Enclosed are the SBPC recommendations for new funding priorities for the FY19 budget, including a chart that summarizes the final project rankings by the Council. Division/unit heads made both written and oral presentations and subcommittees of the Council were assigned to provide a balanced review of the proposal. All proposals submitted were required to articulate strategic alignment across a set of criteria that related to University benefit/impact and the new strategic Academic Plan 2016-21: *Innovation with Impact*. This year, uniquely, a total of only 4 proposals were submitted and 4 presentations were made to the Council, including a University-wide cross divisional IT item that the VP’s put forward together, a proposal from Academic Affairs to increase the number of Graduate Teaching Assistants, a proposal from the Division of Research for a grant writer, and a proposal from Athletics for a video coordinator. The presentations were followed by a discussion and question and answer period and an additional meeting was held to further discuss proposals relative to the strategic criteria. The deliberation and evaluation process involved:

- A rating by each member of each proposal on a 5 point Likert scale. (Excel Summary document attached denotes strategic criteria and final voting results).
- **Strong consensus resulted for 2 top proposals; the Council is not endorsing or recommending funding for the 2 low priority proposals.**

This process resulted in the following:

**FY 2019 SBPC Budget Priorities and Recommendations:**

**Highest Priorities in rank order recommended for funding**

1. **University-wide Information Technology Directory Service**— Total of $170,000 Annually and $330,000 one-time for consulting/implementation services

   Submitted on behalf of ALL the VP’s as a University-wide priority, this project was unanimously voted #1 priority. The Council recommends that all three phases of the technology project be expedited and funded as a top priority by the University. Phases II and III are for a University-wide Information Technology Security Infrastructure with estimated costs of about $258,760 of one-time costs in FY 20 and additional base costs of approximately $90,000-$130,000 to be projected with greater clarity after Phase I as estimating is difficult at this time. This project emerged as the top priority through the new IT governance process, demonstrating strong collaboration and thoughtful consideration as to the needs and priorities for future technology investments.

   The Council urges accelerating the implementation of all 3 phases as the need is critical to ensure integrity and security in the University’s IT system. This project only brings the University to a base level, addressing deficits in investment needed to keep the system current. There are some
potential longer term savings in future years with consolidations in licensing needs and other factors.

2. **Growing Teaching Assistants to Enhance Graduate Education - Total of 50 GTA’s from FY ’19-FY ’23 - $1,868,500 = total new funding request; $373,700 per year --- Academic Affairs will provide a co share of $50,000 per year and $250,000 in total**

The Division of Academic Affairs is co-sharing costs at a total of $250,000 or $50,000 per year. This proposal came to the Provost from a task force studying the issue of GTA’s. The task force recommendation was to fund an additional 80 GTA’s over five years. The proposal addresses the shortfall of GTA’s compared to peer schools and the deficit of GTA’s that has resulted from decades of holding GTA’s constant while enrollment has grown dramatically. The proposal relates directly to the mission of the University and aligns with most of the goals of the Academic Plan. Importantly, the investment in additional GTA’s is accompanied by a detailed plan to revamp the process used to allocate GTA’s among the colleges and departments. The plan was developed by the Office of the Provost and the Graduate School working closely with a faculty-led GTA Task Force and it includes the establishment of a new set of fundamental principles relevant to GTA’s, a new process for allocation, and a set of criteria to be used as guidelines for allocation (see attached). The request for new GTA’s is intimately linked to the implementation of the new allocation model. The proposal was determined to be strong in that it was well-vetted and articulated specific criteria that would be used in the reallocation of process of TA’s. This investment will benefit undergraduates, graduates, and new faculty. With respect to the latter, it is an investment in our new faculty’s success. The Council recommends also that every search process for a TA should develop a plan to generate a strong and diverse pool. It is desirable to accelerate this process, if at all possible, relative to projected and continuing restricted national funding.
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Graduate programs are an essential and vital component to URI’s mission as the flagship learning centered research university of Rhode Island and to our role and commitment to provide advanced education to a diversity of audiences and constituents. The second goal of URI’s 2016-2021 Academic Strategic Plan calls for “increasing the magnitude, prominence, and impact of URI’s research, scholarship, and creative work.” (URI Academic Strategic Plan 2016-2021, p. 3) One of the best ways to fulfill this goal is to promote excellence in graduate education. Providing funding to highly qualified students is essential to making URI graduate programs competitive. Teaching Assistantships are one of the key ways to fund graduate education.

