Provost Langley’s charge to the New and Expanded Financial Resources Committee

As you know so well, a major challenge that this university has faced over the years—especially over the past two decades—is that it has been inadequately financed. Part of the reason for this inadequate financing is the general reluctance, in many instances, of the Commonwealth to live up to its responsibility to support public education. Part of the reason has to do with the fact that we are not seen as a research university by certain important constituencies. Part of the reason also has to do with the images with which the term “urban” has been associated and the centrality of that term (and its accompanying images) to the mission of our campus. A major reason, however, is our own lateness in confronting the fact that we are called on to find sources of funds to finance our general development, as well as to enable us to realize our conceptions of what we are and want to become.

The charge of this committee is to help in reshaping the culture of the campus to one which is more readily inclined to assume some of the burdens of revenue production. To that end, I ask that it: 1) review with care the manner in which other public universities have gone about creating and cultivating such a culture; 2) suggest how those and other approaches may be adapted to our campus; 3) indicate a model (or some models) we may adopt to increase funds from existing sources; and 4) recommend new sources from which revenues may be secured.

In seeking to respond to the charge, committee members should think both in terms of the next five years (the agreed-on duration for the new strategic plan) as well as the longer term. Members should also think in terms of incentives that may encourage revenue-generating activity, especially as those incentives would relate to areas such as retention, graduation rates, extramural funding, and quality of life.

---

1 Special thanks to Ellen O’Connor, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, for giving time, data, and insights to our committee.
Table of Contents

Overview

Main report: Outline

1. Brief overview of how the committee carried out its charge

2. Outline of the key major goals to be accomplished in order to achieve your committee’s relevant portions of Vision 2025.

3. Two to three key objectives under each goal. (*NB: Detailed implementation plans will be developed at a later date.*)

4. Description of the work that remains to be done to get these key goals accomplished (e.g., research, best practices, financial analysis, coordination with other committees, etc.)

5. Recommended broad-brush priorities for first five-year implementation plan for moving toward Vision 2025.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Map of possible new and expanded revenue sources: Summary list.

Appendix 2: Map of possible new and expanded revenue sources: With elaboration and some pro’s and con’s for each source.

Appendix 3: Revenue projections currently available.
Overview

Our committee has some overarching observations.

1. Our report suggests areas for further investigation. In our eight weeks of work, we identified revenue sources but could not fully research each one. Our report is intended neither to endorse nor dismiss particular revenue sources, although we do raise various advantages and limitations that we learned about each through our discussions.

2. Our work on this committee provided us with a special opportunity to consider the multiple sources of revenue in a systemic and holistic way. We all noted that we appreciated this opportunity for a cross-college, multi-disciplinary group to take a high-level view of revenues.

3. The new and expanded revenue sources we considered must be tied together as part of a broader strategic plan, many components of which are articulated in Vision 2025.

A shorthand label for this new strategy is “moving up-market.” The overall business model requires investments, in order to move to higher revenue levels and to new revenue sources.

• Hiring faculty who have a high probability of getting grants from traditional sources that permit higher overhead charges (that bring more revenue), and who may expect higher pay and better facilities.

• Branding UMass Boston as a high-quality choice, worth a higher price tag for students, especially for some professional degrees.

• Enhancing our physical plant, including building dorms to enrich student campus culture, facilities to attract new faculty, as well as better classrooms and housing options that would support higher-priced executive education programs.

• Getting UMass Boston featured more prominently in the news, in public debates, in academic outlets.

This strategy carries some risks:

• It may be difficult to maintain the UMass Boston commitment to serving students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

• The urban mission gives UMass Boston distinctiveness and gives many faculty and staff passion for their work. With a “moving up-market” strategy, the urban mission should be retained as a valued end in itself, as well as a means to distinctiveness in “branding.”
4. Overall, our committee feels we have set out an agenda of issues and questions that will need to be addressed in the next round of work on the strategic plan. Our work integrates with that of other committees by, for example, encouraging faculty pursuit of grants in a way that supports, rather than impedes, the time needed to write and publish (Academic Affairs); tracking whether, and with what student populations, the addition of more students creates revenues on the margin (Academic Planning and Enrollment); and screening new revenue sources for alignment with our values (Mission and Values).

