stake in our success.

Second, it is clear that we now operate in a new and much more challenging resource environment. With the country’s economy still reeling from the recent recession, state appropriations for higher education have continued to decline or have failed to keep pace with cost increases. This in turn has resulted in significant increases in tuition and fees. Universities are under increasing pressure to control costs and be more accountable. More minorities and first-generation college students are seeking higher education than ever before. Continuing education is becoming essential in today’s job market. At the same time, innovative educational “business” models such as free Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCs) are calling into question the value of our more expensive residential immersive model, particularly on a research campus.

Public flagship campuses like UMass Amherst, which can recruit in the national market, have turned to non-resident enrollment growth as a replacement source of revenue. In the residential education model this requires considerable capital outlay in expanding capacity (classrooms, residence halls, recreational facilities). In the absence of state funds for new construction or capital renewal, universities have looked to long-term debt in the bond market for construction and renovation. The resulting debt service adds to the operating expenses, requiring further fee increases. As both federal and state funding of research stagnates or (worse yet) declines, the cost of research, doctoral education and outreach also add to the student burden.

The business model for the flagship research university has frayed. Our second major challenge is therefore to knit it back together by changing our cost structure through innovations in pedagogy and the effective use of technology, and through other efforts to focus our resources and control costs.

With all this in mind, our way forward is clear, if not easy: we must renew our vision of creating impact for the public good through innovation by both demonstrating our value and developing a sustainable cost structure. And we must recognize the essential interdependence of these two tasks: the more successful we are at demonstrating value, the more likely it is that we will attract investment.

Putting Leadership at the Core of Vision

“Creating impact for the public good through innovation” is a sound and attractive purpose, but it does not by itself express our full vision. Scores of institutions share our general mission. Some are the original Land Grant institutions, others are public research universities that have grown up under that general model whether or not they enjoy the specific designation. But our vision has been and remains being not only effective in carrying out that mission, but also in demonstrating leadership in the process. We want to be, and be recognized as, an institution that is providing exceptional value and helping to define what value means today and tomorrow. What excites us is not just the work we do, but the opportunity to excel.

So fully stated, our vision might be “to demonstrate leadership in creating impact for the public good through innovation.” But at a time of tremendous change for public research universities, what exactly does that mean?

For many years the definition of a “leading public research university” was reasonably clear and fixed. The Association of American Universities (AAU) organized itself for the purpose of defining success in this realm, and its public members formed the de facto group of “leading public research universities.” But in recent years that clarity has begun to blur, for two reasons.

First, the substantial expansion of public research universities in the past thirty years has created something of a dilemma from the AAU perspective. AAU membership increasingly overlaps but does not define excellence. A number of very fine universities — UMass Amherst among them — match or exceed the profiles of AAU members in terms of traditional measures, yet are not members themselves. Moreover, given the intention of the AAU to expand membership slowly or not at all, the group of what we might call “member-equivalent non-members” seems likely to grow. At the same time, as institutions have evolved some AAU members have seen their profiles on the traditional measures erode. A few have exited the organization, but others remain.

This dilemma was acknowledged in the “Framework for Excellence,” which attempted to resolve it by articulating a goal of achieving an “AAU” profile in terms of
traditional measures, while bypassing the specific goal of AAU membership. This was quite sensible given the nature of the dilemma, but made for a somewhat ambiguous vision.

Second, however, the AAU notion of excellence is itself under stress and likely to shift. The external environment for higher education has changed considerably. The primary factors enumerated by the AAU — research funding, doctoral production, and faculty recognition by national organizations — obviously remain relevant, but increasingly are incomplete. Considerations of undergraduate success and broader societal impact, essential to the business model of public research universities, are either secondary or not considered in the AAU membership criteria at all.

At the same time, the traditional AAU model seems increasingly dated. The dramatic post-War expansion in federal research support — in terms of both dollars and the range of areas supported — reached an effective plateau some time ago. The few dozen institutions that rode that wave most aggressively have defined “leadership” in the AAU model. But with that period of expansion over, the dominance and perhaps even the relevance of a model based on broad-based research volume may need to be reconsidered. Those institutions that have built large and comprehensive research programs will now have to learn how to sustain strength in a much more constrained funding environment. Those that have been in the process of building their research strength — again, a large group of institutions that includes UMass Amherst — will need strategies that emphasize careful targeting of specific research opportunities vs. large-volume strength across the board. The leaders of today will surely look different tomorrow.

How should these considerations guide our planning? Certainly, the aspiration of UMass Amherst to be a leading public research university remains unchanged. But because a successful strategy to serve students and society will increasingly be the sine qua non for attracting the investment necessary to support the research mission, any forward-looking institution must think beyond today’s criteria for excellence.

Perhaps ironically, UMass Amherst may be well-positioned to adapt because in some ways we are not excessively defined by the old model. What will the “leading” public research universities of the next generation look like? That story is still unfolding, but it seems clear that they will be flexible, adaptive, and creative. In that environment, we may find opportunities that were elusive under the old terms of competition.

And we should keep in mind one other thing. All public research universities confront these challenges. For some, the transition may be even more unsettling than for us. Those that rode the crest of the post-war wave of federal research growth now have vast — and expensive — research enterprises to support. Those that expanded through enrollment-based state investment now face a reversal of fortune on many fronts. Those that sought to build both breadth and depth may now face very difficult choices.

Our specific planning goal must therefore be to lead in a new generation of public research universities. That will require a strong student success strategy and growing confidence in our ability to serve the Commonwealth and society at large. It will require a careful strategy to recognize emerging areas of research strength, and to focus investment accordingly. If we are successful in those efforts, there is no doubt that we will be recognized as a model in the coming years, and will take our place among tomorrow’s leaders.

Integration: The New Imperative

Impact and innovation are enduring components of our vision. But to achieve them going forward, we must apply the modern lessons of integration.