At present, the University of Rhode Island provides financial support for 350 Graduate Teaching Assistantships (GTA’s) at an annual cost of ~$16 million. Based on some unknown distribution algorithm from many years ago (>25 years ago), GTA’s were distributed to colleges and departments and those allocations have remained largely unchanged, despite changes in enrollment, program demand, the advent of new programs, and many other factors associated with a dynamic public research university. In fact, there is no obvious or consistent association between the allocation of GTA’s to departments/colleges and any quantitative or qualitative measures. As such, the current allocation of ~$16 million in GTA support has no strategic foundation. From a sense of responsible management and vitality for the entire institution and its graduate programs, this must change.

At recent Graduate School Summits, there was discussion of a desire on the part of some to seek an increase in the number of GTA’s. However, and even more importantly, there was substantial discussion of the need for clear and sound criteria to guide the allocation of GTA’s, both as they exist now and in the future. Indeed, the University Manual calls for a strategic redistribution on a rotating 3-year basis, which has been ignored for many years. While it may be possible to make a case for an additional investment in GTA’s based on undergraduate enrollment increases, such an investment cannot be seriously considered or warranted until a systematic set of criteria are established to guide the allocation of GTA’s on a regular basis.

To address this critical issue, during spring 2015 the Provost and the Dean of the Graduate School appointed and charged a Graduate Teaching Assistantship Task Force comprising faculty from across the university. The Task Force examined historical information, collected data from individual graduate programs, reviewed GTA allocation practices from other comparable institutions (as provided by Hanover Research), shared findings and solicited ideas at the 2015 Graduate Summit, the Council of Deans, and a Department Chairs Forum in spring 2016. The Task Force submitted their final report, which included a firm recommendation that the current allocation based solely on historical practices be changed and that a set of measures or metrics be developed to guide the allocation of GTA’s moving forward. The Provost Office, along with the Graduate School and a few deans, worked from the Report of the Teaching Assistantship
Task Force (appended) to develop a URI process for GTA allocation that includes a set of Fundamental Principles and Criteria that will guide the allocation of GTA’s in the future.

**Fundamental Principles Regarding GTA Distribution**

1. Graduate Teaching Assistantships represent a significant investment in graduate education and also support for undergraduate teaching and serve to facilitate vibrant graduate and research programs critical to URI’s mission as a flagship research university;

2. All GTA’s MUST participate in some form of meaningful and valued undergraduate instruction, such as laboratory instruction, leading recitations, serving as an instructor of record, leading help/tutorial sessions, formal advising, etc.; or, for a limited number of advanced PhD students, graduate instruction.

3. GTA’s are meant to serve as a mechanism to augment and support full-time faculty teaching and not as a replacement for full-time faculty instruction;

4. GTA’s are awarded to graduate students to assist in recruiting and enrolling top notch graduate students as well as to contribute to advancing undergraduate instruction; GTA’s are not assigned to individual faculty, but to programs, although most graduate students will have a faculty mentor;

5. GTA’s will be assigned teaching roles consistent with their academic expertise and skill set as well as programmatic teaching needs; GTA assignments may be in courses outside the department or college in which they are enrolled; in this latter case, the FTE will be allocated to the department in which the teaching occurs

6. GTA’s will be counted as part of the teaching FTE of the department and college in which the GTA is assigned a teaching role; following national protocols (e.g., the Delaware Study), a full-time GTA (the typical 20 hour per week GTA will count as a 0.5 teaching FTE used in calculating departmental FTE and student to faculty ratios;

7. All aspects of undergraduate instruction should be built upon “best pedagogical practices” and strive to incorporate new innovative technologies. Programs are responsible to ensure GTA’s are prepared for their instructional role, reviewed annually, and that allocation of GTA’s does not stifle instructional innovation.

8. Where appropriate and competitive, splitting GTA’s can expand graduate student funding opportunities and enrollment --- a ½ time GTA (10 hour per week teaching assignment) would receive 50% of the standard stipend (~$8000 per AY) and a 50% or 10 credit per year tuition scholarship (valued at $6550 for RI residents);
9. Where possible and desirable, pairing a 1/2 time GTA (10 hour per week) with a ½ time Graduate Research Assistantship (GRA) will leverage both GTA resources and grant-funded research assistantship resources to expand graduate enrollment and a balanced workload for graduate students (e.g., this may work well with students supported by training grants);

10. A pool of GTA’s should be retained centrally for use as an incentive to stimulate and support the development of new contemporary and innovative graduate programs that address current day societal needs and to enhance diversity in our graduate programs and in the delivery of the curriculum.