5. The map of revenue possibilities appears in the Appendices. We do not believe there are any huge untapped potential revenue possibilities that we have missed.

6. While it is absolutely essential to stay focused on finances and get detailed numerical estimates, many of us on the committee found the discussions of cultural norms and incentive systems to be especially rich. Two issues stand out. First, at UMass Boston there is a culture of adaptation to scarcity, with a long history and often some very creative bootstrapping to keep cherished programs going. The downside is that scarcity can create a climate of hoarding resources and being skeptical about changes that require short-term pooling of resources for longer-term revenue growth for all. Second, incentives sometimes conflict in the pursuit of different university values: for example, cut corners in teaching in order to pursue grants and publishing versus serve a non-traditional student population with thoughtful and innovative teaching techniques. One answer is to find the balancing point and excel in both research and teaching, but many worry that the new demands for productivity are additive rather than easily synergistic.
Main report

The overarching purpose of this committee is to identify revenue sources that will support the investments and programs that are necessary to move toward Vision 2025.

1. Brief overview of how the committee carried out its charge

The work of the committee had four main elements:

1. The committee undertook a thorough review of a wide range of new financial resources as well as current revenue sources that could be expanded. Our guiding question was: Are we missing anything? We aimed to create a thorough map of the possibilities, so that then we could evaluate each resource.

2. We also considered ways to reduce costs and thereby free revenues for realizing Vision 2025. Our guiding question was: Are there any unquestioned assumptions we should revisit?

3. We discussed the norms, practices, and incentives on campus that currently facilitate or impede specific stakeholders in their efforts to pursue revenue sources. Our guiding question was: What cultural changes are needed to generate the revenue for Vision 2025, and how can those changes be realized in ways consonant with this Vision for what UMass Boston will be?

4. We sought comparative data from aspirant peer schools. Our guiding question was: How have other schools enhanced their research standing and pursued ambitious projects, facing a very similar climate of constraints?

The committee met every other Thursday for two hours. Our meetings included presentations and Q&A sessions with key parties responsible for current or potential future revenue sources, for example, Darryl Byers (institutional advancement), Zong-Guo Xia (external research awards), Charlie Titus (becoming a Division 1 school in sports), and Maria Idali Torres (how centers pursue grants with faculty collaboration).

Our meetings also included time for brainstorming about elements 1, 2, and 3 above, in the quest to be thorough. During and between our meetings, committee members contributed ideas for new sources of revenues, for example, health-related programs the public might pay for (Greer Glazer); premium fees for professional degrees (Philip Quaglieri); growth from the new University College (Dennis Maxey); revenues from use of campus facilities (Diane D’Arrigo); executive education programs that play to the distinct strengths of UMass Boston (Eunny Hyun); grants that are beneficial for junior faculty who need to publish (Carol Colbeck); partnerships with area universities and private organizations to create broad-based and attractive grant applications (Bill Kiernan); incentives such as course-load reductions that reward faculty for supporting centers and institutes when they need faculty in order to pursue grants (Maria Idali Torres); and an overall strategic approach to balancing the demands and incentives.
surrounding these multiple revenue sources (David Levy). The complete map of new and expanded revenue sources appears below (see Appendices).

2. Outline of the key major goals to be accomplished in order to achieve your committee’s relevant portions of Vision 2025.

Goal 1: Accurately project how much investment cash is available to support Vision 2025 projects.

Explanation: We need revenue estimates yearly until 2015, with projections for 2020 and 2025. The estimates should indicate assumptions and factors taken into account to make the projections.

Goal 2: Create an overall revenue collection and allocation process that is guided by strategic priorities.

