



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.

The university strongly encourages, and in certain cases requires, employees to use existing contracts (i.e., IUC, SciQuest) for purchasing goods and services; however, we intend to expand and formalize this requirement where applicable. This will be accomplished as part of an administrative purchasing policy being revised with a planned effective date of January 1, 2017. Although current policy states that all procurement activities involving the university shall be coordinated through the procurement department, employees have significant discretion in regards to smaller purchases that comprise a portion of our overall spend. Under existing policy, the purchase or lease of any equipment, material, and supplies when the cost is \$25,000 or greater, the procurement of services when the cost is \$50,000 or greater, and construction contracts when the cost is \$50,000 or greater shall be awarded to the lowest and/or most responsive bidder pursuant to competitive bidding procedures. (Competitive quotations may also be solicited for procurements below the established limits, whenever it would best serve the interests of the university.) Furthermore, any purchase of goods or supplies greater than \$2,500 requires a purchase order to be requisitioned from and issued by the procurement department utilizing our SciQuest Flashcart system. Our Flashcart system allows users to gain immediate access to pre-negotiated supplier punch-out catalogs. By using these programs, the university saves time and money. Our largest punch-out category is for office supplies and our utilization rate is roughly 98%.

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.

Our plans to expand our policy requirements and increase compliance with Recommendation 3A will include components of analysis, communication, and accountability.

We have a reporting process in place of analyzing all suppliers for whom total annual spend has exceeded \$25,000. This enables us to assess compliance with bidding requirements for major contracts. In order to identify areas with the largest opportunities for savings, we have captured from this process all vendors for whom expenditures over a 2 ½ year period ending December 31, 2015 have totaled greater than \$1 million (see Exhibit 1 below). We will conduct analyses of past and present procurement practices to determine where changes or additions to policy requirements are needed as well as establish mechanisms for ongoing analysis to verify compliance in the future. In addition, in order to enhance our data analytics in the future, it is our intention to develop a revised commodity code structure in collaboration with other state universities. This new structure will take into account our current system, the coding conventions in place at other universities, and common industry standards such as the United Nations Standard Products and Services Codes (UNSPSC). By developing a coding system in collaboration with

other state universities, we will enhance not only our own analyses, but also the ability to perform common analyses across institutions. Once created, this commodity code structure will be applied to all purchasing methods inclusive of purchase orders, check requests, and purchasing card (p-card) transactions. Our target for completion is January 1, 2017.

We will develop a comprehensive communication plan to remind all employees of available university-wide contracts and procurement processes, as well as to make them aware of additional requirements in the revised policy. Our plan will begin with an introductory communication from our senior executive officers to draw attention to the topic and demonstrate their support and expectations. We intend to utilize any available resources and venues to inform the university community of our policy requirements, existing contracts, and service enhancements moving forward including, but not limited to, regular attendance and presentations at Business Administrator Services (BAS) forums, periodic training such as “brown bag” events, more frequent Flashcart training and onboarding sessions, articles in the university’s *e-Inside* and *Management Update* newsletters, and website changes. Our outreach and communications across the university will reinforce the importance of utilizing established contracts and will begin immediately.

We will ensure accountability by specifying, within the revised policy, the penalties for violations that will include forfeiting purchasing authority and/or suspension of p-card accounts. We will include an emphasis on accountability in all of our communications and our ongoing analysis of procurement activity will be designed to include identification of purchasing activity that does not comply with policy requirements.

One tool we will utilize for this work is SciQuest Total Contract Manager (TCM) which we have recently acquired. TCM provides us with a fully searchable repository of executed contracts and full authoring capability. Once fully implemented, TCM will provide us with increased visibility and accessibility to contracts university-wide. Although we are just beginning our use of the system, with TCM’s implementation we can become more strategic in our approach to contract maintenance. We are already noticing significant improvements to that end.

In addition to requiring that employees use existing contracts, we will identify other areas for savings. These areas include working with our current purchasing card provider, whose contract has been vetted and approved by the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group (IUC-PG), and identifying ways to enhance our rebates through expanded use of our p-card account for accounts payable payment processing in general. Our rebate with J.P. Morgan Chase is currently \$278,000. We feel that by expanding the program we could increase this amount by an additional \$150,000.

Exhibit 1

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
Expenditures > \$1 million for Ten Quarters Ending 12/31/15

| | Supplier | Description | Campus | FY14 | FY15 | FY16-Q2 | Total | Contract Utilization |
|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|--|
| 1 | Sodexo Inc. & Affiliates | Dining Services | Kent | \$16,603,798 | \$16,396,613 | \$7,708,331 | \$40,708,742 | Kent Campus Dining Services is the largest user of this agreement. Roughly 97% of our dining purchases are serviced through this program. The university has recently hired a consultant to review our dining services program. Once the review has been completed, we hope to understand the purchasing patterns of the various users on campus and at regional campuses and academic centers. We can then drive our combined expenditures through the contracted supplier when it is cost-effective to do so. |
| 2 | Interstate Gas Supply Inc. | Supply and Deliver Natural Gas | Kent | \$5,075,339 | \$3,224,981 | \$1,099,562 | \$9,399,882 | 100% utilization of University Contract for natural gas purchases. |
| 3 | <u>PARTA</u> | Campus Bus Service | Kent | \$2,368,324 | \$2,483,013 | \$908,933 | \$5,760,270 | 100% utilization of University Contract for campus bus services. |
| 4 | Brown Enterprise Solutions | Dell Computer Equipment | All | \$2,353,949 | \$1,990,699 | \$1,085,631 | \$5,430,279 | The majority, or roughly 92% of our standard configuration Dell computers are purchased through the Brown Enterprise Solutions State of Ohio agreement. Infrequent purchases of nonstandard configuration systems are purchased directly from Dell under a separate State of Ohio agreement. We are also aware that some university users purchase computers for individual use outside of the Dell agreements and we will work to assess the extent of these purchases and take steps to ensure utilization of the appropriate contract when it is cost effective to do so. |
| 5 | Ohio Edison | Purchase Utility Electric | Kent | \$2,254,140 | \$1,939,667 | \$872,171 | \$5,065,978 | 100% utilization of University Contract for electrical power purchases. |
| 6 | The Ohio State University | OhioLINK Electronic Library Content | All | \$2,593,311 | \$2,131,672 | \$193,104 | \$4,918,087 | 100% utilization of OhioLINK contract for electronic library content. |
| 7 | CDW Government Inc. | Computer Hardware | All | \$2,796,610 | \$1,504,344 | \$537,151 | \$4,838,105 | 100% utilization of State of Ohio and IUC contracts. Also enabled on Kent State's online purchasing system (FlashCart). |
| 8 | FirstEnergy Solutions Corp. | Purchase Utility Electric | Kent | \$1,301,873 | \$2,090,266 | \$1,242,249 | \$4,634,388 | 100% utilization of University Contract for electrical power purchases. |
| 9 | Bolinds Solutions | Office and Janitorial Products | All | \$1,727,323 | \$1,651,128 | \$747,378 | \$4,125,829 | Bolinds Solutions is a joint purchasing agreement through National Joint Powers Alliance (NJPA). Access to this agreement is enabled on FlashCart. The office supplies commodity will be moving to GBEX/OfficeDepot, an IUC agreement, in April for improved cost savings and rebates. We are aware that some university users purchase office supplies from other providers, particularly when utilizing the university procurement card (p-card). We will work to assess the extent of these purchases and take steps to ensure utilization of the appropriate contract when it is cost effective to do so. Contract utilization for the current program is roughly 98%. |
| 10 | Pepsi Cola | Non-Alcoholic Beverages | Kent | \$1,649,107 | \$1,642,623 | \$821,526 | \$4,113,256 | 100% utilization of University Contract for non-alcoholic beverages for Kent campus. Contract extended for one year until May 31, 2017. |

