



2016 Efficiency Reporting Guidance

In the early part of 2015, Gov. John R. Kasich created the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency to make recommendations to Ohio's institutions of higher education based on three simultaneous principles 1) to be more efficient both in expense management and revenue generation 2) while offering an education of equal or higher quality and 3) decreasing costs to students and their families. The Task Force met several times during the course of 2015. In October the Task Force issued a report with ten recommendations to advise institutions on efficiency and academic practices which will improve both the quality of education and lower costs for students.

Furthermore, House Bill 64 (Section 369.550) requires each institution's board of trustees to complete an efficiency review, based on the Task Force's recommendations, by July 1, 2016, and submit their findings and implementation plans to the chancellor within 30 days, or by August 1, 2016. For additional information on each category and recommendation, please review the [Action Steps to Reduce College Costs report](#), issued by the Ohio Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency.

This document is intended to provide guidance for institutions' reports to the chancellor, based on the legislation – please modify and add additional detail as necessary. **The institutional efficiency review and the implementation plans captured by this template will serve as the data for 2016 Efficiency Advisory Committee Report. These reports are due August 1, 2016.** In 2017 and moving forward, ODHE will issue a survey to the institutions, based on the Task Force Report, as a status update to the implementation plans and will serve as the Efficiency Advisory Committee report.

Campuses will want to review the template to familiarize themselves with the format and content before beginning. The template is structured into four sections:

- **Section 1: Efficiencies** – The first section captures practices likely to yield significant savings for institutions that can then be passed on to students. This includes Procurement, Administrative and Operational, and Energy.
- **Section 2: Academic Practices** – This section covers areas such as textbooks, time to degree incentives, and academic course and program reviews. While improvements to academic processes and policies may not convey immediate cost savings, there will likely be tangible benefits that improve the quality of education for students.
- **Section 3: Policy Reforms** – This section captures additional policy reforms recommended by the Task Force.
- **Section 4: Cost Savings, Redeployment of Savings & Tangible Benefits to Students** – The last section will ask institutions to provide, if applicable, cost savings to the institution in actual dollars saved for each of the recommendations. Furthermore, the institution must advise if the institutional savings has been redeployed as a cost savings to students or offered a benefit to the quality of education for students.

Any questions can be directed to Sara Molski, Assistant Policy Director at the Ohio Department of Higher Education, at 614-728-8335 or by email at smolski@highered.ohio.gov.

Section I: Efficiency Practices

Procurement

Recommendation 3A | Campus contracts: Each institution must require that its employees use existing contracts for purchasing goods and services, starting with the areas with the largest opportunities for savings.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes – College policy requires this for purchases of greater than \$25,000. It is strongly encouraged for all other purchases.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

Recommendation 3B | Collaborative contracts: Ohio’s colleges and universities must pursue new and/or strengthened joint purchasing agreements in the following categories:

- Copier/printer services
- Computer hardware
- Travel services
- Outbound shipping
- Scientific Supplies and Equipment
- Office Supplies and Equipment

Contract Type	Is the institution participating in joint contracts? [yes, no, plan to]	Include additional explanation here if needed. If the institution chooses not to participate, please explain why.
Copier/printer services	Yes	Shared services arrangement with Wright State University, Central State University, Sinclair Community College and Xerox
Computer hardware	Yes	
Travel services	Yes	Rental car agreement only
Outbound shipping	Yes	
Scientific supplies & equipment	Yes	
Office supplies & equipment	Yes	

Assets and Operations

Recommendation 4 | Assets and Operations

4A Asset review: Each institution must conduct an assessment of its noncore assets to determine their market value if sold, leased or otherwise repurposed. Where opportunities exist, colleges and universities must consider coordinating these efforts with other Ohio institutions to reap larger benefits of scale.

Please provide an overview of the process used for the institution’s asset review and the key outcomes below or on additional pages:

A formal assessment of noncore assets has not yet been conducted.

4B Operations review: Each institution must conduct an assessment of non-academic operations that might be run more efficiently by a regional cooperative, private operator or other entity. These opportunities must then be evaluated to determine whether collaboration across institutions would increase efficiencies, improve service or otherwise add value.

Please provide an overview of the process used for the institution’s operations review and the key outcomes below or on additional pages:

A formal assessment of non-academic operations is on-going. In April 2016 this process resulted in contracting cleaning of two of the College’s facilities to a private operator.

