Reaccreditation and Planning: NEASC

- Every 10 years
- Site Visit October 21-24, 2018
- Self-Study, 9 standards, 184 sub-standards
  - 100 pages: Description, Appraisal, Projection
- Major focus areas
  - Sustainable financial strategy
  - Assessment and planning
  - Student outcomes assessment
NEASC Standard 7: Financial Resources

- 7.4 The institution preserves and enhances available financial resources sufficient to support its mission. It manages its financial resources and allocates them in a way that reflects its mission and purposes. It demonstrates the ability to respond to financial emergencies and unforeseen circumstances.

- 7.5 The institution is financially stable. Ostensible financial stability is not achieved at the expense of educational quality. Its stability and viability are not unduly dependent upon vulnerable financial resources or an historically narrow base of support.

- 7.6 The institution’s multi-year financial planning is realistic and reflects the capacity of the institution to depend on identified sources of revenue and ensure the advancement of educational quality and services for students.

- 7.7 The governing board reviews and approves the institution’s financial plans based on multi-year analysis and financial forecasting.

- 7.8 The board retains appropriate autonomy in all budget and finance matters; this includes institutions that depend on financial support from a sponsoring entity (state, church, or other private or public entity).

- 7.9 All or substantially all of the institution’s resources are devoted to the support of its education, research, and service programs. The institution’s financial records clearly relate to its educational activities.

- 7.10 The institution and its governing board regularly and systematically review the effectiveness of the institution’s financial aid policy and practices in advancing the institution’s mission and helping to ensure that the institution enrolls and supports the student body it seeks to serve.

- 7.11 The institution ensures that it has sufficient professionally qualified finance staff, led by a chief financial officer whose primary responsibility to the institution is reflected in the organizational chart.

- 7.12 The institution ensures the integrity of its finances through prudent financial management and organization, a well-organized budget process, appropriate internal control mechanisms, risk assessment, and timely financial reporting to internal and external constituency groups, providing a basis for sound financial decision-making.

- 7.13 The institution establishes and implements its budget after appropriate consultation with relevant constituencies in accord with realistic overall planning that provides for the appropriate integration of academic, student service, fiscal, development, information, technology, and physical resource priorities to advance its educational objectives.
Approach for Self Study Development

**NEASC Standards**

**Compliance**
- Federal definition of a student credit hour
- Identity verification for online students
- Financial statement, audit standards

**Substantive**
- Faculty are demonstrably effective...
- Student success is measured and results used to improve
- Multi-year financial planning is realistic

---

2009 Self Study
Review and update as needed

2018 Self Study

2018 Strategic Plan Progress and Refresh

Unit Plan refresh
Strategic Plan “Refresh” — What is it?

- Opportunity to take stock of changes over the past 4-5 years
  - In our situation
  - Progress resulting from earlier planning
  - Reality check, not starting from scratch

- Confirm/Revise campus-level priorities
  - Changes needed in direction, focus
  - Emerging issues
  - Results in updated campus-level plan/priorities to advance the campus goals over the next 5-10 years.
Strategic Plan “Refresh” — Approach

