

July 23, 2009

To: Collegiate Restructuring Steering Committee
From: Subcommittee on Uptown-CC-RWC Campuses
Subject: **“Baccalaureate Pathways”: A Plan for Restructuring the Uptown & Regional Colleges**

Overview & Recommendations

Overview

The Provost’s January 21 (“One University”) memo to the CRSC charged our subcommittee with developing the following:

- ▶ Recommendations for an administrative and governance structure for the regional campuses;
- ▶ Recommendations for which baccalaureate programs should be offered on the branch campuses and what will be needed to offer those programs, keeping in mind the USO goals for providing expanded baccalaureate offerings on regional campuses;
- ▶ Recommendations for integrating the financial structures of the branches with those of the uptown campus without the University’s losing subsidy or other resources through such changes;
- ▶ Recommendations for the allocation of space at the branches and identification of any needs for additional or altered spaces as a result of offering new programs on those campuses.
- ▶ Recommendations for any managerial or physical changes required for integrating Regional/Uptown libraries, IT systems, and physical plant.
- ▶ Recommendations for creating or reconfiguring transfer and technical associate degree programs at the regional campuses in order to achieve a coherent, strategic array of offerings that are responsive to USO goals and the community’s needs.
- ▶ Recommendations for expanding K-12 outreach through dual-enrollment programs at the regional campuses with the assistance of the standing group working on these issues.

The charge itself envisions a particular outcome, one that includes a heavy measure of administrative and faculty integration through the creation of “unitary departments” across campuses. Such integration would have the primary goals of establishing curricular continuity and facilitating the extension of baccalaureate degrees to or near the regional campuses. However, we have no data to indicate that such vertical integration would necessarily achieve those goals. The subcommittee has come to believe that we can achieve them *without* fully integrating faculties, budgets, or administrative functions as has been illustrated by the successful extension to the branch campuses of baccalaureate programs in nursing and early childhood education; in fact, those programs have succeeded in spite of the more modest incentives offered by the Resident Credit Center financial model, which will be

replaced by the more directly rewarding Performance-Based Budget model. The subcommittee believes that the goals driving this part of the restructuring can be achieved through an alternative approach, which we are calling "Baccalaureate Pathways," an approach that integrates curricula and extends baccalaureate programs to campuses but does not fully integrate faculties or governance structures.

Recommendations

The subcommittee believes that the 12 recommendations summarized below will enable the university to meet the USO goal of offering expanded baccalaureate pathways to students at lower cost. The University's success in achieving that goal should be assessed and the model reexamined no later than 2014.

1. Uptown colleges should develop and deliver baccalaureate degree programs at regional venues, which may be on existing CC and RWC properties or elsewhere.
2. The regional colleges should offer some upper-division (300- and 400-level) courses to enable students to complete their associate degrees and gain credits toward baccalaureate degrees.
3. RWC and CC should select, develop, deliver, and assess new baccalaureate degree programs, consistent with the USO strategic plan, to be offered entirely by the faculty of those two colleges.
4. CC, RWC, and the Uptown colleges should retain their current faculty, administrative, budgetary, and governance structures.
5. The Uptown and regional colleges should create additional affiliate and/or joint appointments for current and future faculty.
6. The Provost should initiate decanal searches for CC and RWC no later than September 1, 2009.
7. The Council of Deans should recommend to the Academic Operating Committee the formation of a standing committee, the Baccalaureate Pathways Coordinating Committee (BPCC), which will hold primary responsibility for development of new and extension of current baccalaureate programs to regional venues.
8. The CRSC should form working groups that include staff and faculty to investigate whether benefits and efficiencies would be realized by combining the CC, RWC and Uptown libraries, IT units, or other administrative units.
9. The intercollegiate disciplinary curriculum committees now at work on semester conversion should be made permanent and be charged with promoting curricular continuity across colleges.
10. The University should move toward a single accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission, eliminating the separate accreditations for RWC and CC.
11. The performance-based budget model (PBB) should supplant the resident credit center model (RCC) as quickly as possible.
12. No later than 2014, the University should assess whether the Baccalaureate Pathways model has succeeded in achieving the goals articulated in this report.