Explanation: If the revenue sources are earmarked for particular operations or units, then they may or may not be available to fund new projects that are part of Vision 2025. We propose investigating whether and where it is appropriate to collect revenues into some kind of common fund, or several unit-level common funds, that can then be dispersed on the basis of strategic priorities.

Goal 3: Prioritize among revenue sources and target where key short-term investments can be made to boost longer-term revenues.

Explanation: Some revenue sources that looked promising will require initial investments – in time, people, money, and/or facilities. We propose creating a process for prioritizing and sequencing these investments. This process will require taking a long view of the return on investments, including knowing when to wait for promising programs to reap returns on investments and knowing when to ignore sunk costs and eliminate programs that are less promising than hoped. This balancing act is challenging in any organization.

Goal 4: Identify incentives that strengthen a culture of involvement and engagement in seeking revenue increases, across all faculty, administrators, and staff.

Explanation: Our hope is that a broad sense of ownership of Vision 2025 will translate into a broad sense of shared responsibility for generating revenues that support the vision. Moreover, we hope that these revenue-generating efforts will be highly aligned with – rather than on top of, instead of, or at odds with – the efforts that will yield the type of research, teaching, and service that are at the heart of Vision 2025. Therefore, it is important both to remove barriers that inhibit revenue-generating efforts and to add incentives that encourage, recognize, and reward revenue-generating efforts.
Goal 5: Compare our portfolio of revenue sources to those of our aspirant peers.

Explanation. Our aspirant peers face constraints similar to ours: a student population that cannot easily bear large fee increases without additional scholarship assistance; many years of reductions in state support; increasing demands for faculty to publish in high-quality journals without concomitant reduction in faculty teaching loads; growing class sizes; and/or stasis or reduction in staffing levels to support these efforts. Nonetheless, they are managing to produce high-quality scholarship and increase their research standing. How are they doing it? What do their portfolios of revenue sources look like?

In addition, we should track our local area comparison referents. With what we call a “moving up-market” strategy, UMass Boston might have to compete more directly with Northeastern and Suffolk; as comparison referents, UMass Boston has a higher academic reputation in many disciplines than Suffolk does but ranks lower in branding and fund-raising.

3. Two to three objectives under each goal.

Goal 1: Accurately project how much investment cash is available to support Vision 2025 projects.

- Objective 1a: Obtain detailed projections of revenue amounts from new and expanded sources identified (see Appendices 1 and 2).
- Objective 1b: Create a master Excel spreadsheet, or other financial management tool, that will facilitate a broad look across revenue sources, rather than managing each source one at a time.
- Objective 1c: Work with the Revenues Advisory Committee to track the impacts of two pilots for 2011: simplified fee structures and premium fees for the College of Management. Indicate where these pilots can be expanded.
- Objective 1d: Distribute this report to key stakeholders, to determine that no promising revenue sources have been omitted.

Goal 2: Create an overall revenue collection and allocation process that is guided by strategic priorities.

- Objective 2a: Track how the premium fees for the College of Management translate into fulfillment of strategic priorities aligned with Vision 2025. What kind of strategic plan best guides the use of the new revenues for realization of Vision 2025? What lessons are there for further fee increases at the College of Management and for premium fees in other colleges?
Objective 2b: Continue the use of “all funds budgeting” – and expand the accompanying mindset throughout the campus (e.g., the notion that “funds don’t wear hats”). Consider how this approach better aligns revenues to strategic priorities. Examine how other universities have adopted “all funds budgeting” in a way that speaks both to the budget process per se and to the university culture (e.g., Rutgers University).

Goal 3: Prioritize among revenue sources and target where key short-term investments can be made to boost longer-term revenues.

- Objective 3a: Investigate the costs of pursuing revenue sources (e.g., investments to move to NCAA Division II then Division I status; staffing needed for new programs for broader public; seed money to support grant-seeking, etc.).

- Objective 3b: Distinguish which revenue sources are the most promising in the short-, medium-, and long-term.