- CPARC oversight
- Review of existing plan and priorities
  - CLC/Deans feedback, August Retreat
- Situation analysis with campus leaders
- Priorities for Action: Does the plan still fit?
- Working Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity and Inclusion (Branch)</th>
<th>Research and Scholarship (Malone, Nieswandt)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Education and Experience (Barr, Gelaye)</td>
<td>Resources (Mangels)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Education and Experience (Krauthamer)</td>
<td>Outreach and Engagement (Cohen)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Working Group charge
  1. *In general, does this still seem on target?*
  2. *Where do you believe it should go in a different direction?*
  3. *What is missing that you think should be added?*
### Working Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Other Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Diversity and Inclusion (Anna Branch, chair) | Diversity Leadership Group | Status of Diversity Council | Laurie Anastasia, EOD  
Shelly Perdomo, SACL  
Leykia D. Nulan, Asst Provost  
Eric Moschella, Assoc Provost  
Willie Hill, FAC  
Laura Lovett, HFA  
Nilanjana Dasgupta, CNS  
Melvin Rodriguez, ISOM  
Linda Griffin, EDUC  
Jean Swinney, NURS  
Dan Gerber, PHHS  
Alexandrina Deschamps, CHC  
MJ Peterson, Senate  
Brittany Frederick**  
Nasir Marumo**  
Daniel Morales**  
Trevor Mukoki**  
Caroline Ault*  
Elizabeth Donoghue*  
Clare Lonsdale*  
Ilina Shag*  
Talya Sogoba* |
| | Chancellor Subbaswamy  
Ryan Bamford, Athletics  
Carol Barr, Academic Affairs  
Bill Brady, HR  
Anna Branch, Equity Inclusion  
Julie Buehler, Info Services and Strategy  
Enku Gelaye, SACL  
Steve Goodwin, Planning  
John Kennedy, Univ Relations  
Michael Leto, Development and Alumni Relations  
Michael Malone, Research and Engagement  
Andrew Mangels, A/F  
John McCarthy, Academic Affairs  
Shelly Perdomo, SACL  
Christine Wilda, Compliance | David McLaughlin, ECE  
Hoang Gia Phan, ENG  
Alice Nash, HIS  
Richard Chu,HIS  
Ingrid Holm, ESL  
Karen Kuczynski, Art/Arch  
Leda Cooks, COMM  
Mzamo Mangaliso, ISOM  
Ernest Washington, TECS  
Doris Clemmons, EDUC  
Korina Jocson, EDUC  
Kalpana Poudel-Tandukar, NURS  
Hava Siegelmann, CICS  
Nathaniel Whitmal, COMDIS  
Scott Stangroom, LIB  
Laura Lovett, MSP  
Sam Killings, A/F |
| Graduate Education and Experience (Barbara Krauthamer, chair) | Shana Passonno, OPD  
Beth Jakob, Grad School | Graduate Council | Neal Abraham, 5 COLL  
David Vaillancourt, SACL  
Martina Nieswandt, VCRE  
Barbara Krauthamer, GRAD  
Lori Baronas, GRAD  
Tilman Wolf, Vice Provost  
MJ Peterson, Senate  
Canan Cevik**, GSS  
Nadia Al-Ahmed**  
Daniel Morales**  
David Morin**  
Trevor Mukoki** |
| | | Ramakrishna Janaswamy, ECE  
Maria Barbon, LLC  
Joseph Black, ENG  
Kristine Yu, LING  
John Lopes, Chair, MICRO  
Sonia Alvarez, POLSCI  
Mark Hamin, LARP  
Frederic Schaffer, POLSCI  
David Cort, SOC  
D. Anthony Butterfield, MGT  
Catherine L. Dimmitt, EDUC  
Cynthia Jacelon, NURS  
Neil Immerman, CICS  
Sarah Poissant, COMDIS  
Leslie Button, LIB  
Paulina Borrego, LIB  
Patrick Sullivan, Registrar | David McLaughlin, ECE  
Hoang Gia Phan, ENG  
Alice Nash, HIS  
Richard Chu,HIS  
Ingrid Holm, ESL  
Karen Kuczynski, Art/Arch  
Leda Cooks, COMM  
Mzamo Mangaliso, ISOM  
Ernest Washington, TECS  
Doris Clemmons, EDUC  
Korina Jocson, EDUC  
Kalpana Poudel-Tandukar, NURS  
Hava Siegelmann, CICS  
Nathaniel Whitmal, COMDIS  
Scott Stangroom, LIB  
Laura Lovett, MSP  
Sam Killings, A/F |
### Working Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Public Engagement and Outreach</th>
<th>Other Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Working Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Other Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research Council</strong></td>
<td><strong>Associate Deans for Research</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (Mike Malone and Martina Nieswandt, co-chairs) | Jonathan Rothstein, MECH  
Jason Moralee, HIS  
Virginia Closs, CLAS  
Maria Tymoczko, LLC  
Emiliano Ricciardi, MUS  
Carey Clouse, ARCH  
Jennifer Normanly, BMB  
Dominique Alfandari, VASCI  
Baoshan Xing, STOCK  
Robert DeConto, GEO  
Kirby Deater-Deckard, PBS  
Lori Goldner, PHYS  
E. Bryan Coughlin, POLYM  
James Kitts, SOC  
David Lepak, MGT  
Martina Nieswandt, TECS  
Rachel Walker, NURS  
Annette Wysocki, NURS  
J. Eliot Moss, CICS  
Lisa Chasan-Taber, BIOEPI | Michael Krezmien, EDUC  
Erin Baker, ENG  
Rex Wallace, HFA  
Shlomo Zilberstein, CICS  
Mark Tuominen, CNS  
Annette Wysocki, NURS  
Jennifer Lundquist, SBS  
Thomas Moliterno, ISOM  
Catrine Tudor-Locke, SPHHS  
MJ Peterson, Senate |
| **Resources**  | **Program and Budget Council** | **Andrews Mangels, AF**  
Lynn McKenna, AF  
Michael Leto, Advancement  
MJ Peterson, Senate  
Sumera Ahsan**  
Jacob Binnall*  
Arpit Jain* |
| (Andrew Mangels, chair) | Lynn McKenna  
Deborah Gould  
Christine Wilda  
Jacqueline Watrous  
Donna Falcetti  
Shane Conklin  
Jim Roche  
Stephen Schreiber  
John Lopes  
David Markland  
Julie Buehler  
Mike Malone  
Bryan Harvey  
William Brown  
Nancy Cohen  
Andrew Mangels | Elizabeth Chang, MUS  
Donna Zucker, NURS  
Stephen Schreiber, ARCH  
Nancy Cohen, NUTR  
Patricia Galvis y Assmus, ART  
Anurag Sharma, MGT  
Ernest May, MUS  
Joseph Bartolomeo, HFA  
Moira Inghilleri, COMPLIT  
Margaret Riley, BIO  
William Brown, ACCT  
Anthony Paik, SOC  
Mark Guerber, AERO  
D. Anthony Butterfield, Grad Council  
Alex Phillips, MSP  
Deborah Gould, Provost office  
Steve Goodwin, Deputy Chancellor  
Eddie Hull, SACL |
## Working Group Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Other Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPARC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Normanly, Chair</td>
<td>Julie Hayes</td>
<td>Marjorie Aelion, SPHHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy Anderson</td>
<td>Laura Hancock**</td>
<td>Tim Anderson, ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bogartz</td>
<td>A-Yemisi Jimoh</td>
<td>Stephen Cavanagh, NURS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.V. Hollot</td>
<td>Mike Malone</td>
<td>Mark Fuller, ISOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Barr</td>
<td>Andrew Mangels</td>
<td>Cynthia Gerstl-Pepin, EDUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Dunlea*</td>
<td>John McCarthy</td>
<td>Gretchen Holbrook Gerzina, CHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Galman</td>
<td>Lynn McKenna</td>
<td>Laura Haas, CICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enku Gelaye</td>
<td>Simon Neame</td>
<td>Julie Hayes, HFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Gould</td>
<td>Martina Nieswandt</td>
<td>John Hird, SBS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Gross</td>
<td>Anthony Paik</td>
<td>Barbara Krauthamer, GRAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliot Moss</td>
<td>MJ Peterson</td>
<td>Tricia Serio. CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Goodwin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Undergraduate student
** Graduate student
Working Group Commentaries