The following pages expand upon these recommendations and describe the rationale for the Baccalaureate Pathways model.

Principles and Goals

Principles

In arriving at our recommendations, the subcommittee identified certain principles that would guide our deliberations. They included:

- ▶ Achieving the goals of the University and of the University System of Ohio—goals to which we are committed—will require our devising systemic incentives for achieving those goals.
- ▶ Although we value the curricular continuity promised by the concept of “One University,” we also value the flexibility and adaptability and entrepreneurial opportunity offered by local decision-making.
- ▶ Building on successful existing models probably offers greater probability of achieving goals than does inventing an entirely new model.
- ▶ Other Ohio universities offer alternative approaches to organizing the relationships between main and branch campuses, but we recognize geographic and cultural circumstances that distinguish our situation from those of the other universities; the best fit for UC would not likely mirror even the most successful of those other Ohio models.
- ▶ The relationships between the branch colleges and their local communities differ both from each other and from the relationship between the Uptown colleges and the Uptown community; any restructuring should aim to preserve and enhance existing relationships, and that would require the preservation of a dean at each of the branch campuses.

Goals

Proceeding from those principles, the primary goals of restructuring the relationship between the Uptown and regional campuses are:

- ▶ To ensure curricular continuity among the Uptown and regional colleges, thereby achieving the overarching goal of establishing “One University.”
- ▶ To increase the portability of credits among colleges within the university by maximizing the number of credit hours that regional-college students accumulate toward the baccalaureate degree during the course of earning their associate degrees at CC or RWC.
- ▶ To offer more Uptown-based baccalaureate degrees at or near the regional campuses.
- ▶ To offer more regional-college-based technical baccalaureate degrees at or near the regional campuses as well as a limited number of specialized non-technical bachelor's degrees as permitted within OBR's guidelines for regional campuses.
- ▶ To offer those baccalaureate degrees at lower total cost and with lower total tuition than would be possible on the Uptown campus by having students enroll in CC or RWC for their first two years of college.
- ▶ To use PBB to increase efficiency and restrain administrative overhead while still extending academic programs.

Baccalaureate Degrees & Upper-Division Courses at Regional Venues

Under the Baccalaureate Pathways model, the Uptown colleges would develop and deliver baccalaureate degree programs at regional venues, which may be on existing CC and RWC properties or

elsewhere. The Uptown colleges would hold primary fiscal and academic responsibility for selecting, developing, delivering, and assessing such degree programs. Uptown colleges will not offer lower-division (100- and 200-level) courses at the regional venues if RWC or CC offer courses that fulfill the same requirement. The regional colleges will offer select upper-division (300- and 400-level) courses to associate-degree students; the credits accrued in those courses should advance those students toward earlier completion of a baccalaureate degree. This expansion of upper-division courses to CC and RWC will firmly establish baccalaureate pathways for regional students, but doing so can happen only with close coordination between the Uptown and regional colleges, a subject discussed below. Appendix A describes the Provost's current policy on approval of 300- and 400-level courses at the branch campuses; we recommend a thoughtful review of that policy.

By earning the first two or three years of a degree at the lower RWC and CC tuition rates and then completing those degrees at the Uptown campus or at a regional venue, students can earn the same degrees offered by Uptown colleges but at a lower rate.

RWC and CC will select, develop, deliver, and assess new technical baccalaureate degrees as well as a limited number of specialized non-technical baccalaureate degrees as permitted within OBR's guidelines.