11. GTA’s are awarded to a graduate student for one year subject to renewal based on a satisfactory performance, progress toward completion, and continued availability of funds; GTA’s will be awarded for a maximum of two academic years (4 semesters) for Master’s students and three academic years (6 semesters) for doctoral students (beyond the Master’s).

Process for GTA Allocation at College and University Levels

1. All existing GTA’s are to be withdrawn from departments and centralized at the College level; deans would oversee the allocation among programs within their colleges using the criteria in the section below.

2. Over three consecutive years, approximately half (a total of 176) of the existing GTA’s in each College will be incrementally contributed to a central pool; this will be done in equal annual increments over the three years and in a manner that will ensure the stability of graduate students currently funded as GTA’s;

3. Upon the recommendation of the SBPC and approval of the President, 20 new GTA’s would be funded by the Office of the Provost in each of years 1, 2, and 3 above to add a total of 60 new GTA’s to the central pool noted above to create a central pool of 236 GTA’s to be allocated consistent with criteria outlined below that will guide allocation of GTA’s; the 60 new GTA’s represents a new institutional investment of ~$2.7m.

4. New GTA allocations from the central pool, beyond those remaining in the colleges, will be allocated based on the criteria outlined below in the next section as part of the strategic budget process in academic affairs.

5. Half of the central pool (118 GTA’s) will be allocated as base GTA funds to the Colleges to be revisited from strategic and programmatic perspectives every 5 years. The other half will remain in the centralized pool to be awarded annually on a multi-year rotating basis in response to college needs and alignment with the criteria below that guide the allocation of GTA’s. The latter half will remain in the central pool and NOT be committed as base to any one college.

6. All GTA’s will be awarded to graduate students to satisfy undergraduate teaching assistant needs, and in support of both graduate student recruitment/retention, and graduate enrollment goals.
7. The central pool of GTA’s will be managed by the Graduate School; recommendations regarding the allocation of GTA’s from the central pool will be based on alignment with the criteria below and will be made by a Steering Committee. The Provost will form the Steering Committee, which will include the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management, two faculty appointed by the Provost, and (administrative position to be named). The Steering Committee will make recommendations to the Provost, who will officially review those recommendations and make GTA allocations to Colleges.

Criteria to Guide the Allocation of GTA’s at URI

1. **Documented Teaching Assistant Teaching Demand – indicative metrics**
   - document the number of sections that **require** GTA’s and rationale for use of instructional TA’s to deliver the curriculum, including those that may be assigned to other departments that need teaching assistance
   - Average student credit hour production and course load per full-time tenure-track, clinical, and lecturer faculty members, respectively
   - Proposed % teaching effort for GTA’s requested

2. **Graduate Program Quality – indicative metrics**
   - Academic profile (GRE scores, undergraduate GPA, undergraduate major and institution, etc.) of admitted graduate students
   - Graduate student time to completion (annual average per department over 5-year period)
   - Graduate student retention and graduation rate – including annual degrees awarded per enrolled student
   - Record of faculty engagement in research, scholarship, and/or creative work, e.g., faculty publications, performances, external funding as appropriate to discipline, etc.

3. **GTA’s as Leverage for Graduate Program Growth and Success -- indicative evidence**
   - Need for GTA’s to sustain and expand enrollment in the graduate program
   - Potential to expand graduate enrollment and graduate student funding opportunities by strategically splitting GTA’s as appropriate and competitive
   - Potential to expand graduate enrollment by splitting GTA’s and GRA’s and combining in a manner that creates an appropriate teaching – research balance for students.
   - Program graduate enrollment trend over most recent three years, including data on diversity
4. Program Outcomes and Impact – largely qualitative evidence

- Professional pathways, opportunities, and demands for graduates of the program – provide alumni data from past 5 years
- Graduate program impact on the economy, society, and/or quality of life for citizens
- Evidence of positively branding the university or contributing to institutional prestige
- Evidence that the graduate program is contemporary, innovative, and in alignment with the university Academic Strategic Plan and commitment to diversity and inclusion
Raters are to be guided by Academic Plan elements & benefits in making their ratings. Council Members participated. Raters are required to distribute their ratings across the 5 response alternatives. Only ratings that are distributed across the 5 response alternatives will be incorporated in the final results.

### Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Very High &amp; High</th>
<th>Avg/Below Avg/Lowest</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Wide Directory Service ($500K); University Wide Information Technology Security Infrastructure ($260K)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grant Writer $77,600 after co share of $10,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Video Coordinators (2) &amp; Equipment $78,650 after co-share of $15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Grad Teaching Assistantships 10 in FY19 $373,700 after co-share of $50,000; Total of 50 from FY19-23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016-21 Academic Plan: Innovation with Impact

#### Theme 1: Enhancing Student Success

**Goal 1**
- Pedagogy to Engage Students
- Expand Experiential learning
- Expand modes of course delivery and assessment by leveraging space & time in new ways
- Faculty development and incentives to promote new learning approaches
- Advancing liberal education
- Access & Affordability, credit completion for all populations

#### Theme 2: Expand Research, Scholarship, and Creative Work

**Goal**
- Achieve high-impact, translational, and innovative research, scholarship, and creative work
- Broaden resources and support growth in research opportunities and demonstrate value and recognition for multiple forms of scholarship
- Foster inquiry-based interdisciplinary knowledge and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and build greater connections across disciplines and academic units
- Target research initiatives that impact economic and workforce development
- Involve undergrad and grad students in rich & varied research, creative projects & other opportunities
- Develop high-performance research computing initiatives to facilitate research and advance big data analyses and applications across all disciplines

#### Theme 3: Grow a Global Presence

**Goal**
- Advance the internationalization of the University, develop students as engaged global citizens, and create meaningful international strategic partnerships.
- Articulate and prioritize internationalization of institution-wide strategic plans and faculty hires
- Provide appropriate administrative leadership and structure to promote and coordinate the globalization efforts of the University
- Create opportunities for the internationalization of the curriculum and co-curriculum to ensure that all students are exposed to global perspectives and build global competence
- Create institutional policies and support mechanisms to provide faculty with opportunities to develop global competence to maximize the impact of student global experiences on learning outcomes
- Expand support structures and efforts to increase numbers of domestic students engaging in international education experiences, and successfully recruit, enroll, and retain international students
- Formalize the process of strategic planning and proposal review, approval, tracking, and assessment of international partnerships

#### Theme 4: Embrace Diversity and Social Justice

**Goal**
- Inspire an enlightened community that is characterized by vibrant cultural diversity; that embraces difference; that is built upon a learning environment that fosters respect, understanding, and social justice; and that rejects prejudice and intolerance.
- Develop robust plans for diversifying faculty and staff by employing new and novel approaches that realize and retain greater numbers of diverse faculty
- Increase the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students from underrepresented groups, and provide support for their inclusion and success in the academic environment
- Create an active learning community among students, faculty, staff, and administrators that engages in open discourse and enhanced understanding about what it means to be a diverse and socially just community

Theme 5: Streamline Processes to Improve Effectiveness
- Engender a highly professional work culture that celebrates service and is characterized by flexible, effective, and efficient processes and by trust, support, and recognition towards greater institutional effectiveness.
- Develop new strategic and supportive human resource, affirmative action, and payroll administrative processes within all divisions of the University that enable efficiency and effectiveness in hiring and retaining excellent employees, and in performance management
- Prioritize and improve information technology to better meet future technology-related needs of the institution
- Explore new business and administrative processes that serve faculty, staff, and students with the highest degree of service and efficiency
- Develop processes and practices that enable Academic Affairs to more nimbly update curriculum, solve problems, and work collaboratively across disciplines in order to better meet the needs of future learners
- Explore changes in long-range space, facility, and capital improvement planning, including deferred maintenance plans; and assess campus planning efforts with the community to regularly make improvements

Theme 6: Implement a Bold Advancement Agenda
- Engender a University culture of philanthropy through strong partnerships leading to the launch of a comprehensive campaign
- Leverage University relationships to expand the pool of individual, alumni, Foundation, and corporate prospects and donors
- Ensure a cutting-edge infrastructure that supports a robust advancement operation

Benefits:
1. The position or status of the University in the overall higher education marketplace
   - Efforts to promote the integrity, brand, news, rankings, etc.
2. URI’s commitment to support the State of RI
   - Efforts that will positively impact jobs or economy or agencies or organizations in the State
3. Positive direct and/or indirect financial impact to the University
   - Potential revenue producing efforts or cost cutting efforts
4. Intangible positive important benefit
   - Efforts that will positively impact morale, work environment, efficiency, reputation
5. Enrollment management goals
   - Efforts that will positively impact admission, retention, and/or graduation rates
6. Quality of the student experience
   - Efforts that will positively impact the learning environment, physical campus, including buildings and lands and grounds, cocurricular programs and services