

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Agenda Item 3.7 Co-located Campuses Review Project Report

RESOLUTION

BE IT RESOLVED: upon recommendation of the Chancellor and with the concurrence of the Program Effectiveness, Research and Technology Committee of the Ohio Board of Regents, that the *Co-located Campus Review Project Report* is approved.

Co-located Campuses Review Project Report:
A Review of Operations and Effectiveness of
Co-Located Technical Colleges and
University Regional Campuses

BACKGROUND

Co-located Campuses Review Project Report: A Review of Operations and Effectiveness of Co-Located Technical Colleges and University Regional Campuses

This report does not recommend that the organizational structures of the co-located campuses should be mandated centrally. However, the report does make recommendations that support achieving the strongest possible citizen and joint institution identification of service and efficiency issues and actions needed to address those issues.

The Community Liaison and Information Committees (CLICs) established to contribute to this report have identified opportunities for efficiency and service improvements that merit serious joint consideration by their respective co-located institutions. A number of the CLICs felt the review process they conducted for this report was very useful and recommended that other colleges and universities that serve a common area but do not share a campus should undertake a similar review.

Section 89.14 of H.B. 95 of the 125th General Assembly required the Board of Regents to:

...review the operation and effectiveness of co-located university branch campuses and technical colleges with particular attention to improved responsiveness to community needs and improved transfer of coursework. The Board of Regents shall report its findings and recommendations to the General Assembly...

In response the Regents established the *Co-Located Campus Review Project* to examine the individual and inter-related operations and effectiveness of the seven specified co-located campuses throughout the state:

- North Central State College and OSU – Mansfield
- Marion Technical College and OSU- Marion
- James A. Rhodes State College and OSU- Lima
- Stark State College of Technology and KSU – Stark
- Muskingum Area Technical College and OU – Zanesville
- Belmont Technical College and OU – Eastern
- Central Ohio Technical College and OSU - Newark

Implementation

The Review Project was structured with persons designated in each community from significant private and public sector leadership positions to lead the inquiry into the inter-related operations and effectiveness of the co-located campuses. This was accomplished through formation of local review groups, Community Liaison and Information Committees (the CLICs). The membership of each of seven CLICs included leaders from large and small businesses, economic development organizations, and community organizations.

The chair of each of the local CLICs, along with designated regional campus deans and technical college presidents, legislative representatives and others agreed to work together as a group to guide the implementation of the project. Regent Donna Alvarado served as

Chairperson of this statewide group, the Co-located Campus Review Project Advisory Committee (the CLAC).

Results

The *Co-located Campus Review Project Report* contains recommendations made by each of the CLIC groups to the leadership of their respective co-located campuses. Recommendations pertained directly to opportunities to improve efficiency, effectiveness, course articulation and transfer, and organizational working relationships.

After reviewing those recommendations reported by each CLIC, a set of Regents recommendations was developed and delivered in the *Co-located Campus Review Project Report*. The Regents recommendations are built on the insights, experiences, and observations of community leaders from the private and public sectors who were working members of the CLICs. If vigorously and fully implemented by the co-located campuses, the four overarching Regents recommendations proposed and discussed in this report will produce significant gains in efficiency and cost containment, improved community responsiveness, improved course transfer and articulation success, and improved co-located campus working relationships.

Efficiency: The local committees found that there is occasional and variable cooperation regarding maintenance and custodial services, sharing of buildings and classroom facilities, grounds keeping, some administrative services, security services and parking, shared access to libraries and recreational and athletic facilities. They recommended that operations be reviewed regularly to identify unnecessary duplication, better control expenses and identify new opportunities to share infrastructure and resources.

Recommendation #1: The Board of Regents recommends that each pair of co-located campuses establish a shared advisory group to ensure continuous systematic action on efficiency issues.

Some co-located institutions may choose to implement this recommendation by jointly charging an appropriate existing group to accomplish this recommendation.

As reinforced by the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy, the Regents believe that institutions must expand and intensify efforts to identify opportunities for improving academic and administrative efficiency and turn those possibilities into everyday reality. Co-located institutions must discover how to fully capitalize on their unique relationship to achieve new, mutual levels of efficiency and cost containment. (This challenge applies to all campuses in a shared community environment, not solely to co-located campuses.)

Course Transfer and Articulation with Degree Programs: The local committees (the CLICs) identified more work to be done to address adequately the critical matter of credit and course transfer between the co-located institutions. They recommended making all students aware of problems with transferability of some courses and increasing collaboration to resolve transfer and articulation issues.

Recommendation #2: The Board of Regents recommends that each pair of co-located campuses accelerate its efforts to collaborate to develop articulation agreements for specific degree programs. Concurrently, these institutions should participate vigorously in the development of changes to Ohio's Articulation and Transfer Policy to be completed April 2005 and begin to engage faculty in the policy's implications once fully implemented.

Responding to the Needs of the Community: The local CLICs reported broad-based community support for their respective campuses. They also cited the campuses' combined and complementary value to their communities. To improve responsiveness to communities, the local committees suggested improved outreach, joint reviews of student feedback, development of follow-up action items, marketing, and development of new program offerings.

Recommendation #3: The Board of Regents recommends the establishment of a "Voices of the Community" Council at each pair of co-located campus to ensure continual responsiveness.

The Regents recommend that a council of community representatives be established at each co-located campus to contribute to continual collection and interpretation of information about the community's evolving higher education needs. In collaboration with the institutions' leaders, such a "Voices of the Community" Council would identify, envision and develop joint strategies for addressing the needs of all sectors of their communities. Some co-located institutions may choose to implement this recommendation by jointly charging an existing group with this work. Some may also choose to charge a single group with implementing recommendations #1 and #3.

Working relationships: The local committees reported highly varied current and historical levels of cooperation and collaboration between institutions. Several CLICs described frankly a history of troubled relationships, a sense of mistrust, and even enmity between their institutional pairs. The CLICs asserted a common message that high levels of collaboration are necessary if the communities are to be served in an effective and efficient manner. To achieve and maintain that level, CLIC recommendations centered on expanding communication practices, improving information flow; drafting shared mission statements and appealing for new levels of operational autonomy for the regional campuses.

Recommendation #4: The Board of Regents recommends that each pair of co-located institutions create and work toward a shared vision of community service.

The Regents believe that if co-located campus personnel, policies and practices are to be fully aligned to improve service and efficiency, then they

must be anchored in a shared campuses' vision. That vision statement will serve as a reference point for campuses' leadership and as the driver for their mission activity.

Concluding Observations

From the local CLICs' reports and from the presentations made by the community leaders to the Co-located Campus Review Project Advisory Committee (the CLAC, two overarching findings emerge:

- Community leaders believe that the two campuses have distinct and important missions and that having both in the community is an asset rather than a liability, and
- Community leaders believe the campuses, viewed either individually or together, are effective and efficient and see no reason to believe that merging the two institution administrations would yield noticeable savings.