4C Affinity partnerships and sponsorships: Institutions must, on determining assets and operations that are to be retained, evaluate opportunities or affinity relationships and sponsorships that can support students, faculty and staff. Colleges and universities can use these types of partnerships to generate new resources by identifying “win-win” opportunities with private entities that are interested in connecting with students, faculty, staff, alumni or other members of their communities.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

For assets and operations being retained, affinity relationships are being explored.

Please identify partnerships and sponsorships in effect for FY2016:

Partnerships/Sponsorships	Description
Food Service Vendor	Financially supports annual student event

Administrative

Recommendation 5 | Administrative cost reforms

5A Cost diagnostic: Each institution must produce a diagnostic to identify its cost drivers, along with priority areas that offer the best opportunities for efficiencies. This diagnostic must identify, over at least a 10-year period:

- Key drivers of costs and revenue by administrative function and academic program;
- Distribution of employee costs — both among types of compensation and among units;
- Revenue sources connected to cost increases — whether students are paying for these through tuition and fees, or whether they are externally funded;
- Span of control for managers across the institution — how many employees managers typically oversee, by the manager’s function; and
- Priority steps that would reduce overhead while maintaining quality — which recommendations would have the most benefit?

Has the institution produced a cost diagnostic? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

Please provide details on the result of the assessment. What are the cost drivers, based on the categories above? Please discuss the institution’s priority areas that offer the best opportunities for recommendation.

If the institution has not produced a cost diagnostic, is there a plan to? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not completed a cost diagnostic and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

Yes – A broad based committee is charged with producing this diagnostic.

5B Productivity measure: The Department of Higher Education developed a common measurement of administrative productivity that can be adopted across Ohio’s public colleges and universities. While the measure should be consistent, each institution should have latitude to develop its own standards for the proper level of productivity in its units. This will allow, for instance, for appropriate differences between productivity in high-volume environments vs. high-touch ones.

What steps has the institution taken to improve the productivity measure score or what are the institution’s plans to improve the score?

The administrative productivity measure was just received from ODHE and we are currently studying the data used to generate the score.

Has the institution implemented or considered utilizing Lean Six Sigma methodology as a tool to evaluate the institution’s processes?

No

5C Organizational structure: Each institution should, as part or as a consequence of its cost diagnostic, review its organizational structure in line with best practices to identify opportunities to streamline and reduce costs. The institutional reviews also should consider shared business services — among units or between institutions, when appropriate — for fiscal services, human resources and information technology.

Has the institution reviewed its organizational structure? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes – Departments and functions have been re-aligned to operate more efficiently and to better serve students. Business, Information Technology and Human Resource services are already shared among units.

If the institution has not reviewed the organizational structure, is there a plan to? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution not completed a review and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

5D Health-care costs: Like other employers, colleges and universities have experienced rapid growth in health-care costs. To drive down costs and take advantage of economies of scale, the Department of Higher Education has convened a working group to identify opportunities to collaborate. While no information on healthcare costs is required in this year’s survey, please feel free to share ideas that the institution believes may be helpful for the working group to consider.

(Optional) Has the institution identified any healthcare reforms that the working group should consider? Please describe.

(Optional) Has the institution achieved any expected annual cost savings through health-care efficiencies? Please explain how cost savings were estimated.

5E Data centers: Institutions must develop a plan to move their primary or disaster recovery data centers to the State of Ohio Computer Center (SOCC).

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

No – This would not be cost effective for our institution.

5F Space utilization: Each Ohio institution must study the utilization of its campus and employ a system that encourages optimization of physical spaces.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No, not during FY 2016.

Please provide details on the results of the assessment below or on additional pages:

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

Yes – We plan to undertake a campus master planning process in FY 2016 – 2017. Space planning was included in the scope of work for the current master plan adopted in 2003. The space plan was re-visited and updated in 2011 in preparation for conversion to semesters.

Energy

Energy Efficiencies seek to refine sustainable methods utilized by institutions to procure and use energy (resulting in more efficient use of energy), including, but not limited to lighting systems, heating & cooling systems, electricity, natural gas, and utility monitoring.

What energy efficiency projects has the institution implemented or enhanced within fiscal year 2016?

