

## RCM 5 Year Review: Initial Hearings

Hearing 1: Deans Council / Associate Deans / Finance Directors

November 30, 2004

### Comments from Participants:

Overall: Numerous comments in support of RCM in general and need simply to refine it.

- Abandon the **hold harmless** concept;
- Review **assessments**, especially vis-à-vis programs in academic vs. non-academic areas;
- Define **faculty in the context of how state appropriations** are distributed in RCM.
- Review **hold harmless**;
- Review distribution of **state appropriations, especially with regard to research faculty**;
- Need for accurate, easily obtained, **understandable data**;
- The **affordability of non-professional graduate programs and the Discovery Program**;
- Examine **cost of delivering graduate education at UNHM**;
- Need to review **service level agreements**.
- **Hold harmless** should be eliminated;
- **State appropriations vis-à-vis research faculty** should be examined;
- Complexity imposed by AES and inability to use federal funds to support teaching;
- Very large start-up packages are expected by new faculty in COLSA;
- **Credit hour weighting** needs to be examined;
- **IDC revenue sharing** needs to be reviewed, especially vis a vis EOS
- Examine the relationship between **assessments and grants with low indirect cost rates**;
- Need to address the misunderstandings regarding **competition between units**.
- Scrutinize **space costs and Facilities Service Level Agreements**; need for consistency in application of policies having to do with using other unit's space, etc.
- Examine **research faculty in reference to distribution of state appropriations**;
- Review **indirect cost revenue distributions**;
- RCM currently provides no **incentives at the department level**;
- Cost of start-ups is also a big problem for CEPS;
- The **13% IDC share directed to PI's** should be examined;
- Student **financial aid** and it's impact on the colleges should be reviewed;
- Mechanism needed to **review curricular decisions** made by academic units which have an impact on other academic units;
- Large amounts of **IDC revenue are going into reserves** of institutes, centers, and PI's;
- **IDC generated by earmark** programs needs to be discussed;
- **Auxiliary** charges: units have little control over the cost or services provided.
- Examine balance between central and local needs;
- Timely and accurate **data needs to be accessible** (especially true in the areas of tuition and financial aid);
- **Indirect cost distribution** – especially relationship between center-based and department-based research;
- Different **assessments for foundation grants** should be examined;
- **Facilities'** financial structure should be examined;
- RCM formulas and tools are **complex**. An update schedule is needed and buried items regularized.

- Need to examine **graduate student compensation** in order to remain competitive. **Health benefits packages** are now being offered at many institutions.
- Must be careful not to create disincentives for faculty to write grants and to **include graduate students on grants**;
- There needs to be an appropriate level of central support for research;
- **Student fees** at UNH are high in comparison to our competitors; shouldn't fee-based auxiliaries pay academic assessment?
- Cautioned against wholesale elimination of **small classes** which could lead to elimination of programs and thereby damage graduate education, much of which takes place in small classes.
- Suggests exploration of an idea whereby the **Graduate School receives a portion of some revenues**.
- UNHM's current year **budget is real time** rather than based two year lag. What are the implications for changing this?
- UNHM deserves a larger share of the **revenue associated with graduate and professional programs**;
- Concerned about implementation of the **Discovery Program**;
- Concerned about **auxiliary costs** and chargeback policies
- The library's main financial challenge is matching revenue to expenses;
- Revenues not keeping pace with inflation on serials and salaries;
- Periodicals and college allocations examined, but book budget down 23% this year to compensate for the other increases;
- Library has no way to directly generate revenue except through fundraising.
- Explore "**real-time**" **budgeting** because it is difficult to start new programs with delayed revenues;
- Intrigued by idea of adapting **RCM for the department** level;
- Explore elimination of **hold harmless** funding;
- Review **assessments on grants with low IDC rates**;
- Full review of **IDC distribution** is warranted. Need to determine whether IDC revenue is being used to support research.
- **Location of major programs** requires review;
- Connection between **research faculty and distribution of state appropriations** should be examined.
- Examine **complexity** of formulas with an eye toward simplification.
- **Financial aid** costs;
- **Incentives/disincentives re location of sponsored projects** due to the academic assessment;
- Department vs. central control of **study abroad** programs;
- Need to review revenue sharing and incentives to offer **INCO and Honors courses**;
- Accessibility of reporting on student and financial aid **data**;
- **IDC distribution**.
- The confluence of **real time costs and delayed revenues**;
- **Chargebacks** – have they been eliminated or just hidden?
- **Waivers** and the fact that they represent real costs;
- **Facilities** and **CIS** costs/rates.

Candace Corvey: described CBC's oversight of charge rates and basic policies guiding allowable rate increases. Offered services in clarifying misconceptions about RCM.

Bruce Mallory: invited participants to email any further comments. Such comments to be added to the official RCM review record.