- Objective 3c: Create a timeline for the order in which investments will be made, and the sequence by which new revenues are re-invested for next projects. Take a wholistic, systemic view across multiple projects.

Goal 4: Identify incentives that will strengthen a culture of ownership for revenue increases across all faculty, administrators, and staff.

- Objective 4a: Harvest lessons from the research literature on cultural change in higher education institutions.

- Objective 4b: Connect to the work done by the Academic Affairs Committee on how research work is to be encouraged, evaluated, and rewarded.

- Objective 4c: Connect to the work done by the External and Community Relations Committee regarding how community engagement fits in a portfolio of scholarship.

- Objective 4d: Work with the Faculty Development Committee to understand incentives for (and constraints on) revenue-generating work at different career stages; this work may involve collecting qualitative (interview) or quantitative (survey) data from faculty about alignment between career goals and revenue-seeking opportunities.

Goal 5: Compare our portfolio of revenue sources to those of our aspirant peers.

- Objective 5a: Obtain information on revenue sources of our aspirant peers (we have this information for our peers but not our aspirant peers; and we have enrollment ratios and expenditure information for our aspirant peers, but not revenue information). Determine who can be deployed to do this work and how hard or easy it is to get this information (in dollars and in percentages).

- Objective 5b: Continue to track “best practices” in the field, as the funding climate changes from 2010 to 2025.
4. Description of the work that remains to be done to get these goals accomplished.

Collect specific revenue projections; this is the top priority. We need the fine-grained data. Moreover, we need data across programs, not just one program at a time. Appendix 3 suggests a template for looking at multiple revenue sources at once.

Collect revenue profiles from aspirant peers, as well as local peers / competitors / partners.

Determine whether enrollment growth is a source of revenue. Identify the marginal cost/benefit of an additional student. Understand how that number changes at different overall enrollment levels (e.g., is there a point where the cost of new facilities and support services for additional students exceeds the revenues from additional students?). Differentiate among types of students: undergraduate, master's, Ph.D. (e.g., professional-master’s-program students are likely sources of revenue; Ph.D. students represent a cost/investment).

Link the efforts of ORSP and the Faculty Development Committee, to identify incentives and concrete next steps to support faculty, at different career stages, in seeking grants and other outside revenue sources.

Track the premium fees from the pilot at the College of Management: what level of revenues is obtained; what elasticity of demand for the courses results (if any); the profile of students in the college; and how the funds are used strategically to advance Vision 2025.

5. Recommended broad-brush priorities for first 5-year implementation plan for moving forward toward Vision 2025.

Our five goals represent the immediate steps that must be taken in the next year – regarding both an overall revenues-and-investments planning process as well as collection of specific data – in order to generate increased revenues for 2015 and beyond.
Appendices

Appendix 1. Map of possible new and expanded revenue sources, summary list.

I. New sources

I.A. University College
I.B. Tiered fees for professional degrees
I.C. Executive education
I.D. New programs for broader public
I.E. Become Division I school in sports
I.F. Lease university property

II. Expanded sources

II.A. Institutional advancement
II.B. Grants
II.C. Licensing of intellectual property
II.D. Enrollment growth
II.E. Public use of campus facilities
II.F. State funding
II.G. Sales of university logo items

III. Reduced costs

III.A. Increase in student / faculty ratios
III.B. Reduced debt-servicing costs
III.C. Pursuit of all scholarships for which students may be eligible
III.D. Review revenue models for centers and institutes
Appendix 2. Map of possible new and expanded revenue sources, with elaboration and some pro’s and con’s for each source.

I. New sources

I.A. University College

Notes: The nature and purposes of University College and the potential pro’s and con’s of seeking revenues from this source were widely discussed and documented through the Faculty Council’s review process (see the Faculty Council website for documents). See revenue projections in Appendix 3.