Integration is simply the recognition that we can achieve more when our purposes are aligned and our efforts and resources are coordinated. As a research university we are uniquely positioned to understand the power of successful integration. There is hardly a research problem or field of inquiry that has not been transformed in recent years by contributions of scholars from multiple perspectives. Whole new realms of knowledge have emerged at the intersections of what we once thought we understood. Intellectual integration of this kind not only makes our lives as scholars more rewarding, but it also makes our institution more competitive in the eyes of research sponsors. Going forward, then, if we are to “recognize emerging areas of research strength, and focus investment accordingly” we must identify and remove barriers to integration and support productive interactions among scholars.

More generally, however, we have come to see how integration affects performance across the board. Duplication of effort— or, worse yet, efforts that run at cross-purposes — squander resources at a time when our resource base is under severe stress. Lack of clari-
ty regarding the institution’s goals can dissipate effort just when focus is most needed. Working in isolation robs each of us of our chance to be part of a larger enterprise.

The strategic planning process can be very effective in promoting integration and overcoming isolation. First, it can help build a clear sense of what the community is trying to accomplish, and empower an institutional perspective at every level of the campus. Second, the planning process can bring focus to common problems and encourage collaborative solutions. Finally, it can help us understand where our resources are deployed and therefore suggest opportunities for deriving greater value from them.

Just as with interdisciplinarity, integration in services and processes does not mean doing everything the same, or quashing initiative. Quite the contrary, when we understand the bigger picture we see new possibilities, and we can apply our individual creativity confident that we are contributing as part of a group with shared purpose.

Perhaps most important, however, constructive integration signals that we are an organization that deserves respect and investment. When we are confident that our resources and efforts are effectively employed, that confidence comes through to legislators, donors, and funding agencies.

So to our enduring heritage of impact through innovation we can now add integration, the hallmark of a successful public research university in the years ahead. It should not only guide our planning, but be evident throughout our plan.

**Taking the Next Steps**

What, then, are the characteristics of a leading public research university in the coming decades?

- An outstanding faculty engaged not only in advancing knowledge and graduate education but equally devoted to teaching undergraduates at the cutting edge using the latest technology and pedagogy;
- An outstanding faculty engaged not only in basic research, but also in translating its results for the benefit of society;
- A compact with the local, state, and federal governments for a share of support commensurate with our demonstrated benefit to the public;
- A flexible and “learning” organization committed to innovation, effectiveness, and accountability;
- A cost of attendance to students commensurate with the value we add to both their learning experience and their success in the job market; and
- Loyal alumni and employer communities which, as a direct result of value received, invest in our continued success.

These are the vision and goals around which the planning process is organized, and by which we will measure our success. It will obviously require our full effort, but the prize is worth it. By meeting these challenges we will help to secure for the next generation the marvelous enterprise we inherited. Our legacy will be a public research university well-adapted to the environment in which it will operate.
II. KEY PLANNING CHALLENGES

Preliminary discussions have established an initial statement of key planning foci around which four principal committees would be organized. For the first three, the challenges center on impact: demonstrating the value of what we do.

To us, the value of what we do may seem self-evident. But to students and their families, funding agencies, policy makers, employers, donors, and other key groups on whom we rely confidence in the apparent value of what we do has been eroding for some time. As we engage in our strategic planning process, we need to refine, reassert, and reinforce our value as a university in the public interest and rededicate ourselves to the public good. We must challenge the perception of being self-absorbed.

As the cost of attendance has increased, students and families have become more insistent on seeing an appropriate return on their investment. Policy makers, faced with impossible choices for the use of tax dollars, seek to protect their own investment and also to advocate on behalf of families. Funding agencies face their own difficult choices, and need to satisfy both themselves and their appropriating authorities that expenditures on university research can be justified in the face of other societal needs. Donors need to know that their dollars will advance the causes important to them.

Pursuit of vague notions of prestige, which drive up the cost of running the university, must be weighed against the direct benefit to those who are footing the bill. Ultimately, we will have to justify clearly the added value of the immersive residential education on a research university campus against the added cost.

It is likely that the future of postsecondary education in this country will consist of an even broader range of options than currently available: from narrow technical credentials earned cheaply through free online courses to immersive, multifaceted learning experience in close interaction with learned scholars and teams of peers earned at considerable cost. Public research universities will be challenged to convince the public to invest in maintaining their full range of activities in order to keep the immersive experience affordable to a large segment of society.

So, with competition for tax and tuition dollars tightening, we must be more effective in demonstrating why we are a sound investment. Granting agencies, governments, and students face many choices, and they will place their bets on institutions that are most responsive to their needs. This leads to some important questions that our plan must answer.

Two Overarching Issues

Two important perspectives must pervade the work of the planning process:

- The first is diversity, inclusion and access. Every substantive discussion, from advising to workforce development to resource investment must consider and address both our institutional values and society’s expectations in these areas. Diversity strategies will therefore need to be considered in the work of all planning groups and reflected where appropriate throughout the plan.

- Given the centrality of effective resource utilization to our strategy, it is expected that every group will do its work in that context. While one major challenge focuses on larger institutional resource questions, that perspective must also be reflected across consideration of substantive topics.

Focus 1: Student Learning Experience and Student Success

It is true that the delivery system for higher education is undergoing a revolution of sorts, blending online platforms and self-directed and self-paced learning. In that sense, our traditional classroom-based approach is severely challenged. It is also true, however, that what makes us attractive is a highly immersive residential educational experience that combines educational, social, and developmental opportunities for students. Public research universities are destinations, not just educational delivery systems. Without that character, we would literally be out of business.