Administrative & Governance Functions

Under the Baccalaureate Pathways model, RWC and CC would retain most of their current administrative and governance structures—as would the Uptown colleges. However, for the purpose of leading the development of baccalaureate degrees at regional venues, the Council of Deans would recommend to the AOC the formation of a standing committee composed of administrators and faculty from CC, RWC, and several Uptown colleges (including at least A&S, AHS, Business, CECH, and Nursing); the group, which we will call the Baccalaureate Pathways Coordinating Committee (BPCC), should also include the Senior Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management and may include representatives from UC's budget, communication, and marketing offices. The BPCC will hold the following responsibilities:

- ▶ to assess the feasibility of developing new and extending current baccalaureate degrees to regional venues,
- ▶ to coordinate curricula,
- ▶ to develop and coordinate execution of a marketing plan,
- ▶ to monitor progress,
- ▶ to coordinate the allocation of space and associated overhead costs at all regional venues used by the Uptown colleges, and
- ▶ to assess financial and academic performance.

The individual colleges and programs offering courses at regional venues will hold responsibility for staffing courses and ensuring the fiscal soundness of their own programs. The Office of Enrollment Management will hold primary responsibility for recruiting students to the new regional baccalaureate degrees.

This model would not merge all faculty in a single discipline into Uptown-based unitary departments as originally envisioned, but some administrative mergers—such as uniting the CC and RWC libraries with Uptown-based University Libraries and centralizing most IT functions—may yield benefits. Those issues should be addressed in the coming months by working groups that include broad representation, including appropriate staff.

Finally, with regard to administrative functions, the subcommittee urges that the Provost immediately initiate decanal searches for both CC and RWC. Doing so will clearly signal the colleges' future status, reassuring and giving direction to the faculty, staff, and students of those colleges; doing so will also reinforce the University's commitment to fulfilling the USO's strategic vision for branch campuses.

Dual Enrollment

The subcommittee's original charge included forming recommendations for expanding K-12 outreach through dual-enrollment programs at the regional campuses. Instead, we understand that a separate working group on dual enrollment has assumed responsibility for that charge.

Faculty

Faculty in the regional colleges would continue in their current roles with their current affiliations. Therefore, they would see no change in their RPT and governance processes. However, the Uptown and regional colleges will create additional affiliate and/or joint appointments for current and future RWC and CC faculty with three goals: enhancing their involvement in baccalaureate teaching at the regional venues, increasing the scholarly opportunities for regional faculty, and by making the regional faculty members' expertise available to Uptown colleges, creating a broader, more diverse curriculum. Conceivably, Uptown and regional colleges could jointly hire and share new faculty for permanent assignment at regional venues, provided that one of those colleges holds the primary appointment for purposes related to contract compliance. The Uptown colleges would also have the option of designating a primary campus for their faculty, whether at Uptown, a regional campus, or another regional venue.

Curriculum Continuity & Delivery

We propose that the intercollegiate disciplinary curriculum committees now at work on semester conversion be made permanent and be charged with promoting curricular continuity across colleges. The collaborative approaches developed through semester conversion will become especially important to creating smooth pathways from CC and RWC to the Uptown colleges' completion programs. Those pathways should exist for both transfer and career associate-degree programs. The success of this baccalaureate outreach will depend both on the initiative of the Uptown colleges and on the cooperation of the RWC and CC faculty and administrations. Despite this vision of university-wide curriculum committees, ultimately, the individual colleges offering individual courses must abide by their own bylaws in approving and owning those courses. Disputes over curriculum will be adjudicated by the Academic Coordinating Committee (ACC), as is already the University's policy and practice.

CC and RWC will be expected to develop “technical” baccalaureate degrees, consistent with the USO strategic plan. The ACC will review and approve these programs to ensure that these degrees do not duplicate or compete with existing Uptown programs. Appendix B describes the current RWC approval process for such programs.

Regional Accreditation

We propose that the University move toward a single accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission. The current separate accreditations of RWC, CC, and Uptown colleges are largely historical byproducts that serve no useful purpose and may retard transition to a One University model.