| | Supplier | Description | Campus | FY14 | FY15 | FY16-Q2 | Total | Contract Utilization |
|----|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---|
| 11 | Ellucian Company | Banner Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System | All | \$1,308,123 | \$1,238,246 | \$1,403,303 | \$3,949,672 | 100% utilization of University Contract for ERP system. |
| 12 | Fahlgren Mortine | Advertising Services | Kent | \$1,863,259 | \$1,729,806 | \$48,675 | \$3,641,740 | This advertising service provider contract expired and has transitioned to OneSixtyoverNinety (see line 15). |
| 13 | City of Kent | Purchase Utility Water and Sewer | Kent | \$1,555,891 | \$1,142,725 | \$697,486 | \$3,396,102 | 100% utilization of City of Kent water and sewer services. |
| 14 | NCS Pearson Inc. (Embanet in FY14) | Distance Learning | Kent | \$1,991,442 | \$789,186 | \$580,194 | \$3,360,822 | 100% utilization of University Contract for specified distance learning courses. Currently transitioning to a University Contract with Everspring. |
| 15 | OneSixtyoverNinety | Brand Development and Advertising Services | Kent | \$ - | \$192,027 | \$3,052,703 | \$3,244,730 | 100% utilization of University Contract for University Communications and Marketing (UCM) advertising and brand development. We will work through UCM to ensure that all regional campus expenditures are processed through this agreement as well. |
| 16 | IUC Insurance Consortium | Insurance Premiums | All | \$2,069,180 | \$ - | \$987,073 | \$3,056,253 | The university purchases through this consortium (IUC-IC) whenever possible. We purchase insurance outside of this program only for coverage not available through the IUC-IC. In the rare instances where we have purchased outside of the IUC-IC, those purchases have been publically bid. |
| 17 | American Electric Power Co. | Purchase Utility Electric | Tuscarawas and Stark | \$668,698 | \$1,333,957 | \$692,292 | \$2,694,947 | 100% utilization of University Contract for electrical power provider. |
| 18 | Case Western Reserve University | Ohio Department of Development Research Grant | Kent | \$1,594,121 | \$868,904 | \$27,145 | \$2,490,170 | NA/ - Research Grant |
| 19 | The Brill Furniture Company | Residence Hall Furniture | Kent | \$651,887 | \$1,065,417 | \$614,606 | \$2,331,910 | 100% utilization of University Contract for residence hall furniture ordered by Residence Services and the Office of the University Architect (OUA). |
| 20 | Blackboard Collaborate Inc. | Course Management System | All | \$402,236 | \$933,327 | \$889,852 | \$2,225,415 | We will collaborate with University of Cincinnati to contract with Ohio Academic Resources Network (OARNet) for a State of Ohio and/or IUC platform for 2017 and beyond. We are aware that some faculty members utilize online course delivery systems outside of the current University Contract and, once an OARNet agreement is in place, we will work to maximize contract utilization. |
| 21 | Dominion East Ohio | Supply and Deliver Natural Gas | Kent and others | \$981,089 | \$856,209 | \$352,496 | \$2,189,794 | 100% utilization of University Contract for natural gas purchases. |
| 22 | Apple Computer Inc. | Computer Equipment | Kent | \$579,915 | \$650,524 | \$882,132 | \$2,112,571 | We utilize a State of Ohio contract, but we are aware that there are some purchases of Apple computers made outside of this agreement. We will assess the extent of these purchases and take steps to ensure utilization of the appropriate contract when it is cost effective to do so. |
| 23 | Royall & Company | Student Recruitment | Kent | \$976,224 | \$642,021 | \$490,692 | \$2,108,937 | 100% utilization of University Contract for applicable student recruitment services. |
| 24 | Solar Turbines Inc. | Power House Turbine Repair and Maintenance | Kent | \$970,920 | \$698,285 | \$323,243 | \$1,992,448 | 100% utilization of University Contract for turbine repair and maintenance. |
| 25 | McGraw-Hill Global Education | Computer Software for Math Emporium | Kent | \$887,273 | \$824,595 | \$227,262 | \$1,939,130 | 100% utilization of University Contract for Math Emporium software. |

| | Supplier | Description | Campus | FY14 | FY15 | FY16-Q2 | Total | Contract Utilization |
|----|---------------------------------|---|-----------------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--|
| 26 | Blue Technologies | Document Management Services and Copier/ Printer Purchases | Kent and others | \$664,917 | \$770,461 | \$322,706 | \$1,758,084 | Nearly 100% utilization of University Contract. On rare occasions, certain departments have needed to purchase outside of the contract but we are aware of such instances and support those necessary deviations. In the near future, we will review this program to ensure that we are offering the most competitive program to our constituents. |
| 27 | Contract Source Inc. | Equipment and Furniture | All | \$728,875 | \$831,781 | \$162,991 | \$1,723,647 | Contract Source is one of many furniture suppliers supporting the university. OUA and other departments fully utilize this and other properly vetted contracts for furniture. |
| 28 | Follett Bookstore | University Bookstore | Kent | \$752,443 | \$770,074 | \$78,683 | \$1,601,200 | This bookstore service provider contract expired and has transitioned to Barnes & Noble College (B&N) in FY16. The bookstore service provider agreements primarily provide commissions and scholarship funds to the university. The expenditure figures shown here represent purchases made from the bookstore by academic or administrative departments. These purchases are incidental and not required by our agreement with B&N. Our expenditures with B&N through the 2nd quarter of FY16 has been \$277,713. |
| 29 | Roy's Stow Travel | Travel (primarily airfare for student international programs) | Kent | \$769,594 | \$794,104 | \$ - | \$1,563,698 | The majority of payments to this supplier are for student travel which is charged back to the students at the actual cost. Payments to the supplier for travel of faculty accompanying students are covered by the university. We do not currently have an exclusive travel services provider for the university, but we will be assessing this area along with all other university travel. |
| 30 | United HealthCare Services Inc. | Student Healthare Insurance | All | \$ - | \$805,093 | \$576,680 | \$1,381,773 | Prior to FY15, Aetna was the provider of student health insurance. The actual cost of this insurance coverage is charged back to the insured students. |
| 31 | EBSCO Information Services | Library Subscriptions | Kent | \$127,573 | \$610,344 | \$592,091 | \$1,330,008 | 100% utilization of University Contract for the applicable library serials. |
| 32 | Piper Aircraft Inc. | Purchase of Aircraft | Kent | \$ - | \$866,939 | \$441,235 | \$1,308,174 | 100% utilization of University Contract for purchases of aircraft. |
| 33 | Fishnet Security | IT Infrastructure Project | Kent | \$1,199,093 | \$ - | \$ - | \$1,199,093 | This expenditure was for a single IT infrastructure project and was publicly bid. |
| 34 | BSN Sports Inc. | UnderArmour Athletic Apparel, Footwear, and Equipment | Kent | \$2,229 | \$468,185 | \$565,617 | \$1,036,031 | 100% utilization of University Contract with UnderArmour, for which BSN is the product fulfillment vendor, for orders placed by Intercollegiate Athletics. |

