

**Budget Transparency Budget Model Initiative
Performance Subcommittee Report
March 26, 2019**

Budget Transparency - Performance Sub-committee

Summary Report

Question 1: What are the strategic goals of the University?

The University defines general areas of focus, in particular: nationally competitive research production; student success; community advancement; competitive resource generation. Among the goals from the provost's strategic plan, several can guide budget priorities. These include, *build and retain a diverse, world-class faculty, become a major global institution, and prepare graduates who will change the world*. The goals should reflect regional, national and global engagement and impact. The Provost's strategy is ready for implementation in a formal way with each goal supported by a number of projects with managers, target metrics, timelines, milestones, and resource assessment. There is a need for an overall UH strategy that is more specific than the existing form, and a strategy implementation plan. There are drawbacks and constraints that the committee identified in its report.

Question 2: How do we ensure sufficient resources at a centralized level to meet strategic priorities and reward outcomes that are aligned to the strategic goals of the University?

The university budgets state formula funding and all types of centralized tuition and fees each year for ongoing operations and new initiatives. State mandated (statutory), Designated, and governing board authorized (Premium) tuition is charged to all graduate students. Undergraduate students pay state mandated (statutory) and designated tuition. All students pay the consolidated university services fee (CUSF) and the consolidated course class fees (consolidated academic fees). Our current budget model relies on each of these self-generated sources. There is general support for a budget model that has revenue performance and growth at its core; one that sets a judicious and transparent tax rate so that Colleges can predict the rewards for revenue growth, while at the same time contributing to the centralized resource pool.

Question 3: What is the desired ratio of undergrads to graduate students?

The percentage of graduate to undergraduate students at the University of Houston is currently 18:82. This ratio skews toward undergraduates different from many of our peer institutions and nearly every AAU public university. If UH desires to be considered among the types of Universities that "earn the majority of competitively awarded federal funding for academic research and are educating tomorrow's visionary leaders and global citizens" ([Association of American Universities](#)), this ratio needs to change in favor of more graduate students. While no specific ratio has been agreed upon, a range of 20%-25% graduate students is suitable.

Question 4: Colleges have established annual targets that are approved by the Provost to ensure that the measures are consistent with university and college goals and that the targets are appropriate. Should these targets continue to be used for calculating outcomes funding?

We recommend that the Provost retains the practice of awarding performance funds as linked to college success measures. There are however recommendations for change derived from the drawbacks of the current procedures. The recommendations are mainly on using 3-year averages, comparing to peers, accounting for differences in resources inside UH, and considering growth-related base allocations.

Question 5: Currently, colleges are rewarded for each outcome target that is met and for the percent growth in overall enrollment. Should this methodology continue?

The practice of rewarding the colleges (as and when available) based on target outcomes met should be retained; however, universal rewarding of enrollment growth should be considered on a college-by-college basis depending on capacity to expand without negative 5-year-projected impact on education quality and student recruitment and retention.

Question 6: Should colleges be penalized for missing outcome/enrollment targets?

Colleges must certainly be held accountable for their targets that have been derived in consultation with the Provost. While state formula funding is substantially driven by increases in enrollment, the ever-growing crops of new students must be accommodated physically and intellectually in the classrooms and labs. The perpetually increasing size of the student body must be coupled with increase in the number and sizes of classrooms and labs, faculty (tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track), and associated services. The current penalty for missing outcome/enrollment targets appears to be disqualification for access to extra one-time funding for special initiatives. This should be applied proportionally to the degree of severity the target was missed. In order to account for expected fluctuations in measurable metrics, it is advisable that assessments related to missing targets be viewed in the context of a three year window. Also, a penalty can take effect only after missing a target a second time. The underlying reasons why the target was missed should be identified and addressed.

Question 7: Should the 50-in-5 targets that are now complete be included in the calculation of outcomes funding?

Response - majority

Each college has developed a set of 50-in-5 benchmarks to measure increase in research productivity and scholarly contributions. Those measures are specific to the disciplines within the various colleges. The 50-in-5 metrics being defined for five-year time period means the intense focus of the initiative would eventually change. Put another way, the 50-in-5 initiative is an acceleration of effort that might shape funding priorities while the program is in effect. As such, the 50-in-5 targets should be included in the assessment of college performance and allocations, subject to the constraints and concerns expressed above.

Report of Budget Transparency Sub-committee on Performance

Question 1: What are the strategic goals of the University?