- Working group feedback reports, along with feedback from CPARC, other FS Councils, WG leaders and others were developed into Commentaries:
  - Compared to 2013 Plan:
    - Updated situation and trends
    - Priorities from 2013 that need to continue
    - New or expanded emphases for 2018
  - Basis for the refreshed 2018 Campus Plan and Reaccreditation Self-Study
- The 2018 Campus Plan will be a set of high level priorities to drive unit planning
Joint Task Force for Resource Allocation

II. Establish UMass Amherst as the destination of choice for talented Massachusetts students of all backgrounds seeking exceptional educational value.

Our goal is that UMass Amherst graduates will be known as individuals who have excelled in a challenging environment, participated in rewarding and diverse intellectual and applied experiences, and succeeded in setting and achieving high expectations. They will be known as innovative thinkers and problem solvers, effective communicators, valued team members, and socially aware and responsible citizens.

Students and families face many choices in their decision to secure the best educational experience, and UMass Amherst is positioned to be a clear choice by being a more responsive, interesting, and distinctive institution. Our priority is to be the destination of choice for talented Massachusetts students of all backgrounds seeking exceptional educational value.

The nature and quality of the undergraduate experience remains central to institutional success. Since the adoption of the original plan, the undergraduate student educational experience has become even more important as student and societal expectations have risen, student interests have shifted, employers have sharpened their focus on preparation, and admissions competition has intensified. Moreover, there is widespread consensus that these trends will continue. Establishing UMass Amherst as a “destination of choice,” in all its dimensions, thus remains the campus’s core goal going forward.

The discussions begun five years ago produced many changes. Metrics of student satisfaction and outcomes have been developed and incorporated into annual planning and budgeting. A comprehensive review of academic and career advising led to important improvements across campus. A strong partnership between staff in Academic Affairs and Student Affairs and Campus Life has been formed to support an ambitious student success initiative. These and related achievements form an important foundation for future success.

Improvements in student outcomes and selectivity have been a major factor in our dramatic rise through the US News rankings. The Great Recession and its aftermath made our price differential vis-à-vis private competitors especially advantageous. But we cannot rest on our accomplishments to date. We are challenged to match a broader, brisker pace of change in competition and student expectations.