I.B. Tiered fees for professional degrees

Notes: The College of Management will pilot a premium fee of $200 for graduate students (per semester of enrollment) and $100 for undergraduate students. A management degree has a high expected value. For the MBA degree, the nearest competitor charges approximately $21,000 compared to our approximately $11,000 cost. There is room for the college to charge additional fees, while remaining an affordable public option for obtaining an MBA degree.

Pro’s: Responsive to demand for MBA degrees and the price the market will bear.

Con’s: Some students might be driven away. The enrollment figures will be tracked. Some of the increased revenue will be deployed for additional scholarships to retain diversity in the student body.

Next steps: The use of the additional revenues will be governed by a strategic plan, to be determined.

I.C. Executive Education

Notes: CCDE (becoming University College) offers a range of continuing education programs for mid-career professionals. The proposal here is for targeted executive education programs that play to UMass Boston’s specific strengths. These programs will not be traditional semester-long courses, but instead will last approximately one day to one week. Other programs, such as Dispute Resolution, also offer various forms of training for mid-career professionals which go beyond traditional coursework and degrees.

Pro’s: These programs showcase UMass Boston’s strengths and can have an impact in the workplace and the world by shaping the perspectives of influential people who attend. There are models in the Boston area to consider, such as the one-week custom
course for women accounting professionals from Deloitte-Touche offered at the Simmons School of Management.

Con’s: These models also remind us that this market niche is quite full in Boston. Another “con” is that these courses are labor-intensive for faculty to prepare, particularly if they are customized in the way that will be a draw. These courses do not count as part of the course load, nor do they count strongly in faculty reviews and promotions. Faculty must be paid commensurate with consulting rates or rates for similar programs at other schools. Attendees expect nice facilities, and UMass Boston has neither residential facilities nor high-quality classrooms for offering the highest revenue-generating programs. Revenues generated must cover faculty “ad comp” pay as well as facilities rental (e.g., at the UMass Club), which may limit the amount of revenue they generate for use in pursuit of Vision 2025 programs. Detailed numbers are needed.

Next steps: UMass Boston can identify specific niches, such as the demand by international leaders for programs with international content, coming through OITA. Programs on diversity in the workplace, human rights, climate change, coastal environments, conflict resolution, or global partnerships may distinguish UMass Boston. When plans for residences are drawn up, the inclusion of some rooms and facilities appropriate for in-residence executive education should be considered.

I.D. New programs for broader public

Notes: Three ideas were generated from the College of Nursing and Health Sciences.

1. GoKids Boston can be used more widely by the public for fees (school groups, etc.). Currently, it is supported by grants and aimed at target populations for research purposes.

Pro’s: The GoKids facility can be more fully utilized. Broader use aligns with the mission of serving the community by combating childhood obesity.

Con’s: An initial investment would be required, for a staff member who could oversee business development for the facility.

2. A walk-in clinic at Walgreen’s, possibly one on or near campus, could be staffed by CNHS.

Pro’s: It provides clinical practice for students and may bring revenues. There is a model of another nursing school doing this.

Con’s: Supervision of students may stretch faculty.

3. The Center for Clinical Education and Research (CCER) has health-monitoring tools that are already sought-after by marathoners and might have a broader market.
Pro’s: Health-conscious exercisers increasingly seek biofeedback and technology tools to track and meet their goals. The market is there.

Con’s: As with the GoKids model, a business development staff person may need to be hired.

I.E. Become a Division I school in sports

Notes: NCAA Division I schools do not have business models that show net revenues. Instead, the move to being a Division I school yields greater offsets of the costs of running a sports program. For example, instead of spending $3 million to run a Division III sports program, a university might spend $8 million to run a Division I program and reap $7 million in return (tickets, etc.). The overall impact is a $2 million decrease in the cost of the sports program. The investigation of this revenue source should link to the recommendations of the Student Life Committee.

Pro’s: Builds school spirit. As UMass Boston builds a residential component, sports teams will link well to that type of campus culture. Stronger school spirit may support retention. There is a timing issue: Acting soon may make it more likely that UMass Boston can get a seat in Division II, which may be limiting access soon.