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 | Plan to | We will investigate the most cost effective savings opportunity for an enterprise-wide copier/printer solution by evaluating three potential paths: 1) collaborate through the Inter-University Council Purchasing Group (IUC-PG) to construct a mutually beneficial agreement; 2) partner with other universities in our region on a shared services/joint RFP process; and/or 3) conduct our own competitive bidding process and make the resulting contract available to other Ohio colleges and universities. We expect to begin development of an RFP in July 2016. Savings for this project is estimated at \$300,000. |
| Computer hardware | Yes | We are currently participating in IUC-PG agreements, strong consortium agreements, and state contracts for purchases of computer hardware. See above for spend on contracts with Brown Enterprise Solutions, CDW Government Inc. and Apple Computer Inc. |
| Travel services | Plan to | We will investigate the most cost effective savings opportunity for travel services by evaluating three potential paths: 1) collaborate through the IUC-PG to construct a mutually beneficial agreement; 2) partner with other universities in our region; and/or 3) conduct our own competitive bidding process and make the resulting contract available to other Ohio colleges and universities. We anticipate beginning work on this project in September 2016. |
| Outbound shipping | Yes | We, along with other IUC-PG members, utilize strong consortium agreements for outbound shipping with multiple service providers that cover the wide spectrum of needs of the various institutions. |
| Scientific supplies & equipment | Plan to | Ohio State University has offered to conduct a joint request for proposal (RFP) competitive bidding process for Life Sciences on behalf of the IUC-PG membership. Once completed, Kent State University will begin to utilize the finalized negotiated supplier agreement(s) for purchases of scientific supplies and equipment. Our usage has already been submitted to Ohio State University. We will participate in meetings/discussions with all IUC members as the bid process progresses. |
| Office supplies & equipment | Yes | We have joined with other IUC-PG schools in switching our office supplies and equipment purchases to Office Depot/OfficeMax under an IUC-PG agreement. Annual savings under the new agreement is estimated at \$71,000. |

Assets and Operations

Recommendation 4 | Assets and Operations

Background and Methodology:

In January 2016, KSU issued a Request For Proposal for the selection of a consultant to assist with operational and asset reviews. After learning that Youngstown State University and Wright State University were both interested in hiring a consultant, a shared contract price was negotiated that resulted in a savings of 13% of the original proposal. KPMG LLP (“KPMG”) was awarded the work to inventory and identify, at a high level, potential opportunities. The Opportunity Scan Study commenced in January 2016 with the following objectives:

- Identify KSU’s asset opportunities to leverage existing assets to raise new revenue and / or offset costs from operations and maintenance of facilities and services currently provided by the University.
- Review and assess the opportunities that may exist for Kent State University to leverage existing assets that may be under-valued or under-utilized.
- The identification of revenue and cost opportunities is a chance for Kent State University to enhance its business practices by applying domestic and international leading practices.
- The expected results of the asset opportunities would be to raise new or incremental revenue and / or offset the costs of operating and maintaining the facilities and services currently provided by the University.

During the review, KPMG identified asset opportunities by conducting an opportunities scan workshop and collecting data about KSU’s operations. Selected KSU practices were then compared with other universities and regional and state transportation agencies for the selected opportunity areas including Facilities Division, Residence Services, IT Services, Residence Services and Real Estate Division. In addition to the above opportunities, KPMG identified potential opportunities in other non-core business areas i.e. Bookstore operations, Golf Course and parking. A preliminary list of potential revenue generating and/or cost savings asset opportunities were developed. The asset opportunities were screened based on financial, commercial, operational, acceptability, implementation and timing / readiness principles and a benchmark value was normalized to produce a relative comparison to KSU.

The initial list of potential opportunities reviewed by KPMG is included below. From this list of 34 items, 15 items were selected for additional analysis and will be discussed in the appropriate section below.

| Business Area | Long List of Potential Opportunities Identified | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Facilities | 1. Outsourcing FM services 2. Consolidation of Housekeeping 3. Cell Towers 4. Fleet Management 5. Fiber optics | 6. Consolidation of fuel / salt procurement 7. Using a vendor managed inventory process (VMI) 8. Renewable energy usage 9. Review capital planning / deferred maintenance |
| Dining Services | 10. Comprehensive Outsourcing contract 11. Pouring Rights Contract | 12. Consolidate the meal plans using benchmarks 13. Consolidation into a multi-University Consortium |
| IT Services | 14. Outsourcing IT Desktop Support 15. Outsourced telecommunications | 16. Consolidation into a multi-University Consortium for printing 17. Generating revenues through the advertising on website, buses, message boards |
| Real Estate Services | 18. Disposition of surplus / excess land 19. Monetization of the microcell sites on campus 20. Revenues through advertising and sponsorship of excess lands | 21. Ground leases 22. Developing/renewing the campus master plan |
| Residence Services | 23. Residence Hall P3 24. Housekeeping / Maintenance FTEs 25. Rent rate distribution | 26. Business operations / KSU housing policy 27. Procurement process |
| Parking | 28. Monetization of Parking | |
| Book Store | 29. Value analysis of the Barnes & Nobles contract 30. Customer satisfaction survey (Voice of the Customer) | |
| Golf Course | 31. Outsourcing of operations 32. Sale of the Golf Course 33. Use of university FTEs | |
| Buses | 34. Outsourcing of the current bus contract | |

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:

Based on the above noted review process, the following items have been considered for additional analysis and possible implementation.

1. Real estate disposition – Based on a review of real estate parcels currently owned by the university it was determined that there are several parcels that may be identified for sale or lease. The potential value of a sale of these parcels is estimated at \$450,000 - \$550,000. The university is beginning the process of developing a comprehensive facilities master plan so decisions regarding sale of the parcels will be made after the plan has been completed.
2. Parking – The university has approximately 12,000 parking spaces on 70 lots across the Kent campus. KPMG assessed the university operations as compared to other recent monetization transactions and indicated that a leveraged finance model is necessary in order to evaluate the parking monetization potential. Based on preliminary KSU parking results and recent market transactions, KPMG has indicated a potential one-time payment of between \$25.00 million - \$30.00 million of these assets. The university is currently assessing parking services using Lean techniques and is completing a campus master plan which will also address parking.
3. Golf Course – The university golf course is not a core asset of the university and has been experiencing financial challenges. KPMG reviewed the operations of the golf course and has assessed that outsourcing the operation of the course is not likely based on the recent closure of two area golf courses. Additional reviews should be performed to determine the value of leasing or selling the land as an alternative approach to continuing to operate the course. The possible value of the land ranges from \$250,000 - \$500,000.