Our understanding of the question

Strategic goals lay out the path to accomplish the mission of the institution. They are developed in the broadest sense to guide priorities, set specific objectives that can be used to develop implementation plans that includes measuring achievements.

Response - majority

Among the goals from the provost's strategic plan, several can guide budget priorities. These include, *build and retain a diverse, world-class faculty, become a major global institution, and prepare graduates who will change the world.* The goals should reflect regional, national and global engagement and impact.

The University also defines general areas of goal focus, in particular: nationally competitive research production; student success; community advancement; competitive resource generation. (<http://www.uh.edu/about/mission/>)

Response – alternative

The University needs an overarching strategy that leads the development of strategies for the 4 branches of education, research, innovation and community engagement. In support of each of the 4 sub-strategies would be 3 activities that are: advancement, communications and government/community relations. The next step is to create implementation plans for the 4 strategies of education, research, innovation, and community engagement. Having a strategy can lead to constraints if and when opportunities arise, but such constraints can be positive because identification and prioritization of opportunities should also be an ongoing community activity. In this context, the University-wide goals require further elaboration, followed by developing implementation plans. The Provost's strategy is ready for implementation in a formal way with each goal supported by a number of projects with managers, target metrics, timelines, milestones, and resource assessment. There is a need for an overall UH strategy, and a strategy implementation plan.

Pros and Cons

Pros

- Presents a set of guides to prioritize effort/action, budgets, space and policies.
- Provides a benchmark to measure progress and success in all university functions.
- Builds a shared mission for the campus community.
- Projects University ambitions to the surrounding region and across the state.
- Creates opportunity for strategic management of goals on an ongoing basis.

Cons

- Does not provide guidance for areas where two goals might be in conflict.
- Can potentially tie the University down when opportunities arise that do not align with the strategic goals.
- The strategy development process is laborious and could lead to conflict.

- May fail to achieve intention without clear shared understanding, both through communication and through the clear designation of goal “implementers”.

Additional Questions

- Do we feel that the goals are too high/low, are they at the strategic level or semi- operational level? Is this sufficient for the university?
- To what extent do strategic goals reflect current (or past) needs (of the community/university/other stakeholders) relative to near or distant future needs of the same or other groups?
- How might our goals prompt us to think strategically about how we create/leverage partnerships in support (e.g., UH’s involvement in Houston’s big data science efforts being right now led more by Rice) and in leadership to ultimately combine in ways that move us faster toward where we want to be?
- Is our community ready to engage in an intense activity to develop a comprehensive strategy and sub-units strategies, followed by an even more intense activity to develop, apply and follow an implementation plan?
- What distinctive competencies does UH possess that would enable the university to achieve its strategic goals?

Question 2: How do we ensure sufficient resources at a centralized level to meet strategic priorities and reward outcomes that are aligned to the strategic goals of the University?

Our understanding of the question

Assuming “we” refers to the colleges and their faculty members in the UH system, we consider the key aspect of the question to be the portion that states - “How do we ensure sufficient resources at the centralized level.....” This suggests that we need to think about how the activities that we, the faculty, do contribute to the resource pool used by central for its goals.

Another aspect of the question that follows from our understanding is how to measure the effort and outcomes of what we do.

Response - majority

The university budgets state formula funding and all types of centralized tuition and fees each year for ongoing operations and new initiatives. State mandated (statutory), Designated, and governing board authorized (Premium) tuition is charged to all graduate students. Undergraduate students pay state mandated (statutory) and designated tuition. All students pay the consolidated university services fee (CUSF) and the consolidated course class fees (consolidated academic fees). Our current budget model relies on each of these self-generated sources. There is general support for a budget model that has revenue performance and growth at its core; one that sets a judicious and transparent tax rate so that Colleges can predict the rewards for revenue growth, while at the same time contributing to the centralized resource pool.

Response – alternative

How do we take into account the central administration's own mechanism for ensuring central has resources it needs for strategic priorities?