Project	Collaborative Partnership(s)	Explanation
Performing Arts Center Chiller Replacement	USC #36-20009-15-001	Purchased off the U.S. Communities Government Purchasing Alliance Contract
Cooperative Electricity Purchase	Sourcing Office	Joined collaboration to increase buying power
Electricity Shedding Rebate Program	NRG	Will be paid to reduce energy during peak load times on the grid

Section II: Academic Practices

Recommendation 6 | Textbook Affordability

6A Negotiate cost: Professional negotiators must be assigned to help faculty obtain the best deals for students on textbooks and instructional materials, starting with high-volume, high-cost courses. Faculty must consider both cost and quality in the selection of course materials.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

No, faculty work with Bookstore staff to obtain best deals for students on textbooks and instructional materials.

6B Standardize materials: Institutions must encourage departments to choose common materials, including digital elements, for courses that serve a large enrollment of students.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

At this stage, no plan has been implemented. The Resource Renewal committee (an all college committee composed of both faculty and staff) has made a recommendation which will be brought forward to faculty senate for evaluation/discussion in the next academic year.

6C Develop digital capabilities: Institutions must be part of a consortium to develop digital tools and materials, including open educational resources, that provide students with high-quality, low-cost materials.

Please explain your efforts to develop digital tools and materials.

We have had discussions, but we are not part of a consortium. We are exploring various consortium options with both secondary and higher education institutions.

We have discussed the topic within the larger discussion of textbook affordability.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

Recommendation 7 | Time to Degree

7A Education campaign: Each institution must develop a coordinated campaign to educate its full-time undergraduates about the course loads needed to graduate on time (two years for most associate degrees and four years for most bachelor's degrees).

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes - The Tuition Challenge Program will offer a five percent tuition rebate to students enrolled in a minimum of 12 course credit hours, and a ten percent tuition rebate to students enrolled in 15 or more course credit hours. Students must achieve a C or better in each class and subsequently enroll as a full-time student the following semester in order to receive the tuition rebate.

The concept of the Tuition Challenge Program is to encourage students to enroll full-time each semester, thus, remaining on the fast-track to graduation.

Key outcomes:

- Decrease cost to students
- Decrease time to completion

Clark State has published a 2 year schedule and invested in a new student planning software. These allow students the ability to plan their schedules for 2 years which decreases the time to degree as they know exactly when the courses they require will be offered. (Not all courses are taught every semester at every campus. This tool allows students to pre-plan based on where and when the courses they

need will be offered). All advisors (academic and staff) are being trained on the software to assist students in being efficient. It is also an assignment in the required First Year Experience class.

Key outcomes

- Students will only schedule courses included in their program major
- Students will plan to take courses in the term the classes are offered

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7B Graduation incentive: Institutions should consider establishing financial incentives to encourage full-time students to take at least 15 credits per semester.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes – The Tuition Challenge Program was adopted in FY 2016 giving eligible students a 5% - 10% discount on tuition based on enrolling full time and successfully completing (grade of C or better) all courses taken.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7C Standardize credits for degree: Institutions should streamline graduation requirements so that most bachelor's degree programs can be completed within 126 credit hours or less and an associate degree programs can be completed within 65 credit hours or less. Exceptions are allowed for accreditation requirements.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes - All programs are now below the maximum 65 credit hours with the exception of two program (Theatre Arts and Associate of Arts in Aviation). These programs will adjust the maximum credits for Academic Year 2017-2018.

Key Outcomes

- All programs are between 60-65 credits

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7D Data-driven advising: Institutions should enhance academic advising services so that students benefit from both high-impact, personalized consultations and data systems that proactively identify risk factors that hinder student success.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes - Students who are new to Clark State are advised during their first two semesters by academic advisors and later by their faculty advisors. The academic advisors establish the initial contact after Compass placement testing and/or during mandatory New Student Orientation (NSO). Advisors speak to students regarding their academic program choices to ensure that the student understands all academic options. This is the first opportunity for the student and advisor to speak about the relationship between their academic program and their career choice. If the student is unclear about his or her academic program or has career questions, the advisor can schedule an immediate follow-up assessment appointment with the student. A First Year Experience course was added beginning fall 15, which added a requirement to see an Advisor to complete an Academic Map. As a result, there was a 106% increase in the advising visits from spring 15 to fall 15. Academic Advisors utilize database systems such as AdvisorTrac to track all student advising meetings and to make notes of any areas of focus or student needs.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7E Summer programs: Each campus must develop plans to evaluate utilization rates for summer session and consider opportunities to increase productive activity. In particular, institutions should consider adding summer-session options for high-demand classes and bottleneck courses that are required for degree completion.