Consolidating our success will require attracting students more on the basis of quality than of price. As we look ahead we can see an even greater challenge. A declining birth rate means that the college-aged population throughout the Midwest and the Northeast will contract significantly beginning in 2023. The class we will be recruiting seven years from now will represent an entirely different competitive challenge, especially among the applicants with stronger academic profiles who have fueled our recent rise through the rankings. While applications for admission from this group have risen dramatically, our yield has not. We therefore still have work to do to demonstrate to the Commonwealth, the nation and the world that UMass Amherst is the place to be, now and in the future.

Top 20 Strategy

Our strategy to remain strong through a protracted demographic downturn is to consolidate the gains we have made to date, and ramp up the quality of the undergraduate experience across the board. If we are successful, we have the opportunity to continue our momentum and move into the Top 20 public universities in America. Performance at that level can give us the basis to attract nationally competitive students, even from a smaller pool.

Achieving our Top 20 goal calls for taking improvements in the undergraduate experience to another level, deepening and broadening the destination of choice strategy begun five years ago. To be successful, responsibility for the student experience must be shared among all faculty, staff and students.

Our sense of what the destination of choice objective means has shifted somewhat in five years. It emerged originally from the reality of our unique position as only one of many fine universities in a dense higher education market, in which we wished increasingly to be seen as a first choice institution. This perspective is still important. But increasingly, our destination of choice strategy focuses on two related objectives:

1. To make available a world-class education to the sons and daughters of Massachusetts. They have a right to expect and receive the kind of affordable, distinctive education that the finest public research institutions in the nation offer. Some other states have long recognized the power of high-quality public higher education. It is our mission to provide it here.

2. To demonstrate that world-class quality to students in other states and nations so as to attract the kind of diversity and resources essential to our educational success. Success here at home relies on success performing on a national and international stage.
Planning

Home
FY19 Planning and Budgeting
Strategic Plan Refresh
2018 NEASC Reaccreditation
Departmental Planning Data
Other 2017-2018 Planning and Accreditation Activities
Planning Groups

Strategic Planning

This site provides information on the ongoing planning and accreditation processes at UMass Amherst. Use the menu to the left to navigate the site and find information on the FY19 planning and budgeting process and other ongoing planning processes, access the planning data, and review materials related to planning groups on campus.

For an overview of strategic planning and to read previous reports, see the Chancellor’s Strategic Planning page.

www.umass.edu/planning
Strategic Plan Refresh

In 2012, the campus launched a broadly consultative process of strategic planning to address the challenges facing us at a time of significant and rapid change. The resulting plan, "Innovation and Impact: Renewing the Promise of the Public Research University," continues to serve as a guide for action and resource allocation at all levels.

Many of the forces that shaped development of the Innovation and Impact plan remain salient in 2017, but much has transpired in the past five years. Moreover, we have made considerable progress toward the goals we set five years ago. It is therefore appropriate to step back and review our situation and priorities, and to refresh the campus-level plan during the academic year 2017-18. This renewed plan will inform both the self-study document for NEASC reaccreditation in 2018 and a refresh of the unit plans in AY 2018-19.

Working groups have been established in six broad areas to assess the campus's situation today, to review progress achieved since the initial plan, and to identify any issues that should be addressed in drafting a revised plan. Using this input, a draft of the refreshed 2018 campus strategic priorities will be available for review by the University community, with subsequent revision based on campus feedback.

Instructions for Working Groups

Strategic Plan Progress Summary

Strategic Plan Refresh Overview

Situation Summary - December 11, 2017

Working Groups
Strategic Plan “Refresh”: Observations

- "Double Down"
  - Moving into Top 20 will require significant further improvement
    - Quality and Value — in terms of the student experience, timely progress, career and life preparation — are the essential focus
  - Destination of Choice, Partner of Choice, Sustainable Resource Strategy even more important today than 5 years ago

- "Distributed"
  - We all have a stake and role in the success of the University
    - Shared accountability
    - Shared responsibility for actions

- "Determined"
  - Confidence to continue our trajectory of innovation and impact despite challenges
Strategic Plan “Refresh”: Observations

- **More Focus**
  - Student success, career and professional development, use of evidence
  - Partnerships, aligning resources for impact (faculty, students, physical, administrative supports)
  - Alternative revenues (e.g. online)

- **New Focus**
  - Community of Choice
    - Destination for those who study, live, work here to join and remain
    - Climate

- **Different Focus**
  - Adaptive re-use: shift away from new construction and toward more effective use of existing facilities
  - Predictive analytics (e.g. EAB SSC, space allocation)