Pros and Cons

Pros

- It is an imperative for the University to put in place a system that achieves growth in tuition revenues and not just SCHs.
- There is substantial heterogeneity in the State's formula funding for SCHs in different areas, and some Colleges have the capacity to generate revenues beyond formula funding. They should be encouraged to, and supported in so doing.
- The University needs to be managed as a portfolio (of assets) where Colleges remain independent. Non- or low-revenue generating Colleges or entities, such as the Library should be funded by levying a tax or fee on higher-revenue generating Colleges.
- Tax rate (or fee) needs to be set with great care to provide the correct incentives for Colleges to enhance their revenue generation ability. If colleges benefit financially from doing more, they will certainly do more.
- Revenue performance and growth must be at the core of ensuring the availability of resource. The best system would be to set a judicious tax rate so that Colleges can predict the rewards for revenue growth, while at the same time contributing to the centralized resource pool.
- The University might also think of ways to increase its various sources of income, in general. However, in the short term, we recognize that the only real sources of income that we have control over are increases in tuition and/or increases in enrollment, particularly graduate enrollment where there are significant national and international market opportunities.
- Increasing enrollment such that this also increases revenues could come from having the right mix of undergraduates and graduates. From a faculty perspective, the strategic hiring of high-level instructors to cover the teaching load of research faculty could enhance the opportunity for increasing revenues through enrollment.

Cons

- External funding at UH is not likely to be at a level in the near future to be a major component of the University's overall discretionary resources.
- In future years, payoffs from endowments will not be at a level to fund a significant portion of the University's needs.
- The rewards for increasing enrollments in the current system are ad hoc and unpredictable. The link between base funding and adjustments to College performance and success are non-transparent and unpredictable at best.
- The view that investment in Colleges with the highest revenue rates of return will lead to "unfair" outcomes is fundamentally flawed. Not funding Colleges that generate more revenues denies them of reinvestment capital from their revenues. To pursue exogenous redistribution objectives is a self-defeating exercise that will eventually lead to general mediocrity across the University.

Question 3: What is the desired ratio of undergrads to graduate students?

Our understanding of the question

What ratio of undergraduate to graduate students should the university strive for?

The University would like to have a ratio that:

- Enhances the learning environment of the institution
- Critical mass to sustain successful programs
- Enhances the reputation of the institution
- Facilitates the retention and recruitment of the best faculty
- Satisfies the state legislature and its goals articulated through initiatives like 60x30TX
- Propels us over the AAU threshold
- Supports our national competitiveness goal

Response – majority

The percentage of graduate to undergraduate students at the University of Houston is currently 18:82. This ratio skews toward undergraduates different from many of our peer institutions and nearly every AAU public university. If UH desires to be considered among the types of Universities that “earn the majority of competitively awarded federal funding for academic research and are educating tomorrow’s visionary leaders and global citizens” ([Association of American Universities](#)), this ratio needs to change in favor of more graduate students (selected sample in table below).

UH has made significant progress through a variety of efforts (e.g., UH-in-4; improved advising experiences; shift to a more residential campus) to transform its undergraduate educational experiences and, ultimately increase its four- and six-year graduation rates. These investments not only have the important benefit of improving student success, they are also likely to significantly impact other important outcomes like future giving. Continued attention to the success of undergraduates is essential. But with those efforts now increasingly mature, it is a natural time to also consider the ways in which our graduate student body and its representation can help us expand our research enterprise and bolster our reputation as a Tier 1 research university.

As is the four-year graduation rate, the research enterprise and professional training, are two areas that significantly impact the standing of a university in its community and nationally. Consequently, UH needs to make a significant effort and investment to bring size of the graduate student population in line with the recent increases in undergraduate enrollments. One of the fundamental considerations for attracting high quality research active faculty is the size and quality of the graduate program. The University needs to improve the quality and increase the numbers of graduate students in order to continue to attract and retain high quality faculty.

Response – alternative/minority

None

Pros and Cons

Pros

A larger more vibrant postgraduate program will:

- Make the university more visible and increase the reputation of the school
- Improve faculty recruitment and retention

- Enhance the capacity to be competitively awarded federal funding

Cons

- Programs that take resources from the undergraduate program are likely to be viewed less favorably by the legislature in Austin. These may eventually subside once the impact of an improved ratio can be seen and evaluated.
- Simply increasing the number of graduate students does not ensure that the graduate student experience is a successful one. Increased attention to mentoring would be important.

