

MEMORANDUM

To: Council of Deans

From: Chaden Djalali, Executive Vice President and Provost

Date: October 28, 2019

Subject: REIMAGINING THE ACADEMIC ENTERPRISE – Phase 1 Efficiencies

Building on the Fearlessly First Strategic Framework and related initiatives started in the past two years, we are taking a first step toward reimagining OHIO. As discussed at recent Deans' Council meetings, we will present a university plan to the Board of Trustees in January 2020 that outlines significant steps toward long-term financial sustainability.

We all recognize the need for shared responsibility, and I know you have devoted much thought, discussion, and time to improving efficiency, moving your colleges toward strategic repositioning, and reducing costs of operation; I thank you for your excellent and thoughtful work so far.

In order to complete the academic portion of this plan, your leadership, concentrated attention, and collaboration are critical. To support your work on a tight timeline, additional materials are attached, and templates have been made available through OneDrive. Please note that administrative and auxiliary units are also working to complete their portions of the plan.

Overview

Each academic unit will submit a college-level plan for the following by Friday, November 15, 2019. The college-level plan should include an individual plan for each department/school.

- 1) A plan to align with the university workload policy (Policy 18.009, <https://www.ohio.edu/policy/18-009>) by fall 2020, and to identify instructional efficiency gains from streamlined curricular offerings and updated workload, course size, and scheduling policies.
- 2) An evaluation of all programs based on provided criteria (attached) to identify potential candidates for program reinvestment, program rightsizing, program merging within and across colleges, and program sunseting.
- 3) A college personnel workforce plan that includes identification of areas with excess instructional or administrative capacity as well as duplication with other academic or administrative units.
- 4) Beyond the above efforts to identify efficiencies within and across the colleges, alignment of administrative functions such as communication, student advising, transactional business processes (concur, bobcat buy, other p-card activity), institutional research and effectiveness, and HR, will likely yield additional optimization. The administrative leads of these functions have been tasked to work with you on aligning these functions across the system. Please work with them in these areas.

All plans must reflect the overarching principles below (developed with input from multiple deans' conversations):

- Act with the best interests of Ohio University's core mission of teaching, research and creative activity, and service foremost in our thinking and aligned to our Fearlessly First Strategic Framework.
- Protect and prioritize student success, academic quality, and scholarly excellence.
- Embrace accountability, shared governance, and shared responsibility.
- Embrace data informed decision-making.
- Communicate with one another about the decisions we make to ensure we have identified and addressed potential cross-unit impacts including consideration of all campuses and locations.
- Eradicate internal competition and duplication of courses, programs, services.
- Streamline programs and course offerings with a focus on clear pathways to completion, with higher impact, and well-defined value proposition.
- Prioritize areas for strategic growth such as Ohio Honors Program, professional development programs, and online education.
- Reshape allocation of resources to position the university for new academic endeavors.
- Take necessary near-term action in the context of longer-term institutional strategy.

Attachment: Academic Planning Guidance and Timeline

Target date for plan completion: Friday, November 15, 2019

Board of Trustees materials due: December 13, 2019

Board of Trustees meeting: January 16–17, 2020

Each academic unit will submit a college-level plan for the next two years that includes the following elements by Friday, November 15, 2019. The college-level plan should include individual plans for each department/school.

Some suggested templates and target ranges are included below or available on OneDrive; information to be evaluated, templates, and targets will vary by program and discipline, but changes to metrics should be identified and include an explanation for the modification.

I) Instructional efficiency: Provide an instructional efficiency plan that will align with the university workload policy (Policy 18.009, <https://www.ohio.edu/policy/18-009>) by fall 2020, and that identifies instructional efficiency gains from streamlined curricular offerings and updated workload, course size, and scheduling policies.

- Analyze the teaching workloads by department/school for each faculty member, sections taught, average class size and any course releases for the past year, fiscal year 2018-19.
- Analyze actual class size for undergraduate classes, overall, and then for service courses, major courses, graduate courses, labs/studios, etc., for the past year.
- Analyze curricular efficiency: Review curriculum by program/majors to determine opportunities to streamline the curriculum such as evaluating college requirements, reducing the number of electives offered, consolidating curricula across majors and colleges, and so on. Identify any curricular duplication to be streamlined. Include minors, certificates, and general education offerings as appropriate.

Deliverables:

- a. Provide a college faculty workload policy that aligns with Policy 18.009 for each school/department, and a plan to move to this workload by fall 2020. This should include a mechanism to include differentiated and variable workloads and an accountability mechanism. This should take into account the level of program (undergrad, masters, doctoral), research expectations, and faculty type; for specialized areas, specify credit equivalents and how these are determined. Course release for expected service obligations should be minimized. An outline of Policy 18.009's

requirements for a department's overall workload are below:

Program	credits or equiv per year	notes
Baseline (policy 18.009)	30 credits	100:0:0 TRS
Associates	24–27 credits	Units with an associate degree or two-year programs will be expected to devote 80-90 percent of effort to teaching.
Undergraduate only	21–24 credits	Programs with a baccalaureate program only will devote 70-80 percent of effort to teaching
Includes Masters	18–21 credits	Departments with an active masters program will be expected to devote 60-70 percent departmental workload to teaching
Includes Doctoral	15–18 credits	Departments with active doctoral programs will be expected to devote 50-60 percent of departmental workload to teaching.