Financial Incentives & Issues

In considering whether to maintain separate colleges and departments, the subcommittee posed the question of how those units will find incentives to collaborate in creating new baccalaureate programs at regional venues. We suspect that good will and broad institutional interest will not suffice, and some existing models (especially that of the Resident Credit Center, RCC) have proven to hold only marginal incentives. Because the performance-based budget model now being implemented ties revenues to program growth, PBB offers an incentive for the kind of robust development we seek with this new outreach effort. We propose that the RCC model be entirely supplanted by PBB as quickly as possible.

Non-Financial Incentives

Although financial incentives offer the primary catalyst for achieving the goals described above, other incentives will reinforce the effort. Among the non-financial incentives are the following:

- ▶ The UC brand is generally stronger than the brand of any individual college (with the possible exceptions of CCM and DAAP). Enhancing the brand at regional venues should help increase enrollments at CC and RWC as well as in Uptown programs at regional venues and eventually at the Uptown campus. Enhancing the UC brand may also slow the encroachment of competitors, including Miami University, Sinclair Community College, and others.
- ▶ The well established relationships that CC and RWC have with their communities, their convenient locations, and their lower tuition rates should promote pathways to the Uptown colleges and programs.
- ▶ The Uptown and regional colleges have some common interests and goals and have the opportunity to collaborate in ways that reduce redundancy and increase synergies, redounding the benefit of the entire institution.
- ▶ The greater collaboration among faculty across all campuses should help break down some of the traditional barriers between faculty. Uptown faculty may gain greater appreciation of the University’s teaching mission, and regional faculty may gain greater appreciation of our research mission.

Appendix A

Guidelines for the Approval of 300- and 400-level courses at RWC and Clermont

300- and 400-level Courses

- Proposals submitted to the Provost Office for new 300- and 400-level courses at RWC or Clermont must include a statement that Deans of the branch campus and appropriate 4-year college have reviewed and discussed the proposal and agree on the recommendation; all approved new offerings at the branches must align in numbering and content with 300- and 400-level offerings in the 4-year colleges unless they fall within categories described below
- An alternate pathway is to have the baccalaureate college offer the course at the branch campus through the Residence Credit Center with permission of the branch campus
- A review of existing 300- and 400-level courses at RWC and Clermont will be conducted by the Provost Office for consistency, equivalency, and alignment

300- and 400-level Technical Courses

- Some 300-and 400-level courses are needed for technical associate degree programs (the AAS, for ex) and for some certificate programs at RWC and Clermont
- These courses should not duplicate coursework in Baccalaureate programs
- Proposals to the Provost Office for new courses in this category should carry a brief rationale as to why courses need to be at the upper level

300 and 400-level courses for Technical Baccalaureates

- It is understood that 300- and 400-level courses in the technical discipline will be necessary for such degrees; a careful explanation of such courses must be submitted to the Provost Office when requesting approval of new technical baccalaureate degree programs
- Requests for new “liberal” arts courses at the 300- and 400-level needed for technical baccalaureate degrees must include a statement that the branch campus and appropriate 4-year college have reviewed and discussed the proposal and agree on the recommendation;
- Technical Baccalaureates cannot duplicate programs already existing in one of the Baccalaureate Colleges

Provost Office

December 2005

Appendix B

Technical Baccalaureate Programs Approval Process

Raymond Walters College

1. Academic Department (degree level, program, courses)*
2. Curriculum Committee (degree level, program, courses)*
3. Faculty (degree level, program, courses)*
4. Dean (degree level, program)**
(course approval pending degree/program approval by Provost)
5. Provost (degree level, program)
6. Academic Coordinating Committee
7. UC Board of Trustees (degree level, program)
8. Dean, Provost (course approval)
9. Ohio Board of Regents (degree level, program approval)
10. Higher Learning Commission (degree level approval)

Comments:

- * During steps 1-3 the Dean and/or Associate Dean, Academic Affairs and/or Academic Department Chair are in consultation with Provost's office and Deans of any relevant UC baccalaureate colleges to assure avoidance of program duplication.
- ** It was agreed that the Dean would not approve courses prior to Provostal degree/program approval because Provostal course approval required degree/program approval first.