Potential constraints

- Size of the GTF pool for increases in the eligible graduate students
- Faculty with the capacity and resources to accommodate more graduate students
- Availability of suitable research and office space for more graduate students
- Availability of suitable functional, well-equipped, and staffed research facilities (may need a UH-level focus on donor prospects interested in scholarship)
- Upward movement in national competitiveness cannot be met by only growing the masters degree offerings, although they can generate revenue to support growth in the doctoral and equivalent degree programs

Additional Questions

- How should the strategic enrollment planning already undertaken by UH inform this conversation?
- Related, how does this inform the “best” strategy to shift the ratio towards higher graduate student numbers? More specifically, how will undergraduate student body growth expectations inform or shape the ways in which increasing graduate student numbers is approached?
- Within an expanded graduate student presence, what might the desired ratio of masters/professional degrees to PhDs be?
- What are the peripherally related budget implications for an increase in graduate student body (e.g., GTF)?

| University | Ratio Grad:UG | University | Ratio Grad:UG | University | Ratio Grad:UG |
|--------------|---------------|------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| U of Houston | 18:82 | MSU | 22:78 | Iowa State | 13:87 |
| Georgia Tech | 47:53 | U Indiana | 24:76 | Purdue | 25:75 |
| U of Arizona | 22:78 | U Buffalo | 31:69 | Duke | 58:42 |
| U Michigan | 35:65 | Rutgers | 28:72 | Princeton | 35:70 |
| U Iowa | 27:73 | UCLA | 32:68 | Washington U | 51:49 |

Note: (1) Selected from mainly AAU, (2) Yellow shaded are private universities

Question 4: Colleges have established annual targets that are approved by the Provost to ensure that the measures are consistent with university and college goals and that the targets are appropriate. Should these targets continue to be used for calculating outcomes funding?

Our understanding of the question

Philosophically speaking, should report card-linked college success measures provide the basis for the distribution of annual performance funds (as and when available)?

Response - majority

We recommend that the Provost retain the practice of awarding performance funds as linked to college success measures; however, with recommendations for change derived from the cons of the current procedures (explained below). Recommended changes include:

- Use 3 year rolling averages of some report card measures (e.g., expenditures);
- Determine college-specific measures/targets based on external benchmarks (external peer or aspirational colleges) while accounting for resource differentials between institutions;
- View all colleges as contributing to a unified university portfolio, with attention to how setting/achieving targets maintains UH's regional and national competitiveness and its priorities and distinctiveness as a whole, while accounting for college-specific resource differentials;
- Increase base funding to support some continual growth targets (e.g., enrollment) or consider acceptability of maintenance as a target for some colleges; and
- Align similar measures (though not necessarily targets) across colleges, where possible.

Response – alternative/minority

None

Pros and Cons (current practice)

Pros

- Process should enable within-college clarity of important outcomes, measurements, and targets (if shared) that can inform strategic planning to achieve.
- Process provides rewards for colleges that perform better each year; such rewards are appropriate (and may be necessary) for enhanced performance. Enhanced performance is necessary given UH's steep trajectory of success and growth goals as a university. (note: "better performance" targets should account for within-college resource availability)
- Receipt of performance funds may create new opportunities to enable growth in report card measures the following year (e.g., investment into seed grant funds for faculty to obtain pilot data to increase external grant applications).
- Process has served as a unifying factor for faculty as they have common goals to work towards collectively for the betterment of the College. This has also increased faculty productivity.

Cons

- Currently, measures and targets are based on 1 year of data; however, there are natural yearly fluctuations in things like expenditures and degrees granted that might call for looking at data in terms of a 3 year rolling average to enable more stability in colleges' ability to achieve steadier upward growth (and thus performance funding) over time.
- One-time performance funding may not sustain target achievement over time (e.g., continual enrollment gains) and makes planning difficult-to-impossible; increased base funding is needed for sustainability and continued growth. Because of the likelihood there will be variation in tolerable enrollment growth among colleges, a system that funds higher revenue generating entities can provide the resources need to subsidize others until opportunities favor a re-alignment of priorities.
- In the absence of base funding to sustain growth-oriented targets (e.g., enrollment, degrees granted), rewarding *maintenance* goals may be best (note: this recommendation would not apply to things like citation increases).

