The state of the university is strong:

- Applications and enrollment
- Faculty recruitment and retention
- Reputation, rankings and visibility
- Research profile
- Basic finances - balanced budget and AAA rating
- Facilities - new, renovated, maintained

*Well-positioned to take next steps as a leading research university*
Challenges

- Increasingly competitive environment
- Flattening revenue sources
- Opportunities outstripping resources
- Shifting student expectations, interests
- Major facilities needs

Therefore:

*We need to carefully chart our path*
Too long. Let's just do a short Powerpoint.
• What has changed since the adoption of the V2C?

• Why should we engage in strategic planning now?

• What is the process and timeline for developing our strategic plans?

• How will those plans be translated into capital campaign priorities?
Changes at Rice since V2C adopted

- Larger, more diverse student body; shifts in student interests
- Expanded, more robust research profile
- Capital investments: physical infrastructure and research equipment
- Expanded curricular and co-curricular offerings
- Increased visibility and reputation, domestically and internationally
- New faculty: 40% of TTT faculty hired in the last 10 years; 54% of all faculty
Applicant pool is larger and more geographically diverse

- **2006**
  - Applications: 8,776
  - Admit Rate: 24%
  - Yield Rate: 34%

- **2011**
  - Applications: 13,816
  - Admit Rate: 19%
  - Yield Rate: 38%

- **2016**
  - Applications: 18,236
  - Admit Rate: 15%
  - Yield Rate: 35%

Data source: Office of Enrollment
Domestic undergraduate diversity has increased

3% of undergraduates are international

12% of undergraduates are international

*Other includes Multiracial, Not Reported, American Indian and Native Hawaiian

Data source: Office of the Registrar Census data
Degree-seeking undergraduate credits (As of census date, mid-October)

**Fall 2004: N = 47,225**
- **Natural Sciences**: 22%
- **Humanities**: 34%
- **Engineering**: 14%
- **Social Sciences**: 17%
- **Architecture**: 3%
- **Other**: 4%
- **Music**: 4%
- **Business**: 1%

**Fall 2016: N = 59,928**
- **Natural Sciences**: 25%
- **Humanities**: 16%
- **Engineering**: 23%
- **Social Sciences**: 20%
- **Architecture**: 3%
- **Other**: 7%
- **Music**: 3%
- **Business**: 3%

"Other" includes Dean of Undergraduates (FWIS, LPAP, LEAD, etc.) and Continuing Studies (EDUC).
“Does this count as big data?”
Sponsored Research & Other Sponsored Program Revenues by Funding Source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal</th>
<th>Foundations</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>State, Local &amp; Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY04</td>
<td>$67.1M</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$67.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>$85.4M</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$140.2M</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$140.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($ in Millions)
Federal Research Revenues by Funding Source

FY05: $58.5M
- DOD
- NIH
- NSF
- NASA
- Other Federal
- Pass Throughs

FY10: $79.1M
- DOD
- NIH
- NSF
- NASA
- Other Federal
- Pass Throughs

FY16: $84.9M
- DOD
- NIH
- NSF
- NASA
- Other Federal
- Pass Throughs

($ in Millions)
72% increase in doctoral degrees
Awarded from AY 2005 to AY 2016

2005
137 Degrees

- Natural Sciences (33%)
- Engineering (47%)
- Humanities (4%)
- Music (7%)
- Social Sciences (9%)

2016
235 Degrees

- Natural Sciences (32%)
- Engineering (43%)
- Humanities (9%)
- Music (1%)
- Social Sciences (12%)
- Business (3%)
Media Mentions 2007–2016 as of Sept. 30

- 2007: 8,733
- 2008: 12,693
- 2009: 19,039
- 2010: 21,648
- 2011: 24,962
- 2012: 27,173
- 2013: 30,004
- 2014: 31,875
- 2015: 39,259
- 2016: 50,843
“How can I trust your information when you’re using such outdated technology?”
### Percent of seniors who participated in activities as an undergraduate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published/presented a paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus study - US</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship abroad</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship - US</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer service</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: COFHE Senior Survey 2006 and 2016
Consolidated budget

Consolidated budget includes research and auxiliaries

FY 2006: $385.9M

FY 2017: $679.8M
Growth of endowment

$ in billions
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Higher education landscape has changed

- Multiple challenges to financial model
- Increased emphasis on equity and access
- Questioning of efficacy and value
- Online learning
- Increased globalization
Some key questions for Rice

• What must we do to advance our research achievement and reputation?

• What should shape our priorities in faculty recruitment?

• Are there particular global problems we might want to focus on? Major new endeavors we should begin?

• What changes might we want to see in undergraduate and graduate education?

• What should be the composition of the student body?

• Are there critical aspects of our culture or organization we need to change?

• What things about Rice are distinctive and important to maintain?
Administration consultation with Faculty Senate and deans on faculty engagement

Faculty Senate plays a critical role in designing process and reviewing documents

Schools engage both in university planning and formulating their own strategic vision and plans

Informal group conversations with president and provost

Faculty participation in an innovation visioning process: RiceLIFT
• Preliminary conversations with Rice Board of Trustees

• Initial discussions with deans and vice presidents about key questions and to explore the role of V2C going forward

• Brief presentation of status and general plan to the Faculty Senate

• No decisions yet on process or substance of strategic and campaign planning
The strategic planning process: Learning from experience

- How should this process build on and be different from the *Call to Conversation* and the *V2C*?
- Presidential tenure and strategic planning: a wide range of practices
- Review other universities’ processes and timelines
• Strategic themes and priorities emerge from faculty process and conversations with other constituents

• Themes inform university and school needs and opportunities assessment

• Priorities assessed for fundraising feasibility

• University and school priorities integrated into campaign vision and priorities
Timeline

- Timeline flexible pending consultations with Faculty Senate
- Aiming for interim draft for trustees to discuss in May 2017
- Seek final approval during fall semester 2017
- Plan to inform both fundraising priorities and other university initiatives
- Silent phase of campaign may begin during 2017
• Rice has built a strong foundation to take the next steps to achieve its high aspirations as a research university

• Both Rice and the higher education environment have changed substantially over the last decade

• We have an incredible opportunity, but need to choose carefully our priorities and strategies

• Given pressures on resources, we can succeed only with very successful fundraising

• Strategic planning is part of the institutional life cycle

• Faculty input and engagement is especially critical
No upper limit
“If you don't know where you are going, you might not get there.”

—Yogi Berra
Responsibility, Integrity, Community, Excellence
Defining our culture. Guiding our behavior.