It does not seem likely that the idea of “going away to college” is going to disappear, nor that young people will lose their appetite for an immersive educational experience. The question, however, is who will be in a position to enjoy that experience, and what institutions will be providing it. Some observers see the current residential university model as fading in importance, becoming a niche for the wealthy while those of average means shift toward lower cost and more flexible educational options.
## Destination of Choice

The relevant question is therefore how to offer a *competitive* immersive residential experience. In part that depends upon our success in focusing resources and containing costs, but perhaps in larger part on our success in providing the kind of experience that will make us a destination of choice for students. In that sense the following will be critical:

1. **Providing a successful path to completion.** Increasingly, students are looking for assurance that their choice of a college will work for them from admission to graduation and beyond. How can we help them make timely progress, in a program of their choice, with access to courses when and as needed? How can we support their progress through advising and other services, and to position them well for employment or additional study?

2. **Providing value in the curriculum.** While cost control is essential, it must remain the servant of quality. The evidence is clear that price is not everything, and that low cost will not necessarily trump quality for many students. Families continue to make significant financial sacrifices to secure what they believe to be a “better” experience. As competition among residential universities increases, how can we come to be seen as a more responsive, interesting, and distinctive institution?

   a. **Curricular Innovation.** While it may not be that “MOOCs,” self-paced learning, real-time online feedback, and other emerging educational innovations will replace the immersive residential experience entirely, these kinds of approaches have powerful implications for how education is delivered. How can we incorporate new approaches into our model, and help to bring down our cost profile in responsible ways? How can we integrate educational innovations into our own offerings?

   b. **Providing a rich choice of opportunities.** As the price of education rises, student expectations rise with it. This means that they expect access to a variety of amenities and experiences. But it also means that they want engaging teaching, access to faculty, and distinctive opportunities like study abroad and community service. They are also likely to be increasingly interested in educational “extras” that provide additional value for their money: “4+1” graduate programs, certificates (especially credentials with career relevance), meaningful internship experiences, leadership opportunities, and the like. They also clearly value appropriate flexibility, for example blended experiences that marry some online study with face-to-face experiences.

   c. **Undergraduate research.** All of the above, of course, could apply in varying degree to any undergraduate institution. But we are a research university. We say that the public research university offers something special, something that sets us apart. What is that “something,” and what is its relevance to what students are looking for? How can our research mission enhance our undergraduate competitive edge?

Currently, we talk about the unique advantage of studying with a research-active faculty member. We highlight the opportunity for undergraduates to participate directly in faculty-led research. We emphasize the rapidity with which new knowledge can find its way to the curriculum at a research university. All of this is true, and all of it is important.

But are we making the most of this potential? To what extent are research-active faculty engaged in the undergraduate classroom? Roughly one-third of undergraduates report participating in some research project with a faculty member, but could that experience be more widely shared, or more effectively integrated into a student’s education? To what extent do undergraduate courses actually reflect the expansion of knowledge? How can graduate students better serve as role models and guides?

   d. **Career Development.** Research universities have career preparation as only one element of their mission, but it is an important element. It is widely acknowledged that effective college-level preparation is the prerequisite for success in a growing range of careers. As a research university, we tend to focus more on broad preparation than on vocational skills, but our objective is nonetheless to prepare students for productive lives and lifelong learning.

One question for us is how to demonstrate effectiveness in producing the kinds of educated graduates that our mission promises. In recent years the Association of American Colleges and
Universities (AAC&U) has worked closely with employers to identify the appropriate intersection between liberal education and workforce needs. The AAC&U has identified learning outcomes and “high impact” educational practices that support success in preparing students for rewarding and productive careers and that provide a sound framework for satisfying employer expectations.

One opportunity for us, then, is to improve our alignment with the AAC&U framework. Our recent reform of General Education drew heavily from that framework, as did the implementation of the new Integrative Experience requirement. But what about other aspects of the undergraduate curriculum? The AAC&U approach also emphasizes authentic assessments of student learning (i.e. evidence that students can apply their learning to complex problems and real-world challenges). What is our capacity to undertake such assessments in ways that will be meaningful not only to ourselves but to employers and other stakeholders?

**Focus 2: Research Foci and Funding**

The imperative to provide value to research sponsors is part of our DNA. By definition, a successful grant proposal is one that has risen to the top in a competitive peer-review process. But we make decisions every day about the nature and direction of our research efforts, and those choices are opportunities to increase the value we provide to sponsors.

1. **Federal Agencies.** As the competition for federal research dollars becomes increasingly intense, we will need to work even harder to demonstrate alignment with agency priorities. It seems clear that these priorities will continue to stress interdisciplinarity and large multi-investigator groups, often assembled across institutions. This campus has had some striking success along these lines, but what will it take to expand that success? How does the array and size of doctoral programs affect research competitiveness? What steps can individual investigators take to associate themselves with competitive teams? What actions can the institution take to support those efforts?

2. **Business and Industry.** While less important in sheer dollar volume than federal agencies, research support from business and industry is nonetheless an essential component in supporting our research mission, and in some disciplines represents a particularly important piece. Support from business and industry can also signal success in translating academic research into forms with demonstrable practical impact, which has value of its own. This campus has made a major commitment to strengthening research partnerships with business and industry through the UMass Innovation Institute (UMII). How quickly and broadly can we build on that foundation? What current successes provide models for the future? What new areas have untapped potential for industry support? What opportunities exist to leverage federal funding with industry support, and vice versa? What are the emerging industry needs for graduate education, especially at the Master’s level?

3. **Society at Large.** Although sponsored activity is of great importance, our value and our impact extend well beyond those projects. How can we demonstrate the importance of research and graduate education in building social and cultural capital, and in opening up new areas of inquiry? How can we demonstrate the “value” of our values, and of the scholarly and creative work for which there may not be direct paying customers?