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:

Based on the above noted review process, the following items have been considered for additional analysis and possible implementation.

1. Dining Services - Kent State University currently has a Sodexo contract that ends in May 2017. Based on benchmarking completed by KPMG it was determined that there was potential for additional revenue and/or capital funding related to dining operations. With the end of the contract nearing, the university has hired Innovative Hospitality Solutions (IHS) to assess the current dining services model and offerings and assist in the competitive selection of and negotiations with a potential new dining partner. This process will be completed prior to May 2017. The broad range of financial gain is \$2 million to \$6 million in cost savings/revenue generation.
2. Bus Service – Kent State currently contracts with the Portage Area Regional Transit Authority (PARTA) for bus service. This service includes use by students, faculty, and staff around campus as well as on the general routes around the area. This contract has been in place since 2004 with amendments in rates since that time. The most recent amendment sets rates for the fiscal year 2016 and 2017. In the coming summer, the university will gather data to assess the needs of students and determine if the current bus service is meeting the needs of the students. Any changes will be incorporated into negotiations with PARTA and other potential partners to find the service provider that meets the needs of students at the best value. Based on a current cost of \$2.3 million, it is estimated that the university could reduce the cost by \$175,000 to \$250,000 based on negotiations on service level and rate.
3. Cell Phone Stipends – Kent State currently provides a stipend to cover cell phone costs for those employees that are deemed to have a business need. The stipends totaled \$488,810 for fiscal year 2015. The use of stipends should be reviewed to determine if the process of approving stipends should be modified and if the amount of the stipend can be reduced based on current plan pricing and benchmarks with peer institutions. The range of savings could be from \$48,000 to \$450,000.

4. Facilities operation – Based on the KPMG review, there were three recommendations for further review. The first is the custodial/housekeeping operation of the university. The KPMG review suggests that outsourcing this operation could save the university approximately \$900,000 per year. Another option would be to create a shared service operation which could reduce the cost approximately \$150,000 per year. A second recommendation related to facilities is to contract with a third-party for management of university fleet vehicles which would include maintenance of the vehicles. These recommendations are projected to save \$28,000 to \$70,000 per year. The third recommendation relates to the use of a preferred vendor managed contract for parts and maintenance which could translate to between \$325,000 and \$650,000 in savings annually. In addition to the items noted in the KPMG report, the university review of residence services has indicated a potential opportunity to modify housekeeping service which would save an estimated \$498,000.

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.

Kent State has a number of partnerships and sponsorships that have been recently implemented or are in the process of being reviewed in the coming year. Immediate opportunities in fiscal year 2017 include campus dining and the beverage sponsorship. The university is also in the process of completing a request for proposal for athletic physician services with a request for hospital sponsorship which would include exclusivity and designation as the “Official Hospital of Kent State Athletics”. Other sponsorship opportunities being considered include the sponsorship of the Kent State healthy campus initiative.

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.

Please identify partnerships and sponsorships in effect for FY2016:

| Partnerships/Sponsorships | Description |
|----------------------------------|---|
| PNC Bank | This agreement designates PNC as the university’s exclusive bank with a branch and ATMs on campus. The university received a one-time royalty payment and annual royalty payments. The agreement began July 1, 2015 and extends through June 30, 2027. |
| Pouring Rights Agreement – Pepsi | This agreement is for the exclusive right as the beverage provider of Kent State. The agreement will terminate May 31, 2017. A request for proposal will be released in the fall of 2016 for a new provider. Based on the KPMG assessment, there is the potential for revenue in excess of the current agreement estimated at approximately \$150,000 per year. |

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Bookstore – Barnes & Noble | The university bookstore is currently managed by Barnes & Noble College Booksellers, LLC (“Barnes & Noble”). On May 13, 2015, Kent State University entered into an agreement with Barnes & Noble for the exclusive rights to operate and provides services for our bookstores on seven of eight campuses (excluding Geauga). The agreement will terminate on June 30, 2021, with options to renew and extend. |
| Campus Dining – Sodexo | This agreement has designated Sodexo as the independent contractor to provide dining services to Kent State University for the past 14 years. The term of the agreement shall expire on May 31, 2017. The agreement began during the 2001-2002 academic year. |

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.

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.

The division of Business and Finance has developed a cost analysis tool. Costs and revenue are able to be reviewed by function (e.g., instruction, institutional support, etc.), by classification (e.g., salaries, benefits, supplies, etc.), by division and by department. A review is currently being performed to identify cost drivers and answer other questions posed above. Based on preliminary review of the data by expense category, there are four costs that have remained at the top for the past eight years reviewed. These costs include salaries, student aid, employee benefits and capital expenses. The data obtained will be further disaggregated to review by campus and department. Data will be added annually. Organizational or structural changes that occur will be accounted for in table updates so that comparative trend data is available.

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 Department of Higher Education has developed a preliminary productivity measure which was shared with the institutions. The institutions have agreed to work with the Department of Higher Education to refine the calculation and develop a composite score by December 31, 2016.

Based on the Ohio Department of Higher Education’s Information system that compiles expenditures per full-time equivalent student (FTE), Kent State is ranked relatively lower than other public four-year universities. In FY15, when ranking from highest to lowest in terms of spending per FTE, Kent State was 10th of 13 institutions. Kent State’s average of \$15,623 per FTE was about 75% of the average spend of \$20,712 for all institutions. This information may be useful in reviewing productivity in addition to the common productivity measure and the cost diagnostic.

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

Yes, both the Business and Finance and Information Services divisions are training personnel to utilize the Lean methodology to evaluate current processes and identify opportunities for improvement. The Information Services division has streamlined the development of workflows and solutions and has adopted Agile Project Management methodologies to deliver project results quickly.

The division of Business and Finance is working with the in-house Center for Corporate and Professional Development to establish a sustainable structure that incorporates the Lean methodology within the division. A steering committee has been appointed and training will be provided by the Center for Corporate and Professional Development. A group of current employees within the division will be selected for intense training with the goal of certification as Lean Higher Education Practitioners. This training will incorporate actual projects selected by the steering committee. The certified practitioners will then be considered “team leaders” and will work with selected teams of individuals on projects. In the beginning, a member of the steering committee will also be tasked with the responsibility for coordinating and deploying Lean projects. The responsibility may eventually develop into a separate office as the Lean methodology becomes a fundamental component of the division’s culture. Two phases of training and projects (eight to ten total) are expected in fiscal years 16 and 17, with nearly 40 employees trained across departments. A train-the-trainer model will be employed beyond fiscal year 17 in order to broaden this component throughout the university.

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.

The institution has not done a comprehensive review. However, as changes in leadership occur, structure has been assessed to better serve the needs of our stakeholders. Efficiencies have been realized in the following key areas:

- Enrollment management aligned with Academic Affairs
- HR aligned with the current Business & Finance division

Plans to change the organization structure to enhance services to students are underway and will be implemented in spring 2017. The university will be combining services offered by the Registrar, Bursar, and Financial Aid in a “One Stop Shop” to address student queries. The goal is to resolve 70% of student queries on the spot and all queries within 48 hours. This change will provide better service to students while maintaining the current cost.