Please provide details on the results of the assessment. In particular, please address whether the campus added summer session options for high-demand and bottleneck classes.

An extensive review of summer course offerings was completed by an ad hoc committee of faculty, deans and student services staff. The purpose was to increase summer enrollments. Data on enrollment patterns was reviewed. Key decisions included: identifying and offering courses that College Credit Plus, transient/guest students (home from college for the summer) are likely to enroll into. To align better with regional colleges/universities as well as high school spring term end dates, the "D" term start date was adjusted. We also offered classes that continuing students need to progress into the second year and/or complete graduation requirements.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7F Pathway agreements: Ohio institutions should continue to develop agreements that create seamless pathways for students who begin their educations at community or technical colleges and complete them at universities.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes - Clark State continues to develop agreements for the intended purpose of creating seamless pathways for students. A majority of the agreements have been developed with universities within the Miami Valley region as most students stay within this area to complete a baccalaureate degree. The Clark State Director of Student Success and Completion is the articulation liaison and makes contact with the university partner. In most cases, the two institutions share curriculum and syllabi in determining course transferability. The university's degree requirements typically guide which type of associate degree would be the best option, such as an Associate of Arts or Sciences, Associate of Applied Business or Applied Science. A standard articulation agreement between a community college and university is considered a 2+2 agreement. In a 2+2 agreement the student completes the Associate degree (which is typically 60 credit hours) then completes the remaining 60 hours at the university and earns a baccalaureate degree. In many cases a student can take

additional courses at the community college beyond those required in the Associate degree which will satisfy the requirements of the baccalaureate degree. If the student transfers at least 75 hours from the community college, it is considered a 2.5 + 1.5 agreement. The 1.5 refers to the remaining 45 hours the student will complete at the university. In the instances where a student can transfer in 90 hours, it is called a 3+1.

Please provide details. In particular, how many articulation agreements does the institution have with other Ohio colleges and universities (either 2+2 or 3+1)?

Clark State Community College has 107 current completed agreements and an additional seven agreements in process.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

7G Competency-based education: Institutions should consider developing or expanding programs that measure student success based on demonstrated competencies instead of through the amount of time students spend studying a subject.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

No

If applicable, please provide additional details. In particular, how many students does the institution estimate the competency-based education programs will serve?

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

At this time there is no plan to implement competency based education. However, we are researching its success at other local colleges.

Recommendation 8 | Course and Program Evaluation

8 Duplicative Programs: Institutions should consider consolidating courses and/or programs that are duplicated at other colleges and universities in their geographic area.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Clark State is a member of the Northwest Ohio Allied Health Education Consortium Program and offers Respiratory Care, Radiographic Imaging and Occupational Therapy Assistant programs in partnership with Rhodes State Community College. Clark State is also in partnership with Sinclair Community College for the Paralegal program. In the case of all programs listed above, students can take several general education courses at Clark State but must take the technical classes at the partner institution.

Clark State is also offering the Judicial Court Reporting program in conjunction with Stark State. As a way of decreasing costs for both institutions the Colleges have signed an MOU that will split the courses 50-50 between both institutions. This reduces the cost as both colleges are no longer individually paying faculty to offer the same courses to small class sizes but combine both classes together with 1 faculty.

Key outcomes:

- Majors offered to students that Clark State would not be able to offer due to high program costs

Meets the need of the students

What courses/programs are currently being shared with other institutions?		
Course/Program	Partnering Institution	Explanation
Respiratory Care	Rhodes State	Students take general education classes at Clark State and take technical courses at Rhodes State.
Radiographic Imaging	Rhodes State	Students take general education classes at Clark State and take technical courses at Rhodes State.
Occupational Therapy Assistant	Rhodes State	Students take general education classes at Clark State and take technical courses at Rhodes State.
Paralegal	Sinclair	Students take general education classes at Clark State and take technical courses at Sinclair.
Judicial Court Reporting	Stark State	Both programs were low enrolled and in jeopardy of being cancelled. Students from both colleges can enroll into a common section of a course. Costs are reduced for both institutions and they get to keep both programs.