**Focus 3: Benefit to the Commonwealth and Beyond**

Our public subsidy has eroded in recent years, but it is still essential. Perhaps more important, as an organization with a mission to serve the public good we must always be capable of demonstrating our success. Showing our impact in the Commonwealth and beyond is therefore part of our own vision.

1. **Accountability.** Taxpayers, students and families, employers, policy makers and others are interested in the details of what we do, but there is also a hunger to tie it all together and show how the parts contribute to the whole. The interest is intense: over the past few years a cottage industry has emerged in various rankings, ratings, benchmarks, dashboards, and other attempts to summarize the value of higher education. This interest reflects the importance of what we do, of course, but also the growing demand for return on investment.

There is no easy way to sum up what a public research university does, and often little agreement on what constitutes “value.” Much of the data that
One of the most important societal roles of the public research university is appropriately aligning our mission and emerging workforce needs. Many of the careers at the cutting edge of economic growth require preparation in emerging methods, perspectives, and areas of knowledge. These are areas of unique strength for public research universities. For example, expanding the pipeline in the STEM disciplines is a key state priority in which we play an important role. Anticipating and modeling the growing importance of graduate training in the new economy provides another example. What trends in workforce needs should be incorporated into our planning? What specific needs represent a good match with our mission? What kinds of feedback and information can make us confident in our understanding, and capable of demonstrating value?

3. Federal Perspectives.

It is clear that the constituency in Congress for supporting university-based research has shifted and in some ways eroded over time. While the growth of competing claims for federal tax dollars has contributed to this, there has been evidence for some time that members of Congress and other federal policy makers are not fully convinced that they receive adequate return on their investment. This is not, of course, an issue over which any single institution has control. But all research universities must do what they can to demonstrate the utility of university-based research, so that the pool of funds from which we all benefit can be sustained or expanded. The AAU, APLU, and other organizations are deeply engaged in this effort. Globally, a new focus on the social benefits of research is emerging. The question for us is how we can contribute to those efforts. How can we demonstrate the societal benefit of our research both in terms of what we do and how we do it? Moreover, if our plan is to be a leading institution in the evolving world of public research universities, how can this institution play a meaningful role in the larger debate?

Focus 4: Balanced and Sustainable Resource Strategy

The mission of the public research university is unique, but it comes with a high cost. The commitment to research roughly doubles the cost of instruction compared with non-research universities. In addition,
the research enterprise carries substantial capital, infrastructure, technology, staffing and other costs that are only partially recovered through grant and contract payments.

For much of the past half century this high-cost model was sustained from two major sources: allocation of state tax dollars and expanding federal support for university research. But extraordinary pressure on discretionary spending at both the federal and state levels has undermined the viability of this model at both ends. Long-term obligations for health care, pensions, debt payments and other non-discretionary spending at all levels of government strongly suggest that the model that carried us to this point cannot carry us into the future.

The question is therefore clear: what can we do differently, in terms of both resources and expenditures, to maintain the viability of the public research university model?

**Expanding Revenues**

Faced with declining direct tax support, all public universities have adopted strategies to expand revenues from other sources. This campus has been creative and effective in finding new revenue sources, from expanded CPE offerings to increased out-of-state enrollment to growing net graduate student revenue. By far the largest new source, however, has been increased revenue from undergraduate fees. These increases have only partially offset losses in state tax support, but they have already tested the limits of what is feasible.

Finding alternate revenue sources will remain important, but cannot be our chief strategy for responding to losses of state support. In our planning, we must look realistically at the potential for additional revenue expansion. What have we learned from revenue enhancement strategies implemented over the past three years? What is a plausible revenue strategy going forward, consistent with other planning goals?

**Focusing Resources**

Impact is a function not only of how much we can spend, but also of how effectively we spend it. The tighter the fiscal environment, the greater the need to be sure investments are focused in the areas of highest impact. In expansionary times we were able to take an expansive view of what research questions to pursue and what curricular options to offer. That process produced many innovations. In a less expansionary (if not outright recessional) time the challenge is to examine critically our choices for building on innovation, and to invest in those with the greatest prospect for success.

An important task is to examine our current pattern of investment from multiple perspectives. The Provost’s Office has already launched comprehensive reviews in the areas of research and graduate education, undergraduate education, and resource utilization. These and other reviews will help us answer several questions: What are we doing well? Where can we see opportunities to put resources to more productive use? Where can we derive impact through investments that advance multiple goals? A similar approach will be necessary in areas outside Academic Affairs.

**Containing Costs**

Expanding revenue and sharpening our focus are essential, but inadequate by themselves. To maximize our ability to invest in innovation, we need to reduce where possible our cost structure. The more successful we are in that effort, the greater the flexibility we will have to support new ideas.

It is always difficult to talk about controlling costs, especially when one is in a third or fourth cycle of cost-cutting. But our emphasis should be on finding new ways to do things, not on spreading resources ever more thinly over what we have done before.

What new technologies and practices can release us from costly administrative and overhead tasks? How can we take advantage of methods pioneered at other institutions or in other industries to reduce our operating costs? Where can we find partners with common needs and interests with whom we can share resources and costs? Many efforts along these lines have been put in place in response to earlier budget reductions. The question now is how to adopt a more strategic and comprehensive view that will position us for the long term.

**Facilities Master Plan**

As part of our fifth-year interim report for NEASC we are required to report on our progress in “developing a facilities master plan and priorities for addressing deferred maintenance.” This follows from the institutional self-study in 2009, which detailed both the growth of deferred maintenance on campus and the increasing reliance on campus-financed borrowing to meet pressing facilities needs.
This remains an area of concern, but also one in which much is in motion. Significant state capital investment has returned after a long dry period, but the campus is reaching the limit of its borrowing power. Many important choices will be made in an uncertain resource environment.

Because facilities issues are so central to the campus's financial and programmatic strategies, the strategic plan must incorporate our facilities strategy into the larger context. What programmatic and other goals should drive capital and renovation priorities? What are plausible financial scenarios, and how might priorities shift under different assumptions?

