

## RCM 5 Year Review: Initial Hearings

Hearing 4: SHHS

December 13, 2004

**Administrative Representatives:** John Aber, Tammy Goldberg, Bruce Mallory, Leigh Anne Melanson, Dave Proulx, P. T. Vasudevan

**Speakers:** Heather Barber, Janet Sable, John Seavey, Raelene Shippee-Rice, Neil Vroman, Bob Woodward, Penny Webster

**Background:** Provost Mallory provided background and context regarding the hearing and set guidelines for the session's format. Noted that this is the design phase of the RCM 5 year review, focused on gathering the critical questions. Written comments are welcomed.

**RCM 101:** Dave Proulx noted the web address for the RCM 5 year review site and discussed several slides from the RCM 101 presentation. In response to a question on use of reserves, Dave noted the usage rules. A question was also asked regarding publication of the list of collected known issues; Dave noted this is being discussed, but the list should be posted sometime soon.

### Questions and Comments from Participants:

- RCM has been **very positive** for the university and for SHHS, although it was implemented at a less fortunate moment in **enrollment cycles** for the school.
- **Graduate tuition revenue** should flow to the unit providing the courses. Colleges could share resources in providing graduate education.
- **Inquiry courses** should count for 1.5 value.
- Concerned about **graduate education** and **interdisciplinary programs**. Feels the model discourages interdisciplinary programs.
- **Course size** is an issue; **Inquiry/Discovery courses**; disconnect regarding **incentives**; is or isn't RCM **supporting the academic plan**.
- Believes **assessments** make it very difficult for "**service programs**" such as Northeast Passage to base themselves at UNH. These programs don't use many of the services supposedly covered in the assessments, such as the library, advising, etc. This is a **negative impact on outreach/engagement**.
- **Lost sense of community:** support services are no longer available – cited examples of paying to have a door unlocked and difficulty in even finding the right group to ask to set up a new computer (and then being charged for the service).
- A **positive impact** on the academy: **faculty are now focused more broadly on students** – not exclusively on majors in the college. Faculty are involved in offering gen ed courses to wider populations and this is exciting for them.
- **Bigger classes** are an issue. We need to figure out if the impact is positive or negative. There is a definite **impact on the kind of work required of students** – bigger classes often require **less written assignments** of students. So although there were statements made at implementation of RCM that it would not impact academic programs, it is indeed having an impact.
- **Much prefers RCM** and the ability to see and understand what's happening.
- Impact on **academic quality:** class size, assignments, and interactions with students are being impacted. Not sure about what the **curriculum committee** is doing.
- RCM has led to a different philosophical bent, with much **emphasis on the numbers**.
- A core question is how to resist **allowing numbers to dictate academic decisions**.
- Knowing more about budgets is positive.
- Many **positive changes**.

- Are **class sizes** growing too large? How do we determine the proper size? Should we set limits on class size?
- Larger classes have an **impact on “infrastructure”** – more students means more advisees and this leads to more phone calls, email, paperwork. Should the university be paying faculty to do these support functions? Faculty should be spending their time teaching, engaging, and doing research.
- Noted that **enrollment trends** will shift again.
- RCM impacts **interdisciplinary efforts** – if interdisciplinary work is a true goal of the university then we need to determine how RCM impacts this.
- Sees a trend toward the **Big 10 model** where classes are large and much of the class work is managed by graduate students. Is this where UNH wants to go? Currently HHS is maintaining a balance, but what will the future bring?
- It’s been a challenge, but HHS **faculty and staff understand the RCM** system. Believes the school would be facing the same economic pressures and issues under the former budget system – pressure to increase class sizes, to provide services to more students, etc.
- It will be important in the review to **identify where the university has control** and where it does not.
- The school can choose to **resist the pressure to increase class sizes** and to make decisions based on numbers.
- Other colleges say HHS faculty are responsible for their college deficits.
- If all colleges and schools were looked at together, would the academic area be in the black? If not, maybe there is a **structural deficit** in the university’s finances that goes beyond any tweaking of the RCM model. Unsure how long UNH can continue to offer the broad academic smorgasbord. Maybe our expenses exceed our revenues. It’s a zero sum game which means colleges must **steal students** from one another.
- Need to evaluate how RCM supports **short and long range planning**.
- Need to evaluate whether the **original reasons for choosing RCM** have been fulfilled.
- Real or perceived barriers

Bruce Mallory: In wrapping up the session, the Provost noted that the SHHS community is quite sophisticated in terms of RCM and has highlighted bigger picture issues, such as the impact on academic decisions.