

Third Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Providence Admissions

Marshall Feldman

10/13/2004

Purpose of Today's Report

- ◆ To Inform New Senators About the Committee and Its Work
- ◆ To Update the Senate on the Committee's Progress
- ◆ To Describe Upcoming Course of Action

Background (Fall 2003)

- ◆ Previous Committee Studied the Issue
 - ◆ Found: Current Offerings at the Providence Campus were such that a savvy student could do an entire undergraduate degree there fresh out of high school
 - ◆ Recommended modifications to *Faculty Manual* formalizing this situation
 - ◆ Faculty Senate rejected this proposal largely out of concern for program quality

Background (Spring 2004)

- ◆ Provost Swan formed a new committee to examine quality and associated financial issues in depth
- ◆ The committee has met regularly throughout the Spring 2004 Semester and over the past summer.

Committee Members

- ◆ Marshall Feldman, Community Planning, Chairperson
- ◆ Will Dvorak, Arts and Sciences
- ◆ Ed Ferszt, Feinstein College of Continuing Education
- ◆ Cliff Katz, Vice Provost
- ◆ Barbara Newman, Human Development & Family Studies
- ◆ Kat Quina, Psychology
- ◆ Jayne Richmond, University College (until Summer 2004)
- ◆ Deborah Rosen, Business Administration
- ◆ David Taggart, Admissions
- ◆ Vince Petronio, Comm. Studies/CCE (since Summer 2004)

Unmet Needs

- ◆ Potentially Underserved Greater Providence Population
- ◆ Students Who Cannot Afford Room and Board Away From Home
- ◆ Students Who Cannot Afford to be Away From Home
- ◆ Students Interested in Urban Topics

Potential Benefits

- ◆ Program Faculty Could Also Add to Kingston's Capacity
- ◆ Additional Faculty Could Strengthen Departmental Breadth
- ◆ Urban Setting Can Add to Pedagogy
- ◆ Enhanced Opportunities for Research in an Urban Setting
- ◆ Greater Presence in Providence Could Enhance the University's Visibility and Contribution to the State

Constraints: Quality

- ◆ Match Kingston Staffing, Support Services
- ◆ Same Admission Criteria as Kingston
- ◆ Charge Departments with Ensuring Quality
- ◆ “Tweak” Programs to Take Advantage of Assets, Meet Needs, Yield Benefits
- ◆ General Education to Offer Substantial, Appropriate Choice

Constraints: Financial Independence

- ◆ Self-Supporting
- ◆ 100 Students Entering Per Year
- ◆ Use Existing Majors That Are
 - ◆ Oversubscribed
 - ◆ Already Heavily Committed in Providence
 - ◆ Can Benefit From the Urban Setting
 - ◆ Want to Participate

Background (Spring 2004)

- ◆ Using This Framework, the Committee Developed a Plan Addressing the Faculty Senate's Concerns
- ◆ Presented the Plan to the Senate in April 2004
- ◆ Faculty Senate Voted to Support the Plan and Encouraged the Committee to Continue its Work

Progress Since Last Report

- ◆ Meetings with:
 - ◆ President and Provost to Discuss BOG Approval
 - ◆ Faculty Senate Executive Committee
 - ◆ Curricular Affairs Committee
 - ◆ Deans and Departments
- ◆ Surveyed Guidance Counselors in Northern Rhode Island
- ◆ Revised Implementation Plan
- ◆ Updated and Refined Budget Projections
- ◆ Determined Approval Process
 - ◆ Departmental Approvals Underway
 - ◆ Drafting Program Proposal/Committee Report

Survey

- ◆ 33 Counselors Contacted
- ◆ 11 Replied
- ◆ 5 Had Follow-up Phone Discussions
- ◆ Counselors from 7 schools estimate between 113 to 149 students would want to take advantage of this program
- ◆ All comments were positive, several very enthusiastic
- ◆ Identified several specific advantages and disadvantages

Revised Plan For Providence Campus Admissions

- ◆ Three Majors:
 - ◆ Communication Studies (COM)
 - ◆ Human Development & Family Studies (HDF)
 - ◆ Psychology (PSY)
- ◆ Learning-Community Model for 1st-Year Students
- ◆ Departments Specify Courses In Major for Each Year
- ◆ Departments Design Their Own Staffing Plans
- ◆ Use Remainder of 15-Credit Per Semester Program for Gen. Ed. and Free Electives
- ◆ Add Daytime Classes
 - ◆ 2 or 3 Days Per Week
- ◆ Students in 3rd and 4th Years Will Also Be Able to Take CCE Courses

Budget Revisions (Part 1)

- ◆ In Consultation with Respective Units Increased the Following Student Services:
 - ◆ Library
 - ◆ Learning Skills
 - ◆ Financial Aid Counseling
 - ◆ General Counseling
 - ◆ Student Services
 - ◆ Admissions

Budget Revisions (Part 2)

- ◆ Increased Planning Horizon to 2020
- ◆ Made Projections Consistent With University's Planning Assumptions
- ◆ Added Promotions to Associate and Full Professor to the Model
- ◆ Adjusted for Participating Departments' Teaching Load Policies
- ◆ Examined Different Scenarios

Enrollment Projections

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Total Enrollment</u>
2005	80	80
2006	80	143
2007	100	220
2008	100	265
2009	100	307
2010	100	313
2011	100	319
2012	100	319
2013	100	319
2014	100	319
2015	100	319
2016	100	319
2017	100	319
2018	100	319
2019	100	319
2020	100	319

Staffing Projections

	<u>Lecturer</u>	<u>Assistant</u>	<u>Associate</u>	<u>Full</u>	<u>Overload (Sections)</u>
2005	0	2	0	0	23
2006	2	6	0	0	19
2007	3	8	0	0	27
2008	3	10	0	0	37
2009	3	10	0	0	39
2010	3	10	0	0	39
2011	3	8	2	0	39
2012	3	4	6	0	39
2013	3	2	8	0	39
2014	3	0	10	0	39
2015	3	0	10	0	39
2016	3	0	10	0	39
2017	3	0	10	0	39
2018	3	0	8	2	39
2019	3	0	4	6	39
2020	3	0	2	8	39

Budget Results

- ◆ Program is consistently in the black
 - ◆ Minimum surplus is \$13,000 in 2006
 - ◆ Surplus grows thereafter to \$1.5 million by 2020
 - ◆ These projections use University's planning assumptions
- ◆ With "worst case" scenario (no tuition or salary increases)
 - ◆ Slight (\$37k) deficit in 2006
 - ◆ Surplus grows to high of over \$300k in 2010
 - ◆ Declines thereafter due to faculty promotions
 - ◆ Deficit after 2019 unless faculty turns over

Approval Process

Two Tracks:

- ◆ Departmental
 - ◆ Department
 - ◆ College CAC
 - ◆ University CAC
- ◆ Overall Program
 - ◆ University CAC
 - ◆ Faculty Senate
 - ◆ President
 - ◆ BOG