Since the 2009 self-study the campus has adopted its first comprehensive campus master plan in decades. It analyzed capacity, land use, and campus systems, and laid the foundation for informed discussion of growth and development. The master plan is an important resource for the strategic planning process, and gives a head start on thinking about how to better integrate programmatic and facilities planning.

**Technology and Other Infrastructure**

The campus's physical infrastructure — from power generation to steam lines to information networks — supports all other activities. Yet it faces the same challenges of deferred maintenance as buildings and streets, as well as relentless demands from users for greater capacity and functionality. Effective use of technology is critical to both our ability to deliver value and our capacity to control costs. How do we understand critical infrastructure needs and their relationship to other goals? What are appropriate financing strategies for infrastructure priorities? How can technology support strategic cost containment?
III. THE PLANNING PROCESS

Through this planning process the campus is aiming to accomplish several purposes:

• “Developing a strategic plan that sets overall institutional priorities” as requested by our accreditors, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), in conjunction with our fifth-year interim report (see Appendix A);
• Incorporating into that plan strategies for addressing facilities needs, achieving a “balanced and sustainable operating budget,” and “implementing a strategic enrollment plan,” also requested by NEASC as part of the fifth-year interim report (see Appendix A);
• Engaging the campus and our broader community in a collaborative discussion of our situation and prospects, so that the plan reflects our best thinking and earns broad support;
• Laying a foundation for decision making at all levels of the institution to guide action in the years ahead.

This is an ambitious set of undertakings that will require concerted effort over a significant period of time. While we must make our report to NEASC no later than August 15, 2013 (and which, for practical purposes, we must therefore have in final draft form by the end of the spring semester), the development and implementation of the plan will surely continue beyond that date.

To ensure a productive process for all involved, it is therefore important to lay out the milestones of the process, both looking forward to subsequent action, and working backward from the completion of a final draft for NEASC.

The report for NEASC will need to include at least the following:
1. The statement of institutional vision guiding the plan.
2. A discussion of relevant context driving the choices we face in achieving that vision.
3. Articulation of the key objectives, and the challenges to be addressed in achieving them.
4. Translation of those challenges into action:
   • Understanding where we are: adaptive changes already in play.
   • Documenting where we will be: changes in the pipeline with impact soon to be seen.
   • Charting what remains to be done: short-, medium- and long-term actions needed to close the gap between where we are and where we wish to be.
5. Mapping out of initial priorities, trade-offs and sequencing for those actions.

The final draft will obviously not answer every question nor identify every action for the campus moving forward. But it must be comprehensive enough to provide a clear statement of and rationale for institutional priorities, and specific enough to guide action, both in terms of what we will do and won’t do, what needs to come first and what we are building toward. The easiest test of success is this: any member of the campus or stakeholder communities should be able to pick up the plan and come away with a clear understanding of the situation we are in, the course we have set, our progress to date, and the changes that we are putting into motion.

This document will be our working hypothesis, subject to refinement and revision as implementation rolls out. It will create the context within which schools and colleges, departments and administrative units do their own planning, and align their activities with the overall campus strategy. It will establish the terms by which we measure our own progress and be held accountable by our stakeholders.

To reach the milestone of a final draft by May 15 we will need a very clear process and assignment of responsibility. Because we are committed to making this a collaborative process, the campus administration and the Faculty Senate Rules Committee have jointly established a general framework for the planning process:

• Overall responsibility for guiding strategic planning resides with the campus administration, in consultation with the Rules Committee. It is understood that specific actions emanating from the planning process will be subject to normal governance policies and procedures.

• The planning process itself will be organized and overseen by the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO), created by the campus in Faculty Senate Doc. No. 13-004 (see Appendix A) as approved on September 13, 2012.

• In order to address the broad range of topics necessary, it is proposed that four major committees of JTFSO be formed: Student Learning Experience and Student Success; Research Foci and Funding; Benefit to the Commonwealth and Beyond; and Balanced and Sustainable Resource
Strategy. Initial topics for those committees (and any subcommittees they may form) appear in Section II. The chairs of the four committees will also serve on JTFSO.

- To be effective, the process must serve as the common sounding board and coordinator of the campus’s planning efforts. In addition, because of the pressures of time — but especially because of the collaborative nature of the process — wherever possible existing groups working on the challenges identified through the planning process should be recruited to the task of developing the plan. These might be existing Faculty Senate councils and committees, administrative coordinating groups, or others.

As noted above, two overarching issues need to be addressed across all the planning groups: diversity, inclusion and access. JTFSO has established the following approach for ensuring that these issues will be fully and effectively addressed.

**Diversity, Inclusion and Access.** JTFSO has established a special working group to consider how issues of diversity, inclusion and access might be expressed in the various topics, and to suggest to JTFSO and the planning groups relevant questions to be considered. The working group will be drawn from the broad campus community, including the membership of existing campus groups charged with addressing diversity from various perspectives.

**Resources.** The Balanced and Sustainable Resource Strategy planning committee will be asked to take the general topics of expanding revenue, focusing resources, and controlling costs, and suggest guidelines for how these can be applied to the work of the topical groups.

In both cases, JTFSO will exercise ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the overarching issues receive full consideration and are appropriately reflected in the strategic plan.

**JTFSO and the Planning Groups**

Because much of the work of the process will take place in the four planning groups, it will be important for JTFSO to provide overall coordination as the process unfolds. Table 1 provides a general outline of how JTFSO and the four committees will interact.