- b. Provide a plan to streamline curricula over the next two years, including essential sections and ideal number of sections offered (see also program review below).
- c. Provide clear policies (including a scheduling policy), targets, and plan for increased section sizes by type and level (e.g., service vs. capstone vs. lab vs. Studio, 1000 vs. 8000), clear minimum enrollment requirements to offer a course, clear targets for reduction of the number of sections offered overall, and clear average workload targets by faculty type and course level for the next two years.
- d. Based on the workload policy, streamlined curricula, and course size policy, develop target total teaching FTE for undergraduate, masters, and doctoral programs (how many FTE of which faculty type at which workload(s) are necessary to deliver the required streamlined curricula). Targets should include an optimized number and mix of tenure track, instructional, and other relevant types of faculty (e.g., clinical, exec in residence), with the understanding that some units may take longer to achieve targets with current personnel.

While the percentage a department or college may gain in efficiency will vary depending on their current levels of efficiency, the overall academic target is to increase efficiency by 40% as tracked in several areas, including the following:

- i. Faculty/student ratio by level (UG, masters, doctoral): this should focus on on-load sections translated back into faculty FTE (not headcount), according to workload policy.
- ii. SCH per faculty (by faculty type and by level—UG, masters, doctoral);
- iii. Average section size by course level and type
- iv. Number of sections offered vs. required
- v. Percent of sections with enrollment lower than established targets
- vi. Other targets as appropriate for the mission or the college or for specific disciplines

Supporting materials (please include templates or equivalent and supporting data with your plan):

- Faculty load report spreadsheet (Faculty Load Report 2018-19.xls); as John Day has shared with you, it is not “required” that this be filled out if you already have data of your own in a different format.
- Course Offering Distribution spreadsheet (John will share an example in Deans’ Council of how he analyzed this for COB)
- Relevant tabs in academic_planning_templates.xls:

Tab 1: Course size template; adapt to academic unit as appropriate

Tab 2: Curriculum evaluation template

Tab 3: Tracking metrics template

- Example workload policy (Workload Policy TU-Academic-Strategy-Sept-12.pdf)

II. Program Review: Provide an evaluation of all programs based on provided criteria to identify potential candidates for program elimination, program right-sizing, or merging within and across colleges.

Deliverables:

- A. Evaluate each program by the following four criteria. (According to the Faculty Handbook, “A program is defined as a course of studies leading to a degree (including an associate degree), a recognized major under a degree, or an option or concentration under a degree that is generally comparable to a major at the University,” including both undergraduate and graduate programs.):
- 1. Financial sustainability:** Evaluate all programs for financial sustainability. In addition to direct program costs and revenue, consider that central college costs and approximately an additional 40% in central university costs ultimately need to be covered across programs. Thus, large numbers of programs running at revenues equal to direct program costs likely are not sustainable. Programs that are not financially sustainable should be considered for elimination, downsizing, or merging based on criteria 2–4 below. Programs that are clearly financially sustainable should be considered for investment and increased enrollment. John is available to provide assistance with this analysis. A very basic template is provided, but it should be adapted for each college (or provide an existing college analysis as long as it includes program, college overhead, and central costs and revenue).
 - 2. Demand:** Determine the number of majors and degrees conferred for each major and program at undergraduate and graduate levels, demand, and enrollment trends.
 - 3. Quality:** Determined by program, but to include student outcomes and research/scholarship/creative activity.
 - 4. Contribution to mission and university strategic initiative themes** (narrative where applicable).
- B. Identify any programs/majors that are targets for elimination, right-sizing, or merging. For every program identified, provide evidence for the four criteria above.

Supporting materials:

- Relevant tabs in academic_planning_templates.xls:
 - Tab 4: Financial Sustainability template (will vary by college)
 - Tab 5: Demand template (adapt for department)
 - Tab 6: Program Outcomes template (undergrad example; adapt for graduate programs)

Tab 7: Research/scholarship/creative activity template (adapt for department)

- Cost per SCH.xlsx (in development)

III. College Personnel Workforce Plan: Provide a plan that identifies areas with excess instructional or administrative capacity and duplication with other academic or administrative units, and that establishes target numbers of faculty by rank and classification (tenured/tenure-track probationary/instructional/etc.) and administrative personnel.

Deliverables:

- A. Based on I and II above, identify areas of significant current or future faculty imbalance in particular programs or departments. Once these programs or departments are identified, the personnel savings template can be used to calculate impact of moving to the optimized number and mix of faculty developed in I.D.
- B. Analyze changes in administrative staffing over the last five years and current administrative needs and functions.
 1. Identify college administrative function needs and FTE in areas identified for potential realignment as contemplated on page 1 item 4, above.
 2. Provide a plan for areas where administrative staffing can be reduced, e.g. through realignment, shared services, technology, or cross-unit collaboration, and include the financial impact.

Supporting materials:

- College Admin Detail.xlsx (this is from last year; an updated personnel snapshot will be available in November)
- Personnel Savings Template.xlsx