Con’s: The initial investment to move through the steps to Division II and then Division I is steep (estimates as high as $50 million), and the process takes time.

I.F. Lease university property

Notes: This idea was suggested in the open meeting of the Strategic Planning Task Force, particularly with reference to the new Bayside property and its desirable location.

II. Expanded sources

II.A. Institutional advancement

Notes: A process is underway to expand fundraising and outreach. With projected growth in enrollments, there will be more alumni to court. Our committee discussed inculcating a culture of giving from undergraduates’ early days, even small amounts of giving among financially stressed students, with an eye to high participation numbers and later giving. We also discussed how strengthening the student culture (a link to the Student Life Committee) might enhance willingness to give. Sales of clothing with UMass Boston logos have skyrocketed, indicating some of this enhanced school spirit. The growing use of social media by colleges to stay in touch with alumni may enhance giving. Finally, we discussed continued courting of Boston-area businesses to support
UMass Boston – as part of a generally growing corporate commitment to “civic engagement,” for which UMass Boston is a particularly attractive target for giving.

II.B. Grants

Notes: We discussed the relatively lower percentage of faculty at UMass Boston who have outside research grants, compared to the percentages at other UMass campuses and aspirant peer schools. Several ideas came up under this heading, with links to other strategic planning efforts.

1. Encourage overall grant-getting.

Notes: This effort links to the work of the Academic Affairs Committee.

Pro’s: Multi-disciplinary collaborations are often preferred by grant-giving organizations, and the well-developed research clusters have stronger changes for getting grants.

Con’s: Preparation of high-status but low-probability grant proposals can be time-consuming. If it diverts effort from other, faster pathways to publication, junior faculty members may actually be penalized for engaging in proposal preparation. Mechanisms for taking grant-seeking efforts into account will be needed.

2. Tie grant-seeking to mission-driven projects.

Notes: Locate where faculty are already investing effort and deploying expertise (e.g., the research clusters)

Pro’s: Immediate opportunities for expanding grants as a revenue source will exist where there is strong alignment with what faculty are already working on.

Con’s: There may be a saturation point, where the obvious opportunities have been pursued and the most likely stakeholders are already managing as many grants as they can handle while still finding time to publish.

3. Hire faculty with expertise in grant-getting.

Notes: In addition to pivoting the efforts of current faculty more toward grant-getting, recruitment of faculty might focus on faculty who have received, or are highly likely to receive, grants. In particular, grants from federal agencies, while more competitive, carry a higher overhead rate and thereby bring more revenues into the university.

Pro’s: Overhead is the mechanism by which grants add to the pool of revenues available to fund new projects.
Con’s: When faculty tailor their work to maximize the chance of receiving grants, they may do less of the critical, daring, and edgy work that has given UMass Boston its distinctiveness and positive reputation in many areas.

4. Partner with other universities in the area, as well as with private entities (e.g., publishers, research units), in order to write broad-based and compelling grant proposals.

Notes: There have already been many mutual beneficial partnerships. For partnering organizations, UMass Boston’s reputation as a diverse university may enhance their chances of getting grants, whether specifically about topics related to diversity or from funders who list support for diversity as one of their core values.

5. Make the best use of graduate assistants.

Notes: The university invests approximately $11m in GAs. It is important to understand how these positions are leveraged to i) enhance student learning and ii) support faculty research. In reality, staffing shortages may mean that GAs are used to do secretarial work and patch the gaps.

Pro’s: Tightening the accountability for GA research productivity ensures that the $11m is a good investment that advances research goals.

Con’s: GAs necessarily vary, because students bring different levels of preparation. Sometimes the intersection of faculty needs and student skills makes it best to use a GA for administrative or teaching-related duties.

II.C. Licensing of intellectual property

Notes: Provost Langley mentioned this revenue source in giving this committee its charge and in remarks to the Strategic Planning Task Force. The Venture Development Center is in its early stages and not yet at a point of producing revenues. We have not found other areas where this revenue source might be produced.