- Current practices may not ensure that growth in some areas (e.g., enrollment) does not come with unintended loss of quality that affect student recruitment and retention and success (e.g., student to faculty ratios; note: quality markers would need to operationalization).
- Because of a largely internal focus on comparing colleges within our system, it is a challenge for us to determine objectively how well colleges perform. Unless targets are chosen with care, colleges might be seen to be "underperforming" because of resource differentials, and this could preclude access to performance-based funding (or even lead to undeserved cuts in funding) for some colleges. This is would take many colleges on a quick and irrecoverable path to a decline in the quality of their programs.
- Performance targets within colleges should be oriented around their external peers and aspirants – it is not clear this is currently the case. Judging our performance externally determines our competitiveness, how we will attract students (and hence raise revenues and can price our programs in accord with their value), how we will get research grants, and how we will rank or qualify for AAU. However, benchmarks/targets must also take into account the resources of peers and aspirant colleges.
- College-set measures show subtle, and perhaps unnecessary, differences within the same general construct that may create inequities between colleges in the ability to achieve them (e.g., percentage of faculty with external grants vs federal research expenditures). Similar measures between colleges (but not necessarily targets) could be better aligned.

Additional Questions

- How does the Provost assesses the appropriateness of the targets set by colleges? How does the Provost's Office attempt to align similar goals between colleges? How are measures and targets determined between colleges to ensure equity in efforts needed to achieve them without a reduction in quality?
- Should Deans present in front of all Deans annually about their measures/targets, what they have achieved, and explain why they have not hit targets? This may enable a better understanding of between-college capabilities, barriers, inequities etc. and reveal larger issues of a growth-oriented reward system.

Question 5: Currently, colleges are rewarded for each outcome target that is met and for the percent growth in overall enrollment. Should this methodology continue?

Our understanding of the question

Should the university continue to incentivize colleges based on predetermined annual performance measures and, in particular, those based on enrollment growth?

Response - majority

The practice of rewarding the colleges (as and when available) based on target outcomes met should be retained; however, universal rewarding of enrollment growth should be considered on a college-by-college basis depending on capacity to expand without negative 5-year-projected impact on education quality and student recruitment and retention.

Response – alternative/minority

None.

Pros and Cons (current practice)

Pros

- The process will enable the colleges to develop measurable performance outcomes that can be evaluated on an annual basis.
- Rewarding the colleges for enhanced performance will provide additional resources for faculty development and faculty infrastructure support.
- Receipt of performance funds may create new opportunities for professional colleges to secure additional training materials for students that are preparing for their professional examinations.
- Not mandating enrollment growths across the board will allow colleges more freedom to fully consider their capacity to expand without impacting student success and other indicators that may affect student recruitment and retention and better align growth to strategic planning. Such considerations should precede the setting of goals that are eligible for performance-based incentives and be detailed to the Provost.
- Outcome targets provide an incentive for faculty and college-wide productivity.

Cons

- Given that many performance targets are growth-oriented, some colleges may not be able to maintain growth without sustained funding from the university.
- Student enrollment in professional programs is determined by established criteria from professional and licensing bodies. Should this be taken into consideration when using enrollment as a performance metric?
- There may be inequalities in the way that the colleges assess the same performance measures (e.g., ratio of faculty with extramural funding vs research expenditure).
Should the measurement parameters be more closely aligned among the colleges?
- Incentivizing enrollment growth may create pressure on colleges to grow to the detriment of student-faculty ratios, declines in full-time/tenured instruction provision, increased reliance on online course provision due to lack of physical space, and, potentially, a decrease in the quality of education.
- State funding may be impacted by a failure to achieve enrollment growths for the university as a whole if colleges are allowed the freedom to opt-in or opt-out for this target.
- The process for allocations based on performance measures is not clear and these funds are not available annually. This inconsistency in funding makes planning to accommodate growth difficult-to-impossible.
- Providing the colleges with a one-time performance funding may not be sufficient to sustain target achievement over time.

Additional Questions

- Should certain target goals be prioritized for funding over the next five years?
- Would the deans be required to produce annual reports that show what they have achieved during the period and why some targets have not been met?
- How will the Provost measure the return on investment when these funds are distributed to the colleges?
- How will the Provost's Office align similar goals between colleges?
- How will the Provost's Office determine measures and targets between colleges to ensure that there is equity in efforts required to achieve them without compromising quality?

- How will the Provost's Office assess the appropriateness of targets set by the different colleges? Would the colleges be compared against external peers?
- What flexibility would the deans have in making decisions about funding their colleges' strategic priorities versus using these funds to support university-wide initiatives (e.g., 50-in-5)?
- The existing performance measures do not include an assessment of enrollment growth. How are funding decisions made when enrollment growth is used as one of the performance measures?

Question 6: Should colleges be penalized for missing outcome/enrollment targets?