### Table 1. JTFSO Interactions with the Four Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JTFSO</th>
<th>Review and refine Vision</th>
<th>Form and charge four committees (JTFSO)</th>
<th>Review committee work; adjust as necessary</th>
<th>Review committee work; adjust as necessary</th>
<th>Cross-fertilize from committee work</th>
<th>Prioritize and sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four Committees</td>
<td>Develop workplans</td>
<td>Review and refine charge</td>
<td>Assign topics &amp; questions to existing groups; Form and charge new groups as needed</td>
<td>Inventory progress already underway (“What we are doing now,” Appendix C.)</td>
<td>Inventory changes in the pipeline (“What we are planning,” Appendix C.)</td>
<td>Establish needed short-, medium- and long-term actions (“What comes next,” Appendix C.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**General Format**

The process will involve multiple groups working across topics that often intersect, and with three time perspectives: what we are doing now, what changes we have in the pipeline, and what needs to happen next. And for each current or prospective action it will be important to articulate why we are doing it, what the specific action is, who is responsible for it, and when we see it occurring. During the process it will be important to find a way to allow participants to see how the different groups are working; at the end of the day, all these different ideas will need to be knit together into a coherent statement of campus strategy. It's a lot to keep track of.

As a general format, then, JTFSO is asking the planning groups to think in terms of the why, what, who and when questions: tying ideas specifically to the stated planning challenges; being clear about what is being described or proposed; assigning clear responsibility; and addressing questions of timing and sequence. Appendix B illustrates how this would work for each of the three timeframes, with some examples.

As the process unfolds JTFSO will work with the committees to refine the template and organize ideas for the draft of the plan.
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NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS & COLLEGES, INC.
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

April 14, 2010

Dr. Robert C. Holub
Chancellor
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Room 374 Whitmore Building
Amherst, MA 01003-9313

Dear Chancellor Holub:

I am pleased to inform you that at its meeting on March 4, 2010, the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education took the following action with respect to University of Massachusetts Amherst:

that University of Massachusetts Amherst be continued in accreditation;

that distance education programming be encompassed within the University’s accreditation;

that the University submit an interim report for consideration in Fall 2013;

that, in addition to the information included in all interim reports, the University give emphasis to its success in:

1. developing a strategic plan that sets overall institutional priorities;

2. developing a facilities master plan and priorities for addressing deferred maintenance;

3. implementing the new general education program, following a four-credit plan, ensuring that quality is sustained and that student learning is in concert with the stated learning outcomes;

4. implementing a strategic enrollment plan which includes a focus on the institution’s goals for retention and graduation of ALANA students and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds;

5. achieving a balanced and sustainable operating budget;
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that the next comprehensive evaluation be scheduled for Fall 2018.

The Commission gives the following reasons for its action.

University of Massachusetts Amherst is continued in accreditation because the Commission finds the institution to be substantially in compliance with the Standards for Accreditation.

We commend the University for the quality of its academic programs, its commitment to excellence, its pragmatic approach to the current fiscal challenges, and the energy and effectiveness of its faculty and staff. We take further positive note of the professional operation in all divisions, the clarity and broadly understood nature of the University's land-grant/flagship mission, the investments being made in assessment, and the institution's persistence in pursuing broad-based strategic planning. We are gratified to note the helpful summaries of assessment of student learning outcomes, the use of those assessments, and the indicators of student success in the E and S forms.

Like all institutions of its size and complexity, University of Massachusetts Amherst is addressing multiple problems and challenges simultaneously while wrestling with a corrosive financial environment which retards progress and, in some key areas, has caused backward movement, as with the decline in the number of full-time faculty and sustained deferred maintenance issues. The University is lauded for its effort to maintain momentum and undertake significant change in such deeply challenging circumstances. Future progress depends significantly on improving financial conditions and the level of commitment from the Commonwealth to give meaning to the institution's assigned mission as the state's public flagship university.

The University is approved to have distance education included within its accreditation because the Commission finds that these programs are designed and delivered at a level of quality meeting the expectations of the institution and the Commission. We are gratified to note that the University's Faculty Senate initiative requires that all distance learning be subject to the same academic standards as on-campus academic programs.

Commission policy requires a fifth-year interim report of all institutions on a decennial evaluation cycle. At the request of the institution, the comprehensive evaluation was delayed one year; hence, the interim report will be due in Fall 2013. Its purpose is to provide the Commission an opportunity to appraise the institution's current status in keeping with the policy on Periodic Review. In addition to the information included in all fifth-year reports, the University is asked, in Fall 2013, to report on five matters related to our standards on Planning and Evaluation, Physical and Technological Resources, The Academic Program, Students and Financial Resources.

We are gratified to learn that the University has placed a high priority on the development of a strategic plan and concur with the team that the Framework for Excellence serves as a useful basis for such a plan. The working priorities are consistent with the findings of the institution's self-study and the team report, including returning the size of the faculty to the level it attained 15 years ago; addressing facilities issues, particularly laboratory and classroom space; and stabilizing financial resources and generating new sources of revenue. We take favorable note of the involvement of the operating units in developing plans consonant with the overall directions established by the Framework. The interim report will afford the institution an opportunity to update the Commission on its success in strategic planning. We concur with the team's observation about the importance of an inclusive process among the administration, Faculty Senate and other stakeholder groups, consistent with our standard on Planning and Evaluation:
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Planning and evaluation are systematic, comprehensive, broad-based, integrated, and appropriate to the institution. They involve the participation of individuals and groups responsible for the achievement of institutional purposes (2.1).

We note that the condition of the campus facilities, cited as a concern in the Commission’s 1999 letter to Chancellor Scott, remains a significant issue for the University and, in the words of the Framework for Excellence, "perhaps its greatest challenge." More than half of the University’s buildings are more than 40 years old, and estimates of deferred maintenance needs are in the $2 billion range. Also, state funding for a new academic and classroom building has been delayed, leading to a search for alternatives. The lack of a facilities master plan has left the campus with, in the words of the team, "visible stigmata." Through the interim report we look forward to learning of the University’s success in developing a facilities plan that is realistic for the times. Our standard on Physical and Technological Resources includes:

The institution undertakes physical resource planning linked to academic and student services, support functions, and financial planning. It determines the adequacy of existing physical and technological resources and identifies and plans the specified resolution of deferred maintenance needs. Space planning occurs on a regular basis as part of physical resource evaluation and planning, and is consistent with the mission and purposes of the institution (8.4).