There are potential changes in the administration of the regional campuses. The current structure will be reviewed by the new vice president for Kent State System Integration. Specifically, the university is exploring a reorganization of its regional campus leadership structure to move from six deans leading our regional campuses to three regional deans leading these campuses. It should be noted that sharing of administrative personnel already exists among some of the campuses, especially between the Salem and East Liverpool campuses which are located in the same county.

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.

A review of the organizational structure is underway within the scope of the Kent State University Effectiveness and Efficiency Task Force and an FY17 budget guideline; in particular, emphasis on shared services opportunities – human resources, budget managers, communications, information services, development, project management, and administrative support. The following describes the areas selected for review:

One area identified for review is administrative functions that are currently performed by a central office and also may be performed at the department level (i.e., decentralized). There may be opportunities to better balance the functions between centralized and decentralized operations and obtain efficiencies. The institution has been successful with an organizational structure used with Development Officers that shares responsibility for personnel between a central office and the colleges. This allows the opportunity to centrally manage institutional priorities and resources yet accommodate the unique needs of departments. Potential areas for review are marketing personnel, student recruiters, and the IT support structure.

Another area for review is closely related functions performed in multiple offices across the institution. If some can be combined, personnel can be cross trained and potential efficiencies gained especially during peak demand times. For example, HR functions and student admissions are currently administered by separate offices based on employee (i.e., faculty, staff, student) or student category (new, transfer, undergraduate, graduate, international, campus).

There are at least two functions recommended for review that may be candidates for a shared services model within the institution or for determining an appropriate balance between centralized and decentralized approaches. Functions identified were business managers and facility maintenance personnel. The estimated cost savings related to shared service opportunities is \$150,000.

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.

Kent State University has engaged the services of Findley Davies to perform utilization, benchmarking, and trend analysis in support of the development of a healthcare benefit three-year strategic plan. KSU's goals are to provide highly competitive benefits to recruit and retain top talent, mitigate trend, analyze benefit plan offerings, explore potential new offerings (HSA plan), optimize resources available to employees, as well as maximize health and wellness engagement with our employees. In addition, we will gain an understanding of where KSU stands today and identify opportunities for change that can help formulate this long term strategy. The engagement with Findley Davies will help meet these goals.

The scope of services are:

- Conduct a benchmark analysis of KSU's medical benefit plans vs. other universities throughout Ohio (IUC members and Large Community Colleges) and the region.
- Review the Employers Health Purchasing Corporation of Ohio (EHPCO) utilization report for key drivers of claim spend and trend.
- Assist in gathering utilization reports from the respective carriers for KSU (Anthem and MMO), if needed.
- Prepare a trend analysis based on current plan designs.

The institution is reviewing a few different initiatives, yet to be implemented, in an effort to control healthcare costs. These include the following that the working group may want to consider:

- Smoke-free and tobacco-free campus (this has been endorsed by the Board of Trustees and the implementation date is July 2017)
- Healthy lifestyles incentives that are tied to employees medical premiums (employees could accumulate a variety of points for engaging in healthy activities/behaviors; this is still being evaluated and an implementation date is yet to be determined)
- Explore a high deductible health plan (multi-channeled communication to employees regarding this option is needed and consideration of bargaining unit agreements; estimated implementation date is January 1, 2017.)

Below are several ideas that were implemented at Kent State to address the rising costs of health care that the working group may want to consider.

| | |
|---|---|
| State organized bids for health care providers | KSU completed bid on August 2015 (bid cycle is every 3 yrs.); |
| Explore Wellness initiatives to drive healthcare costs down (options provided to encourage fitness/diet - e.g. fitness memberships) | Currently offer gym membership discounts through medical carriers; offer Free Fridays at Student Recreation and Wellness Center; also offer various incentives such as gift cards, T-shirts, Garmin-Movebands, etc. KSU participated in an On the Move Company Challenge that is a 12-week corporate fitness competition. The competition creates an infrastructure for more movement throughout the workday and rewards the most active companies with national recognition. In addition, it sets up sustainable goals and habits that will help employees build more movement into their everyday life and rewards them for doing it. |
| Take 5, the university's initiative to promote healthier employees with work/personal life balance | We currently are promoting work life balance through the Employee Assistance Program, financial wellness through Valic monthly offerings, Lunch-and-Learn opportunities that cover a variety of topics (e.g., health, nutrition, etc.); health coaching and nutrition counseling is also offered. |
| From KSU's Strategic Roadmap Initiatives: 2.3: Implement a "Great Place Initiative" that prioritizes attention to the diverse human element of the university 5.1: Create a "Healthy Campus Initiative" that prioritizes the health and wellness of students, faculty and staff | We will look at metrics that include but are not limited to FMLA, Worker's Compensation, and absenteeism. |

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

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Aggregate employee cost share | To offset rising health care costs, we have passed along increases by expanding employee cost share to an aggregate amount of 17%. |
| Audit dependents on health care plans | Cost avoidance achieved by removing ineligible dependents monthly. All new hires show proof for dependents as part of the on-boarding process. |
| Annual health screenings | Unable to project cost savings at this time however there would be cost avoidance because employees can be proactive by knowing their numbers (e.g., blood pressure, glucose, etc.) through biometric screenings and Health Risk Assessment (HRA) information housed in the data warehouse; employees use the Health Portal through Be Well Solutions; employees that have become aware of health issues are now working with a primary physician to have continuity of care. |

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.

Kent State is currently contracted with a managed services Disaster Recovery (DR) Program that ensures our Tier 1 environment will be recovered even when our personnel may not be available. We would not want to diminish our DR capabilities to utilize a recovery site only.

We are making plans to relocate our Tier 2 backup/recovery Quantum device at the State of Ohio Computer Center by June 2017.

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.

The university has a complete inventory of all university owned and leased spaces across all campuses and regional academic centers. This data base system and associated data, which includes information on the occupant or occupant department, use and space details, is regularly updated and is used to manage the campus space utilization and requests for new space. The software allows quick evaluation of assignments and space allocation.

In addition to the space inventory, the university registrar manages the class scheduling software and has the responsibility over all teaching spaces and how they are scheduled. This centralized approach to class scheduling maximizes the usage of all teaching spaces.

It should be noted that Kent State University has regularly evaluated the space assigned to university teaching and instructional, general research, library and student services and compared the results with all other Ohio four-year institutions. Kent State has consistently had one of the lowest ratio of square footage per student FTE in the State of Ohio. This provides evidence of the strong space utilization efficiency environment at the university. Using 2013 data from the Higher Education Information system, the Kent campus in Portage County contains only 69 square feet per full time equivalent student as compared to Ohio State (99 sf/FTE), Bowling Green (102 sf/FTE) and Toledo (102 sf/FTE). The university's regional campuses show similar compression and associated utilization.

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.

Although the university has the software tools to evaluate the instructional space utilization and compare the usage year to year, the tools currently have not been used to determine trends and find new opportunities to increase overall utilization. The university will target overall space utilization efficiencies with the following initiatives:

1. Retool and relaunch the University Space Planning and Advisory Committee: This long standing component of the university space management infrastructure, is currently under review and will be relaunched with new tools to help the committee to make data-driven decisions relative to space management. With the university's growing enrollments and limited resources for constructing new facilities, this committee will be instrumental in finding ways to maximize space utilization and thereby avoiding or minimizing the construction of new university teaching and research facilities. The university will begin the relaunch with a review of the program using the Value Stream Kaizen Event and Lean Higher Education processes.