Our understanding of the question

The University should have a policy on missing outcome/enrollment targets that:

- Holds the colleges accountable
- Allows the colleges to pivot and be responsive to dynamic situations
- Facilitate their success

Response - majority

Colleges must certainly be held accountable for their targets. The targets are co-developed which is a fair strategy. While state formula funding is substantially driven by increases in enrollment as compared to other state institutions, the ever-growing crops of new students must be accommodated physically and intellectually in the classrooms and labs. The perpetually increasing size of the student body must be coupled to increases in the number and sizes of classrooms and labs, faculty (tenured/tenure-track and non-tenure track), and associated services.

The current penalty for missing outcome/enrollment targets appears to be disqualification for access to extra one-time funding for special initiatives. This seems like a suitable penalty, but should be applied proportionally to how badly the target was missed. In this way, there is still some amount of funding available to reformulate their approach to meet/exceed the targets. In the same way, colleges that substantially exceed their (realistic) targets should be rewarded proportionally to the extent to which they over-performed. In order to account for expected fluctuations in measurable metrics, it is advisable that assessments related to missing targets be viewed in the context of a three year window. Also, a penalty can take effect only after missing a target a second time.

It is critical to determine why targets were not met. It is difficult to believe this would be due to a lack of effort, consequently enforcing a penalty may be counterproductive. If this is a consistent problem, either the targets or the leadership for that unit may need to be adjusted.

Response – alternative/minority

None.

Pros and Cons (of applying penalties)

Pros

- Provides leverage and pressure to set achievable and realistic goals, and to meet or exceed them.
- A proportional penalty/reward should result in better morale among the faculty and staff who tried hard and were close.

- A proportional penalty still provides some resources to a college that can be used to achieve the target next year.

Cons

- Enrollment goals can be set at unrealistic levels for the colleges. Even if they can meet enrollment goals, they can be put at risk of not being able to offer quality instruction to the ever-increasing number of students without significant targeted investments. Such investment is necessary for colleges and the university to meet its other student success and national competitiveness goals.
- A proportional penalty provides less leverage than the use of a strict cut-off (e.g., missing enrollment by 1 student).
- In penalizing colleges for not meeting targets, do you make it more difficult to eventually achieve those goals?
- While a budgetary penalty may sound effective, is it really the best approach to solve a problem of underperformance.

Potential constraints

- Available classrooms and labs. Most are used at capacity and for a wide range of (extended) hours during the day. Fridays and weekends are potential opportunities for growth if high quality instruction can be delivered.

Additional Questions

- While substantial efforts have been made to achieve efficiencies in classroom assignments and while there appears to be little more that can be done, the issue merits review to ensure that any remaining inefficiencies are addressed.

Question 7: Should the 50-in-5 targets that are now complete be included in the calculation of outcomes funding?

Our understanding of the question

The question asks us to weigh the relative significance and place of the 50-in-5 initiative to funding priorities. While this is a subset of question 4 with regards to the set of targets each college arrives at for their outcome measures, the institution-wide focus of the program could elevate near-term funding for research and scholarship.

Response - majority

Each college has developed a set of 50-in-5 benchmarks to measure increase in research productivity and scholarly contributions. Those measures are specific to the disciplines operating within the various colleges. The increase in scholarly output over this period has the stated objective of elevating the research profile of the university to align with AAU-level peer institutions.

The 50-in-5 metrics being defined for five-year time period means the intense focus of the initiative would eventually change. Put another way, the 50-in-5 initiative is an acceleration of effort that might shape funding priorities while the program is in effect.

Response – alternative/minority

None.

Pros and Cons (including 50-in-5 metrics)

Pros

- Elevating the 50-in-5 metrics in funding priorities supports the success of the initiative.
- The University stands to improve its national scholarly profile and likely its ranking.
- The educational mission of the University is elevated by linking student achievement with leading research and by having the capacity to hire better faculty, and retain them.
- The University becomes an engine of innovation for the surrounding region and across the state.

Cons

- The educational mission of the University would experience a temporary demotion in funding priority.
- 50-in-5 outputs that are more easily measured or measured more rapidly are rewarded, over longer term research and scholarship.
- Scholarly preeminence opportunities that fall outside of the 50-in-5 outputs might be missed.

Additional Questions

- Are the 50-in-5 targets sufficiently accounted for in the overall strategic goals of each college?
- Would the funding priorities in place to support 50-in-5 remain in place after the 5 year accelerated period?
- Are there areas of research and scholarship missing from the 50-in-5 initiative that are aligned with the strategic goals of the university?