The University has developed a new General Education program, a central feature of which is moving from a three- to a four-credit basis for courses in the program. We note that the plan provides for an expanded award of credit without additional class time, and we share the concern of the team that the change be carefully monitored so that academic quality is not diluted and that student learning in each class increases in proportion to the credits awarded. Our standard on The Academic Program specifies, “Credit awards are consistent with the course content, appropriate to the field of study, and reflect the level and amount of student learning” (4.33). We have enclosed our Statement on Credits and Degrees, which is relevant to this matter. As the program is implemented we also look forward to learning of the institution’s success in assessing the learning outcomes of students:

The general education requirement is coherent and substantive. It embodies the institution’s definition of an educated person and prepares students for the world in which they will live. The requirement informs the design of all general education courses, and provides criteria for its evaluation, including the assessment of what students learn (4.15).

Graduates successfully completing an undergraduate program demonstrate competence in written and oral communication in English; the ability for scientific and quantitative reasoning, for critical analysis and logical thinking; and the capability for continuing learning, including the skills of information literacy. They also demonstrate knowledge and understanding of scientific, historical, and social phenomena, and a knowledge and appreciation of the aesthetic and ethical dimensions of humankind (4.18).

The University has had considerable recent success in matters pertinent to undergraduate enrollment: applications rose 64 percent from 2004 to 2009, the student profile of qualifications has improved, and ALANA representation has increased by 20 percent during that period. We take favorable note of the University’s success in increasing retention and graduation rates from 81 percent in 1998 to 86 percent in 2007 and from 62 percent in 1998 to 69 percent for Fall 2002 respectively. However, we note that the yield of out-of-state students has declined from 21 percent to 11 percent, and also that the six-year graduation rate for ALANA students is nearly ten percent lower than for majority students. The interim report will provide the Univer-
sity with the opportunity to report on its success in increasing the yield of out-of-state students and of its newly designed academic and support programs to address the gap in success measures between majority students and ALANA and economically disadvantaged students. Our standard on Students is relevant here:

Consistent with its mission, the institution enrolls a student body that is broadly representative of the population the institution wishes to serve (6.1).

Rates of retention and graduation are separately determined for any group that the institution specifically recruits, and those rates are used in evaluating the success of specialized recruitment and the services and opportunities provided for the recruited students (6.6).

As with public universities in general, the University of Massachusetts Amherst has experienced a decline in state support as the Commonwealth wrestled with competing demands and challenging economic circumstances. Coping with declines in state allocations, shifting fringe benefit costs from the Commonwealth to the University on the one hand, and the use of budgetary reserves and the infusion of federal stimulus funds on the other hand has left the University with a projected $22 million surplus for the current year but a projected $49 million deficit in FY2011. The University's plans call for increasing tuition revenue by enrolling more out-of-state students, increasing private fundraising, and providing incentives to departments and colleges to generate external support for research. Through the interim report, we look forward to learning of the institution's success in achieving a balanced and sustainable operating budget, consistent with our standard on Financial Resources:

The institution's financial planning, including contingency planning, is integrated with overall planning and evaluation processes. The institution demonstrates its ability to analyze its financial condition and understand the opportunities and constraints that will influence its financial condition and acts accordingly. It reallocates resources as necessary to achieve its purposes and objectives. The institution implements a realistic plan for addressing issues raised by the existence of any operating deficit (9.8).

The scheduling of a comprehensive evaluation in Fall 2018 is consistent with Commission policy requiring each accredited institution to undergo a comprehensive evaluation at least once every ten years. At the request of the institution, the current comprehensive evaluation was delayed one year; hence, the next comprehensive evaluation will be in Fall 2018.

You will note that the Commission has specified no length or term of accreditation. Accreditation is a continuing relationship that is reconsidered when necessary. Thus, while the Commission has indicated the timing of the next comprehensive evaluation, the schedule should not be unduly emphasized because it is subject to change.

The Commission expressed appreciation for the self-study prepared by University of Massachusetts Amherst and for the report submitted by the visiting team. The Commission also welcomed the opportunity to meet with you and Dr. Daniel Fogel, team chair, during its deliberations.

You are encouraged to share this letter with all of the institution's constituencies. It is Commission policy to inform the chairperson of the institution's governing board of action on its accreditation status. In a few days we will be sending a copy of this letter to Mr. Robert J. Manning. The institution is free to release information about the evaluation and the Commission's action to others, in accordance with Commission policy.
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The Commission hopes that the evaluation process has contributed to institutional improvement. It appreciates your cooperation with the effort to provide public assurance of the quality of higher education in New England.

If you have any questions about the Commission's action, please contact Barbara Brittingham, Director of the Commission.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo Maydew
MJM/jm

Enclosures

cc: Mr. Robert J. Manning  
Visiting Team
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THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT

Background: In response to a Trustee mandate, and in preparation for its NEASC reaccreditation review in 2009, the University of Massachusetts Amherst produced the “Framework for Excellence: The Flagship Report, Spring 2009” (http://www.umass.edu/chancellor/budget_planning_041309.html, which set the stage for a subsequent consultative process that assisted the campus in understanding its goals and options in a more broadly systematic way. In order to fulfill its responsibilities with respect to this strategic planning effort, the Faculty Senate created the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Oversight (AHCOSO), which was active throughout the process and which delivered its interim report at the Faculty Senate meeting of May 3, 2012 (http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/Minutes/2011-2012/718TH_MINUTES_05-03-12.pdf).