Once re-launched, this committee will be responsible for reviewing key space changes and new growth opportunities across the campus. This central review will help insure spaces are used efficiently and to their full potential. The university also will begin a new facilities evaluation and master planning initiative beginning in summer 2016. This master plan will help direct capital improvements across the campus, strategically using the limited resources to maximize space utilization, and address the mounting deferred maintenance and deferred renewal needs. Avoiding the capital costs for constructing a new facility and the associated operational costs will be the primary savings associated with this initiative.

2. A comprehensive facilities master plan engagement is planned for fiscal year 2017 to align strategic roadmap priorities, academic programs, enrollment growth, comprehensive campaign, and student/community life strategies to ensure the most effective use of funding resources available to capital investment decisions.
3. Adjustment of class schedule to maximize building usage across all available teaching hours: Beginning Fall 2016 the university will move to full scheduling of courses on Fridays (historically this day was reserved for thesis defenses, college and departmental meetings, guest lectures/symposia, and the like). This move will allow us to accommodate our 30% increase in enrollment on the Kent campus (2008-2016) with minimal creation of additional classroom space and to increase the overall utilization of the university's space resources.

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?

Kent State University has long been a state leader in energy conservation and is one of the few institutions which has invested in cogeneration. Sightlines, a third party facilities asset advisory group, has conducted a thorough review of the operational costs associated with the campus energy usage and power production and compared the results against other similar institutions across the country. Kent State consumes approximately 30% less energy per gross square footage than peer institutions and is considered as one of the best in class.

The university continues to drive the energy usage on the campus down. Recently completed projects have reduced the campus energy usage by more than 20% on the regional campuses and by 16% on the Kent Campus. As can be seen in the table below, the university launched a new phase of energy reduction projects, pushing the overall reduction in energy and water usage beyond the 20% goal as outlined in the Ohio House Bill 251 guidelines.

| Project | Collaborative Partnership(s) | Explanation |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| House Bill 7, Phase 2 | The Brewer Garrett Company, FirstEnergy, Johnson Controls | <p>Kent State University’s Board of Trustees recently approved Phase 2 of the energy improvement projects within the Kent Campus academic buildings, surpassing the 20% goal outlined in House Bill 251. The energy measures and new operational tools will save energy and permit the university to take full advantage of the cogeneration turbines, gas hedging and leverage new revenues from the demand response market.</p> <p>The most notable component of Phase 2 will be major improvements to the campus power and chilled water control systems. This enter-prise optimization system and associated equipment will sub-stantially improve reliability, save energy and maximize our ability to leverage revenues in the demand and economic response markets. This complex system will collect historic operational and utility cost data, and determine anticipated demands and charges and then offer the plant operators recommendations to optimize the operation of the university’s boiler, chiller and turbine generator assets. This new system is anticipated to save energy as well as create a substantial revenue stream (approximately \$366,000 per year) by allowing the facility managers to increase and decrease the university’s need to purchase power on the open market and secure payments from the power providers for the associated benefits to the regional power grid.</p> <p>Partnering with Brewer Garrett, and subsequently with FirstEnergy and Johnson Controls, will permit the university to drive down the costs for energy production to noteworthy levels. Over the next 15 years this project is expected to have savings of approximately \$13 million net of debt service costs (annual excess cash flow of \$429,000).</p> |

| Project | Collaborative Partnership(s) | Explanation |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Natural Gas Contract | Kent State University, Northeast Ohio Medical University (NEOMED), Interstate Gas Supply (IGS) | In March 2016, the Kent State University Board of Trustees approved a contract with IGS, the university's gas supplier. The contract will permit the university to procure and hedge natural gas purchases for the Kent Campus and NEOMED in Rootstown, Ohio. The ability to hedge the gas purchase permits the university to better control the costs associated with this volatile commodity. Partnering with NEOMED has increased both institutions' purchasing power and leverage. |
| Electric Contract | | Kent State University typically uses 102 million kilowatt hours of power over the course of a typical year to operate its campuses. Of this total, 67% is purchased and the remaining amount is produced by the university by the combined heat and power plant and the solar array on the Field House. The university currently has a contract with FirstEnergy Solutions for the purchase of electric. With the expiration of this contract approaching in June 2016, the university began monitoring rates and was able to lock in rates that were 13% lower than the current rates for the next 3 years. This 13% reduction equates to \$900,000 in savings over the next three fiscal years (\$300,000 annually). |

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.

Yes, we plan to implement this recommendation. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Executive Director for Student Affairs have entered into a partnership to work with faculty and departments to negotiate the best deals with book companies and other entities for textbooks, access codes, and other instructional materials. For phase 1 we have identified all Kent Core general elective courses with total enrollments above 1000 across all sections (14 courses) and we will work with the relevant departments to negotiate the best deals.

- ENG 11011 COLLEGE WRITING I
- PSYC 11762 GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY
- BSCI 10110 BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
- COMM15000 INTRO TO HUMAN COMMUNICATION
- ENG 21011 COLLEGE WRITING II
- SOC 12050 INTRODUCTION TO SOCIOLOGY
- MATH 11012 INTUITIVE CALCULUS
- ECON 22060 PRINCIPLES OF MICROECONOMICS
- NUTR 23511 SCIENCE OF HUMAN NUTRITION
- MATH 10041 INTRODUCTORY STATISTICS
- BSCI 10110 BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
- MUS 22121 MUSIC AS A WORLD PHENOMENON
- JMC 20001 MEDIA, POWER AND CULTURE

A second phase will target all courses with total enrollments above 500 (additional 36 courses).

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.

Yes. Five years ago, departments were asked to explore standardizing materials for large classes, especially Kent Core general education courses. This was relatively successful. Almost all science and mathematics Kent Core courses have standardized materials, and approximately 50% of all other Kent Core courses have standardized their materials. This year we renewed our effort, explaining to deans and chairs the benefits of standardizing materials, both from a cost and a student success perspective. The deans and chairs have delivered that message to the faculty. We also do not plan to mandate that courses have standardized materials as we recognize the diversity of approaches to teaching content, especially in the Humanities. (Estimated savings of \$800,000 per year)

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.

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.

The following response is based on the *recommendations* of the Inter-University Council Open Educational Resources (OER) working group.