II.D. Enrollment growth

Notes: Enrollment growth appears to be regarded as an engine for realizing Vision 2025. However, enrollment growth may be revenue neutral. More investigation is needed to get the numbers on the marginal cost/revenue for an additional student.
II.E. Public use of campus facilities

Notes: The Campus Center is a resource for the community and a source of revenue. Outside bookings are still a small portion of the space usage. Priority is given to UMass Boston events, even if that means bumping an event that would bring more revenue.

II.F. State funding

Notes: This round of strategic planning begins with the assumption that state support will continue to decline. Some have argued that stronger lobbying, advocacy, and public awareness campaigns about the value of public higher education might reverse this trend. The suggestion to not give up on pursuing state funding came up, with vigor, at both the open meeting of the Strategic Planning Task Force and the discussion of strategic planning at the Faculty Council.

II.G. Sales of university logo items

Notes: International students may have a particularly strong demand for high-quality – and high-retail-margin – logo items. Sales of logo items at the bookstore have recently skyrocketed, with over $10,000 in sales on 2010 Commencement Day alone.

III. Reduced costs

These are areas to explore, where there may be assumptions to test. That is why we put question marks after each item.

III.A. Increase in student / faculty ratios ??

Notes: There are various measures of what the student / faculty ratio at UMass Boston is, either 16:1 or 19:1. In either case, we are at the low end or just below the middle range of our aspirant peers. The approach needed may be to manage a range of classroom sizes, from larger classes where core classes (with teaching assistants) make sense to smaller classes that encourage the kind of research-intensive training for undergraduates imagined in Vision 2025.

Pro’s: Small additions to average classroom size may be easily absorbed.

Con’s: The average ratio conceals where growth is already occurring and straining resources, particularly with core classes that push class sizes to over 40, with barely a seat per student in a typically sized UMass Boston classroom.

III.B. Reduce debt-servicing costs ??
Notes: This idea emerged from examining information reported by George Mason University, an aspirant peer university. When we receive additional comparative data, we can determine how our debt-servicing costs compare.

III.C. Pursuit of all scholarships for which students may be eligible ??

Notes: This idea emerged after hearing how for-profit universities like Phoenix rely heavily in their business model on pushing students to obtain all forms of scholarships for which they are possibly eligible. The more outside scholarships are obtained – as with outside research grants – the more university resources designated for scholarships are freed up for additional scholarship aid or other uses.

III.D. Revisit revenue models for centers and institutes ??

Notes: The centers and institutes are an engine of research productivity, visibility, and stature for UMass Boston. They generate the majority of grants that come into UMass Boston. As noted by the work of the External and Community Relations Committee, many of these grants are in the area of community engagement.

In some cases, the centers and institutes have more calls for proposals and opportunities to submit grants than they can find faculty to join. Faculty collaboration is mutually beneficial: Centers and institutes get staffing and status to win grants and faculty get the infrastructure and grants administration to enhance their research productivity.

Our committee was interested in the broad variety of arrangements that the centers and institutes have: Some have staff who are supported by the university or by a state line-item budget while some have staff who are entirely on soft money; some support doctoral students or generate GAships; some teach courses and offer certificates; they have various amounts of space; some operate at the university level and some are housed within a college.

Questions were raised about how the creation of new centers and institutes is determined, particularly when current levels of support to existing centers and institutes are strained. What models govern how the costs and revenues are balanced? Which centers and institutes could generate more of their own funding if there were better incentives for faculty to join forces with them? Which centers and institutes could leverage greater investments, turning financial support into higher revenue streams?
Appendix 3. Revenue projections currently available (still very incomplete)

Estimates provided to the Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University College</td>
<td>$5.2M (net)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6.6</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
<td>$9.6</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered fees, CM</td>
<td>$539K (gross)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75M *</td>
<td>$150M *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75M *</td>
<td>$150M *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* “Big Vision” numbers – not actual estimates.