Institutions already provided a list of low-enrollment courses to ODHE by January 31. NOTE: this benchmark will be added to the 2017 Institution Efficiency Survey.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

Section III: Policy Reforms

Recommendation 10 | Policy Reforms

10A Financial advising: Ohio's colleges and universities should make financial literacy a standard part of students' education.

Has the institution implemented this recommendation? If yes, please provide an overview of the process used and the key outcomes.

Yes - In 2013, Clark State began utilizing SALT Financial Literacy Service, a dynamic program that supports students as they finance their higher education, manage student loans, and prepare for the many financial decisions that they will make after graduation. The service also allows students to create a profile and upload their own student loan information and create a personal budget in order to better understand their options and progress. Through Clark State, students can access SALT and all of its resources for free. In school year 2014-2015, a total of 557 Clark State students accessed SALT. Of those students, 37% were delinquent on their loans. With the help of SALT and the Financial Aid office, 67% of those students were brought back to good standing. We continue to promote SALT to all students at orientations and at all student events. Data is currently being collected for school year 2015-2016.

If the institution has not implemented this recommendation, is there a plan to implement? If yes, what is the implementation plan? If the institution has not implemented this recommendation and does not plan to do so, please provide the rationale.

10B Obstacles: The state Department of Higher Education and/or state legislature should seek to remove any obstacles in policy, rule or statute that inhibit the efficiencies envisioned in these recommendations.

What legislative obstacles or policy roadblocks, if any, inhibit efficiencies and affordability practices at the institution?

Prevailing wage requirements applicable to higher education institutions (ORC Section 4115.034) should be repealed. The savings could amount to 30% of labor costs on construction projects.

The Ohio Articulation and Transfer Policy (ORC 3333.16 (C)) – The timeline outlined in this policy affects our ability as a community college to ensure full transferability – and corresponding cost savings – for students.

Section IV: Cost Savings, Redeployment of Savings & Tangible Benefits to Students

The following charts allow each institution to report this information. For the first chart, please provide, if applicable, any actual cost savings to the institution for fiscal year 2016 (or expected annual cost savings) for each of the recommendations from the Task Force. (Please note this does NOT include cost avoidance.) Then the institution should indicate “yes” or “no” to the savings being redeployed to lower costs for students in terms of tuition, room and board, and/or student financial aid. If there was no savings or the institutional savings was not redeployed, please indicate “yes” or “no” to the practice providing a tangible benefit to the quality of students’ education.

For the second chart, please provide more detail as to how cost savings were deployed, specifically in the following categories: reductions in cost of attendance, student financial aid, student services, investment in efficiency and affordability tools, and student program improvements. Please use the explanation field to provide further detail.

Please use the chart below to capture, if applicable, FY16 cost savings, or expected annual savings, to institutions in actual dollars:

Recommendation	If applicable, provide the actual FY16 cost savings, or expected annual cost savings to the institution <small>*Put NA if no savings</small>	Were the savings redeployed to reduce the cost of college for students? (Yes or No)	Or did the practice provide tangible benefits to the quality of students' education? (Yes or No)
<i>Efficiency Practices</i>			
3A: Campus Contracts			
3B: Collaborative contracts			
4A: Asset Review			
4B: Operations Review			
4C: Affinity partnerships and sponsorships			
5A: Cost diagnostic			
5B: Productivity measure			
5C: Organizational Structure			
5D: Health-care costs			
5E: Data Centers			
5F: Space utilization			
Energy projects			
<i>Academic Practices and Policies</i>			
6A: Negotiate cost on textbook affordability			
6B: Standardize materials			
6C: Develop digital capabilities			
7A: Education Campaign			
7B: Graduation Incentive			
7C: Standardize credits for degrees			
7D: Data-driven advising			
7E: Summer programs			
7F: Pathway agreements			
7G: Competency-based education			
8: Duplicative courses and programs			

Low-enrollment programs:			
10: Financial advising:			
Total Expected Annual Cost Savings:	\$		

Please utilize the chart below to show how the total actual cost savings listed above were redeployed to either (1) reduce the cost of college for students or (2) to provide tangible benefits for the quality of students' education:

Category	Amount Invested	Explanation
Reductions to the total cost of attendance (tuition, fees, room and board, books and materials, or related costs — such as technology)		
Student financial aid		
Student success services, particularly with regard to completion and time to degree		
Investments in tools related to affordability and efficiency		
Improvements to high-demand/high-value student programs		
<i>Add other categories as needed</i>		