1. *All higher educational institutions in Ohio should participate in a statewide environmental scan of textbook affordability initiatives to provide a base for developing further coordinated efforts.* Kent State University currently has a textbook affordability committee consisting of members from Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, the Undergraduate Student Senate, Financial Aid, College Credit Plus Articulation, as well as several faculty members. We have completed the scan of affordability initiatives on campus and have found the following:
 - a. Faculty are self-publishing material. For example:
 - i. In Physics “Seven Ideas that Changed the Universe” (annual enrollment of ~ 2000) and “Frontiers in Astronomy” (annual enrollment of ~700) are using a set of self-published low cost workbooks developed by the faculty and sold through the bookstore.
 - ii. A faculty member from the School of Journalism is currently developing an easy to follow set of processes to self-publish. This is being developed with a grant from the University Teaching Council and will be disseminated to the University Community at large.
 - b. Several courses use free e-books. For example:
 - i. General College Physics (I and II) use 2 free e-texts which are made available in Blackboard (affects ~100 students a semester). Remote Sensing (Geography) uses a free e-book (~50 students a year).
 - c. Several courses use online content only.
 - d. The University Library houses 600 items on reserve representing 70 Kent Core classes.
 - e. The University Library provides access to several hundred open resource textbooks through the OER Commons, all available to our students at no cost.
 - f. E-texts and E-papers are available via OhioLINK.
2. Under the OhioLINK umbrella, establish a standing OER group dedicated to encouraging statewide development and use of OERs, including open textbooks. Open educational resources are teaching, learning, and research resources that are free of cost and access barriers for the end user, and which also carry legal permission for open use, repurposing, and adaptation. This group would:
 - a. Coordinate statewide OER efforts, share best practices, help reduce duplication of effort, position Ohio’s higher education institutions to qualify and receive grant funding for such efforts, and publicize success stories;
 - b. Select and recommend to the Department of Higher Education the purchase and/or development of digital tools to be used in the creation or adaptation of OER;
 - c. Explore possibilities for negotiating a better price for state purchase of high-quality digital course materials for use across many institutions, when the cost can be significantly lowered through group purchase.
3. The OhioLINK OER group should seek out and apply for appropriate funding/grants for OER initiatives from foundations and other appropriate governmental agencies. One such example might be *The Ohio Higher Education Innovation Grant Program*.

4. The OhioLINK OER group should explore OhioLINK's collaboration with and/or membership in other open textbook initiatives/consortia across the nation to expedite the utilization of OER in Ohio's higher education institutions. Such consortia or networks may include the Open Textbook Network, Open Education Consortium, and Unizin, among others. Individual institutions may also benefit from memberships in such collaborative groups, if funding for OhioLINK's participation is not available.
5. Ohio's higher education institutions should establish individual campus-wide task forces to make recommendations for lowering costs of course materials including investigating initiatives at other institutions and recommending ways to facilitate faculty use of online library resources and OER more effectively.
6. Ohio's higher education institutions should develop policies that appropriately recognize the creation and adaptation/remixing of OER and textbooks as curricular innovation and service to the academic profession during the tenure, promotion, and reappointment process.
7. Ohio's higher education institutions should provide incentive programs for faculty to create new open textbooks or adopt/adapt/remix existing open textbooks and other OER, with the emphasis on general education courses that attract large enrollments.
8. Ohio's higher education institutions should provide incentive programs for those diverse entities on their campuses who can and will be the publishers of OER, in both print and digital formats. These entities might include university presses, libraries, centers for teaching and learning, distance education and eLearning, academic departments, student organizations, and other groups. While OER are free to the end user, there are costs associated with their production. Incentive programs will help these groups to recognize editorial and production challenges and prioritize sustainable solutions for them.

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.

A communication campaign called "GOT 15" was implemented in the summer of 2014. New students and their parents are notified via postcard about the campaign and it is later explained during the presidential address that takes place during orientation. Students again are informed twice a year during their academic advising sessions. Any student who has not enrolled in or completed 15 or more credit hours after each semester receive an email from our Provost encouraging them to register for the appropriate number of credit hours prior to the start of the semester or to complete the remaining hours during the summer. Prior to implementing this communication campaign, only 67% of first-year students were enrolled in 15 or more credit hours. Since implementing the campaign, 81% of first-year students are enrolling in 15 or more credit hours each fall. By taking 15 credit hours per semester a student would graduate in four years instead of five years which would save the student \$25,680.

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.

In Fall 2016, students who have earned at least 75 credit hours and are in need of additional financial assistance to complete a degree will receive a grant up to \$4,000. Outcomes of this initiative will be available beginning Spring 2017.

Effective with the Fall 2015 semester, KSU eliminated the tuition overload fee for more than 16 credit hours; that is, we expanded the undergraduate full-time tuition plateau from 16 credit hours to 18 credit hours. By expanding the undergraduate full-time tuition plateau to 18 credit hours, students can complete two more credit hours a semester for the same tuition, saving them up to \$912 each semester or up to \$7,296 over four academic years. Not only does this change in the tuition overload plateau allow students to save money each semester, but it also may result in students completing their academic programs earlier because they are enrolling in more credit hours per semester. Therefore, students who take advantage of this option to complete 18 credit hours at the full-time tuition rate could complete their degree programs a semester earlier and save on other costs associated with attendance (e.g., housing, parking). During the FY16, undergraduate students who enrolled in 17 and 18 credit hours saved in excess of \$4.7 million due to the change in the full-time tuition plateau. We estimate on-going annual savings to students to be \$4 million per year.

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.

For the past two years, Kent State has worked with faculty and academic curriculum and policy committees to review and make recommendations for revision of associate and bachelor's degree programs to reduce the total number of credit hours required for degree completion. For fall 2013, 19 out of 42 associate degree programs (45%) were 65 or fewer credits, and 105 out of 131 bachelor's degree programs (80%) were 126 or fewer credits. After two years of revisions, only 28% of our associate degrees exceed 65 credit hours and 5% of our bachelor's degree programs exceed the 120 credit hour threshold.

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.

In the summer of 2013, Kent State University purchased a predictive analytics tool from the Education Advisory Board (EAB) called the Student Success Collaborative. This tool, renamed at KSU to Pathfinder, is designed for academic advisors to help them intervene with undergraduate, at-risk students. We began the implementation process with the vendor in the fall of 2013, conducted a pilot with three colleges in Spring 2014, and went live for the entire university in Fall 2014. We currently have 401 faculty, professional advisors, and administrators active in the system.

This tool uses 10 years of Kent State historical data to create models of success for our students. The model then assigns a risk color of red, yellow, or green to the student. This is based on their current performance as compared to their historical counterparts who went on to graduation in their chosen program. The data allows the advisor to intervene prior to students getting off-track as well as to have better, more targeted conversations.

In addition to the interface that is used with academic advisors, there are also robust institutional reports for administrators to use to help better inform them how students experience their programs. Faculty and program coordinators access the institutional reports for their areas to help leverage data about their majors to help inform decisions. Reports are a valuable tool in assessment, accreditation, curricular decisions, understanding which students are successful in their programs, and where the stumbling blocks may be.

Our key outcome in using this tool is to better aid the university in achieving our retention and graduation goals. Rather than being reactive and trying to help students after they have already experienced difficulties, we want to use our own data to better inform our practices and allow us to be more intrusive, and personalized, in our approach with students.

In addition, in Summer 2012, Kent State implemented required advising for all students. Students are required to meet with their academic advisor before they are permitted to register for classes. Based on our data we are seeing a positive impact from the required advising:

- a) 85% of our students now register on time, on average register for 15 hours or more, and have higher GPAs than those who do not see an advisor,
- b) 95% of those students who register on time, persist to the next semester, and
- c) 96% of Kent Campus students who are pinned see their advisor each semester.

