

Reporting Duplicate Programs

Background

Section 3345.35. of the Ohio Revised Code requires that the boards of trustees of each state institution of higher education evaluate all courses and programs based on enrollment and student performance. It also required that, for courses with low enrollment, boards evaluate the benefits of delivering the course through regional collaboration. To comply with that legislation, the Chancellor provided a definition of low enrollment courses and the boards of each state college and university submitted reports that described the process and data used to identify courses that met the chancellor's definition of low enrollments and then provided a summary of recommended actions for each identified course (e.g., no action, course elimination, reduction in the number of sections or the timing of sections, change in course delivery modality; targeted as a candidate for course sharing).

More recently, the Governor's Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency noted that the legislation required reporting for low enrollment courses but did not address reporting requirements for duplicative programs. Consequently, the task force recommended that: "Institutions should consider consolidating programs that are duplicated at other colleges and universities in their geographic area." The report went on to say, "The Department of Higher Education should identify duplicative programs within each region of the state, with particular attention to co-located campuses. Institutions should then review any programs not covered by the current low-enrollment review ordered by the legislation to identify opportunities to consolidate."

ODHE Data Regarding Duplicate Programs

The Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) identified duplicative programs within each region of the state, with particular attention to co-located campuses. The following steps were used construct the attached spreadsheets:

- Using data reported to the Higher Education Information (HEI) system, ODHE classified degrees awarded since 2012 as a program within an institution using its 6 digit CIP Code, resulting in a list of programs offered at each public college and university in the state.
- Each public college and university was then assigned to one of six regions across the state; these regions are mainly aligned to the six JobsOhio regions associated with the main campus
 - NEOMED is not included due to their medical program focus
 - Southern State Community College was placed in the Southwest Region
- Information on programs at institutions in each region was then used to create spreadsheets indicating
 - Duplicate programs (highlighted in red) at universities in each region
 - Duplicate programs (highlighted in red) at community colleges in each region
 - Duplicate programs (highlighted in red) at co-located campuses

- Data on the number of program graduates is included for the same 3 years and the average cost per graduate of the program was calculated using HEI cost data.
 - The HEI cost data for each course completed by the graduate was summed (please note that costs were summed for all courses taken prior to graduation, whether or not the course was required for the student’s program)
 - This summed cost was averaged across all program completers over the three year period
 - The data were omitted when the number of program graduates was less than 5 over the three year period

These spreadsheets will help faculty, administrators and trustees to see programs that are duplicated in their region, and will help them as they evaluate duplicate program fit within the institution, (e.g. reasonable duplication or unreasonable duplication that should be targeted for action, such as elimination or regional collaboration).

Duplication of many programs is to be expected. For instance, essentially all colleges will have programs in majors that are needed by students throughout the state (e.g., English, psychology, engineering, business, mathematics, history, nursing). Therefore, cases of duplication will need to be considered on a case-by-case basis to determine whether the duplication is appropriate or not. Factors to be considered in this analysis would include dynamics such as: the number of students enrolled in the program, the number of graduates from the program, costs of the program (including staffing, facilities, pedagogical requirements, and accreditation requirements), quality or reputation of the program, etc.

Determining Recommended Actions for Duplicate Programs

The following factors can be used during the consideration of recommended actions for duplicate programs. The bulleted bullet points following each factor are examples of data points that could be assessed in the analysis and may be augmented by other evaluative tools.

- I. Quality
 - Student retention and completion within the program
 - Student employment outcomes
 - Successful student transfer or placement in graduate/professional school
 - Scholarly productivity of faculty and students
 - Attainment of specialized accreditation
 - Program reputation/ranking
 - Areas of specialization within the program that differentiate it from other programs in the same discipline offered in the region

- II. Centrality to the Institution’s Mission
 - Relevance of the program to the institution’s strategic plan
 - Importance of the program to the institution’s reputation or recruiting efforts
 - Need for the program based on data for “in-demand” jobs

3. Cost-Effectiveness
 - Revenue sufficiency to support the program
 - Ratio of number of graduates to FTE faculty/administrators
4. Demand
 - Program enrollment patterns over time
 - Students enrolled
 - Degrees/certificates awarded
 - Understanding reasons for low enrollment in the program
 - Duplication and competition
 - Lack of jobs?
 - Marketing?
 - Data driven market analysis of employer need
5. Potential for Collaboration with Other Institutions
 - Programs with low enrollment at one or more institutions and a need for a range of highly specialized faculty (e.g., BFA or MFA)
 - Programs with low enrollment at one or more institutions but where there is a need for graduates within the region or the state (e.g., certain foreign languages, highly specialized majors)
 - Programs with low to moderate enrollment at one or more institutions that are costly to offer
6. Potential for Elimination
 - Programs with persistent low enrollment where collaboration doesn't make sense
 - Programs with persistent low enrollment and little or no employer demand

Reporting (all submissions will be posted on the Department of Higher Education website)

By April 30th, 2017 each Board of Trustees shall submit an **Initial Report on Duplicate Programs** to the Chancellor. The submission should include:

- I. A brief description of the process and data used to evaluate programs;
- II. A list of the duplicate programs **not targeted** for action and the rationale for the decision (e.g., robust enrollment and program completion, program central to institutional mission and/or reputation, program specialized and therefore not duplicative, program shares a large proportion of classes with other programs on campus).
- III. A list of the duplicate programs **being considered for action..**

By September 30th, 2017, each institution's chief academic officer shall submit a **Progress Report on Duplicate Programs** to the Chancellor, indicating the action being evaluated for each of the targeted programs (e.g., elimination, collaboration with named partner institution for course and program sharing, continuing to evaluate for potential change, other).

By December 31st, 2017, each Board of Trustees shall submit a **Final Action Report on Duplicate Programs** to the Chancellor, indicating the decisions made for each of the targeted programs and a timeline for those actions.

The following format is suggested for April 30th, 2017 Initial Report on Duplicate Programs.

- I. Brief narrative summarizing the identification of duplicate programs targeted for action.
- II. Chart listing duplicate programs not targeted for action and the rationale for continuing the program in its current form, followed by a list off duplicate programs being considered for action

PART I: Programs Not Targeted for Action

Program Name	Rationale for Leaving Program in Its Current Form
Program A	e.g., robust enrollment and program completion; program central to institutional mission and/or reputation; program specialized and therefore not duplicative; other
Program B	
Program C	
...	

PART II: List of Programs Being Considered for Action:

Program A
 Program B
 Program C
 ...

The following format is suggested for **September 30th, 2017 Progress Report on Duplicate Programs**. For each program listed in Part II of the April 30th, 2017 report, complete the following chart:

Program Name	Progress Report	Collaboration Partners, if Applicable
Program A	e.g., elimination; collaboration with named partner institution for course and program sharing; continuing to evaluate for potential change; other	
Program B		
Program C		
...		

The following format is suggested for **the December 31st, 2017 Final Action Report on Duplicate Programs** from the Board of Trustees. For each program listed in the September 30th, 2017 report, complete the following chart:

Program Name	Final Action and Rationale (Include Collaboration Partners, if Applicable)	Timeline for Actions
Program A		
Program B		
Program C		
...		