During this period, the institution also underwent its re-accreditation review by NEASC, which resulted in positive action but also a request that the “Fifth-Year Report,” due on August 15, 2013, give particular emphasis to the following concerns (letter of February 24, 2012, from NEASC to Chancellor Robert Holub):

1. Developing a strategic plan that sets overall institutional priorities;
2. Developing a facilities master plan and priorities for addressing deferred maintenance;
3. Implementing the new general education program, following a four-credit plan, ensuring that quality is sustained and that student learning is in concert with the stated learning outcomes;
4. Implementing a strategic enrollment plan which includes a focus on the institution’s goals for retention and graduation of ALANA students and students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds;
5. Achieving a balanced and sustainable operating budget.

On June 30, 2012, Chancellor Robert Holub completed his term and, on July 1, 2012, was succeeded by Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy. Chancellor Subbaswamy has expressed his desire for the campus to imagine moving beyond the Framework for Excellence, perhaps embracing issues raised in the recent report of the National Academies, Research Universities and the Future of America: Ten Breakthrough Actions Vital to Our Nation’s Prosperity and Security (http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13299) and confronting the challenges of focusing resources, controlling costs, and demonstrating value, in order to create one of the leading public flagship universities of the next generation.

Since the mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Oversight (Sen. Doc. No. 09-042A) expired at the end of AY2011-2012, the Faculty Senate must act if its work is to continue into the next phase of the institution’s strategic planning. The leadership of the Faculty Senate and the central administration have agreed that a Joint Task Force on
Strategic Oversight would be the most appropriate means for deliberating the mandated response to NEASC, new issues raised in the report of the National Academies and by Chancellor Subbaswamy, and other strategic issues that may arise.

**Charge:** To lead this planning process, the Faculty Senate is hereby establishing an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight. The Committee is charged to:

- Make recommendations to the Chancellor with respect to a high-level Strategic Plan which will serve as the institution's mandated response to NEASC, due August 15, 2013.
- Complete the new Strategic Plan, building on the Framework for Excellence but also moving beyond it, perhaps in ways suggested by the National Academies Report, Research Universities and the Future of America, in order to create on the leading public universities of the next generation.
- Monitor the subsequent development of administrative and academic unit plans, and lead the discussion of and response to them.

**Membership:**
1. The Chancellor or a designee
2. The Provost or a designee
3. The Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement or a designee
4. The Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance or a designee
5. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life or a designee
6. The Vice Chancellor for University Relations or a designee
7. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education or a designee
8. The Vice Provost for Graduate Education or a designee
9. The Associate Provost for Academic and Resource Planning
10. The Assistant Provost for Assessment and Educational Effectiveness
11. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Development or a designee
12. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Budget Director
13. Two Members of the Deans Council, appointed by the Provost
14. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate or a designee
15. The Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees or a designee
16. The President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors or a designee
17. The Chair of the Rules Committee or a designee
18. Ten Faculty Members and/or Librarians at large, appointed by the Rules Committee
19. A Representative from the Labor Coalition
20. The Student Trustee or a designee
21. The President of the Student Government Association or a designee

Faculty members should be selected in such a way that representation of all schools and colleges is assured. Co-Chairs will be appointed by the Chancellor, based upon recommendations from the Rules Committee.

**Subcommittees:** At the discretion of the Co-Chairs, the Committee may form subcommittees that may include other members of the campus community.

**Reporting Dates:** The Committee will issue progress reports as appropriate, but at least once per semester. The Committee's Final Report to the Chancellor will also be broadly disseminated to the campus community.

**Sunset:** The Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight is established for a maximum period of three years, subject to possible renewal by vote of the Faculty Senate. If its work is completed prior to that date, the Committee may vote to dissolve itself.
Appendix C. General Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why?</th>
<th>What?</th>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>When?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Framing the problem or opportunity.</td>
<td>Defining the contemplated action or change.</td>
<td>Assigning responsibility.</td>
<td>Establishing timing and order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why is this something that fits in our strategy?</td>
<td>• It might be a program, a policy, a question that requires further study, a collaboration that ought to be triggered...</td>
<td>• What individuals and/or groups need to take action?</td>
<td>• What is the relative urgency of the action?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where does it fit?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Who needs to be consulted?</td>
<td>• Sequencing: what other actions does it assume or rely on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Whose actions need to be coordinated?</td>
<td>• Critical path.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **What we are doing now**: What actions are in place already in response to these challenges?

- Provide a rich choice of opportunities
- Support career development
- Introduce accelerated Master’s programs (“4+1” programs)
- Academic Masters Council, Faculty Senate, Provost’s Office
- XX departments
- Policy implemented in 2010
- XXX programs in place
- Will continue to grow

2. **What we are planning**: What actions are in the pipeline?

- Building innovation in the curriculum
- Improving student learning outcomes
- Reform General Education by introducing the Integrative Learning (IE) requirement
- Gen Ed Task Force, Gen Ed Council, Faculty Senate, Provost’s Office, every school and college and every department
- Policy implemented in 2011
- XXX courses developed so far
- YYY students enrolled
- Full implementation by

3. **What comes next**: What are the actions we need to put in place?

- Responding to MOOCs and related developments.
- Establish campus policy on accepting/granting academic course credit for MOOCs.
- JTFSO subcommittee to initiate. Consult with campus admin, Deans, Admissions, UWW. Senate/AMC for consult and governance review.
- Early priority — campus likely to be pushed by outside forces.

- Responding to MOOCs and related developments.
- Improving curricular effectiveness.
- Explore incorporation of real-time feedback, self-paced learning tools into general curriculum.
- VPUCE, Deans, Depts. Consult with Senate/AMC/UEC, CFT, OIT.
- Start now for medium-term implementation.