

## RCM 5 Year Review: Initial Hearings

Hearing 9: Academic Affairs / Student Affairs

January 31, 2005

**Administrative Representatives:** Steve Bolander (Moderator), Tammy Goldberg, Bruce Mallory, Leigh Anne Melanson, David Proulx, Don Quigley (Faculty Senate)

**Context and RCM Update:** Steve Bolander summarized the purpose of the hearing, provided context, and reviewed the session's format. Dave Proulx provided an update on current RCM functioning and invited technical questions. All participants were invited to submit written comments through the RCM review website.

### Questions and Comments from Participants:

- Asked about standards for **reserve** levels in universities; Dave Proulx replied that the recommended level is 7 – 10% of the operating budget – UNH only has reserves to equal 3%.
- Noted that RCM has led units to be entrepreneurial and creative in creating new courses, etc., Many of these new programs are unique and require special, often manual, handling by the Registrar. Their funding is often outside the model. Although these **entrepreneurial efforts** are positive, they often generate a lot of **work and costs**.
- When RCM was implemented the academic strategic plan was not in place, nor had the reaccreditation process been finalized. Both of these efforts have identified university-wide strategic goals. The RCM review needs to ensure that funds can be identified for core functional areas, such as **outreach and engagement**.
- The Center for International Education is a campus-wide program (INCO) which requires participation by faculty and staff from other RC units such as the colleges. In a sense CIE is in **competition with other RC units**. There is a tension when faculty are asked to participate in activities that do not directly benefit their RC unit.
- Units are **competing** with one another. There is no central system to eliminate **duplicate course offerings**. Also, **marketing** of courses is decentralized and could lead to multiple attempts to reach the same target population, which could confuse the audience.
- Some units, such as the Graduate School, do not share in the rewards – i.e., graduate tuition dollars flow to the colleges with no share to the Grad School. Where is the **incentive** for such units to increase their efforts? Sometimes there is a disconnect between funding streams and those generating the revenue.
- UROP does not generate revenue, but must interact with those units that do. Charges by **service units** rise – in a recent example a cost increased by 30% -- and her unit must meet these increased costs. The service units do not compete with similar enterprises – i.e., they face no competition.
- **INCO course tuition** does not go to the units, but rather to Academic Affairs. She created a new course that aligned with the academic strategic plan, but the dean of the faculty who needed to be involved said they couldn't encourage the faculty to participate when the revenue was going elsewhere.
- Noted the challenges with **INCO** courses are both specific to the program and symptomatic of the **competition** between units.
- Asked whether within RCM there are provisions for initiation of **new interdisciplinary programs**. Dave Proulx replied that a number of new degrees, centers, and programs have been started. Agreements are made between involved parties; often an MOU is developed and signed. Good to get the arrangements in writing. There is **ample opportunity** for new initiatives within RCM. Steve Bolander noted that WSBE has begun a new master's program that is a partnership with CEPS; the MPA/MBA connection has also been successful.

- **Service unit prices** are forcing university customers to go off campus. Often their prices are higher than those in the outside market.
- Effort needs to go into tracking the dollars associated with **study abroad programs**. Need to develop uniformity or at least a small set of models. Colleges are interested in new study abroad opportunities. Dave P. agreed that it is time to look at this subject.
- His program is externally funded through multi-year grants. Before RCM there existed the ability to **carry forward** funds in the general fund. Dave noted that this ability still exists, in this case through the Academic Affairs RC unit.
- Touched on the fact that **Inquiry** courses involve small classes, but RCM provides **incentive** to offer big classes.
- The need to achieve an appropriate balance between decentralization and the identification of **adequate central resources** for pursuit of university-wide strategic initiatives. There were early plans to amass a million dollar fund for such initiatives, but due to funding constraints, we couldn't get anywhere close to that figure. Need to flow the large majority of resources to units, but keep some centrally.
- Academic Affairs really benefits all units of the university – e.g., the university as a whole benefits from enrollment of students. All units should support academic programs. Maybe it's appropriate that **all units support AA**.
- Not many colleges flow RCM to **departments**. Would be good to explore this concept. Dave noted that none do so currently.
- She directs the Honors Program, which is large. She perceives RCM as **rewarding "largeness"** but is hoping to resize the Honors Program to be perhaps smaller and of higher quality. Wonders about the implications of this resizing within RCM. Citing the changes in WSBE since his arrival, Steve Bolander noted that a large program does not necessarily mean lesser quality – the two are not necessarily opposed. Bruce Mallory noted that WSBE has grown even as WSBE faculty and administration decided to cap undergraduate enrollment.
- Pointed out that another topic for discussion may be the fact that academic affairs and student services as well as financial aid serve the university-wide interest – maybe the cost of **financial aid** should be shared beyond the colleges.
- While much of what has been said has highlighted "problem areas" and issues that need to be addressed in the review, on the positive side he finds RCM has brought **clarity** to discussions and has allowed him to make clear and **informed arguments**, to show the effects of a new idea using objective data.
- The current RCM model does not take "**Outreach Scholarship and Engagement**" (as we now define it in the Academic Plan and NEASC) into account. At the time RCM was originally implemented we did not have an Academic Strategic Plan and had not completed our specialized and recent 10 year Accreditation Focused Self Study (NEASC). Therefore the principles in RCM could not have anticipated a few **University-wide Strategic Goals** or Critical Areas we now clearly state (in the Academic Plan and to our Accrediting Body--NEASC) that we WILL ADVANCE over the next 5 years. One such Goals (one of only five goals in the Academic Strategic Plan) is "Outreach Scholarship and Engagement." In addition, in our specialized "Accreditation focused self study--"NEASC", we agreed that we would pay special attention to advance three areas within the Academic Strategic Plan. One of those three areas was again "Outreach Scholarship/Engagement." As this is a core area within both the Academic Strategic Plan and to our Accreditation process, I strongly believe that a review of the parameters set forth in the RCM model is necessary to more systematically account for and determine how the model will fund the "growing operational needs" of this area (Outreach Scholarship and Engagement) over the next 5 years so that we can successfully advance the Academic Strategic Plan and the NEASC commitments that appear in our self study report.
- What is the reasoning behind letting those Divisions/Departments that report to the Asst. V.P. for **Business Affairs** opt out of the RCM process?

- Does the Committee realize that by having an Administrator of Finance and Administration opt out of their Division's own program makes everyone else question the merits of being in the program?