Furthermore, Kent State has initiated various methods of outreach and services to enhance high-impact, personalized consultations with students. Kent's University Advising Office has partnered with various units (e.g., academic departments, residence services and orientation instructors) to enable broader outreach and interventions associated with mid-term grades. Beginning in the Fall 2016 semester, we will be requiring mid-term grades to be recorded earlier in the term to provide students with earlier feedback on their academics. Furthermore, over the last several years, college offices have been identifying and performing outreach to students who fail to register for the upcoming semester in their scheduled time. The intended outcome is to provide resources that might assist students with planning and attending their next semester.

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.

Kent State University's online summer offerings and enrollment have continued to grow over the past several years. In summer 2013, 203 Kent Core courses were offered as distance learning courses (unique sections) at seven of the eight campuses in the Kent State University system. In summer 2014, 224 Kent Core courses were offered as distance learning courses and at all eight KSU campuses. In summer 2015, 227 Kent Core courses were offered as distance learning courses. The change from 2013 to 2015 represents an increase of 24 unique sections—a 12% increase in just two years.

More than 3,000 Kent State students enrolled in Kent Core distance learning courses in each of the past three summer terms (3,228 in summer 2013; 3,545 in summer 2014; 3,254 in summer 2015).

The majority of distance learning Kent Core courses were offerings in English, mathematics, history, geography and 13 other subject areas.

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.

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)?

Kent State University currently has five active articulation agreements with Cuyahoga Community College, Lorain County Community College, NEOMED, Stark State College, and Ursuline College. An additional five articulation agreements are in the process of being finalized and there are several more agreements in the early stages of development.

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.

During Fall 2015, Kent State University appointed a Director for Alternative Credit and Articulation Agreements whose responsibilities include increasing the number of articulation agreements with Ohio and other domestic colleges and universities. This initiative is designed to provide clear and seamless pathways for students who begin their postsecondary education at community or technical colleges and plan to complete their degrees at Kent State University. The Director has streamlined the process for developing and implementing articulation agreements and is actively communicating the updated process to the Kent State University community in order to encourage the development of further partnership agreements. In addition, several expired articulation agreements have been identified and steps are being taken to review, revise and renew prior articulation agreements where appropriate.

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.

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.

In several degree programs, if a student has an industry-recognized credential (e.g., certified paramedic, registered respiratory therapist, licensed cosmetologist, Chartered Property Casualty Underwriter (CPCU) certified in insurance), he or she is awarded specific college credit toward that program only. In some instances, we require that students take a transition course before we award credit to ensure they have the knowledge as well as to get them up to speed on theories behind practice.

Students who demonstrate the ability and knowledge in a particular subject area may earn credit in selected courses through Credit-By-Examination (CBE). Students are also able to demonstrate their prior knowledge through completion of national College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams. In addition, Kent has one master's degree in theatre where a student who has done impressive acting/theatre production (e.g., on Broadway, on television) could be given credit toward the degree.

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.

Yes. Kent State University has, for years, carefully considered options with nearby universities and colleges to offer the most appropriate, state-of-the-art, non-duplicated programs. Below is a list of programs currently offered with other universities. In addition, as part of the 2015 course and program enrollment process we reviewed our offerings across our eight-campus system and eliminated duplication. Per the low program/course enrollment reports submitted to ODHE in January, 2016, we currently have not identified programs for elimination or sharing at this time. However, through our course evaluation report, we identified that Kent State University was inefficient at offering courses, especially distance learning courses, across its 8-campus system and thus we are intentionally collaborating across our campuses to avoid duplication. For Summer 2016, there is a net reduction of eight course sections in English, Mathematics, Psychological Sciences, and Sociology for an estimated savings of \$54,000 in salaries (all adjunct positions), plus benefits. We will continue to expand these course duplication reduction efforts to the fall and spring semesters in collaboration with all regional campus deans.

What courses/programs are currently being shared with other institutions?

| Course/Program | Partnering Institution | Explanation |
|--|---|--|
| Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in Sociology | University of Akron | Since 1972, faculty at Kent State University and the University of Akron have offered courses in this joint Doctoral Program. |
| Combined Bachelor of Science (BS) degree in Integrative Life Sciences and Doctor of Medicine (MD) degree | Northeast Ohio Medical University University of Akron Youngstown State University | Since 1973, Kent State University, the University of Akron, Youngstown State University, and NEOMED have offered, as a consortium, a six (or seven)-year B.S./M.D. program (www.neomed.edu). The program consists of two phases outlined below: 1. The B.S. degree consisting of all humanities, social studies, and basic premedical sciences which is completed in two or three years (can be completed at Kent State, Youngstown State, or the University of Akron); and 2. A four-year medical school course study at the NEOMED campus in Rootstown, Ohio, as well as selected clinical campuses. |
| Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in History | University of Akron | Since 1998, faculty at Kent State University and the University of Akron have offered courses in this joint Doctoral Program |
| Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) degree in Nursing | University of Akron | Since 1999, this collaborative Ph.D. program has provided a rigorous, state-of-the-art joint curriculum designed to change and improve the course of healthcare in the future. |

| Course/Program | Partnering Institution | Explanation |
|--|--|---|
| Doctor of Audiology (AuD) degree in Audiology | Cleveland Clinic University of Akron | Kent State University and the University of Akron and, in affiliation with the Cleveland Clinic Foundation, offers the Doctor of Audiology (AuD) degree through the Northeast Ohio Au.D. Consortium (NOAC). NOAC merges the assets of two university programs that focus on the scientific and clinical bases of audiology with the Cleveland Clinic Section of Audiology to provide students with exposure to the breadth and depth of diagnostic and rehabilitative audiology. |
| Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree in Creative Writing | Cleveland State University University of Akron Youngstown State University | In 2005, the Northeast Ohio Master of Fine Arts (NEOMFA) consortium was formed to offer this MFA degree. Courses for this program are cross-listed at all four universities and students can register in any course on any campus. Opportunities exist for students to work at the Wick Poetry Center, The CSU Poetry Center, the Youngstown State Poetry Center, or one of the university writing labs, and have access to a visiting writers' series, student reading series, literary centers, and various publications. |
| Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree in Enology Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree in Viticulture | Arkansas Tech University Central Lakes College (Minn.) Highland Community College (Kan.) Michigan State University Missouri State University Niagara County Community College (N.Y.) Northeast Iowa Community College Northeast Wisconsin Technical College Northern New Mexico College Redlands Community College (Okla.) Rend Lake College (Ill.) Sonoma State University (Calif.) Surry Community College (N.C.) Texas State Technical College Umpqua Community College (Ore.) Yakima Valley Community College (Wash.) | Kent State University joined the Viticulture and Enology Science and Technology Alliance (VESTA) in 2011. As a member of VESTA, Kent State University provides students with a 21st century education in grape growing and winemaking science and technology. Courses are offered both online (at all member universities and colleges), and face-to-face. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in hands-on field experiences through partnerships developed with local vineyards and wineries, thus providing them with practical wine industry experience near their home location. |

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.

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.

Currently Kent State University is piloting a financial wellness program developed by the Bursar's Office. Other opportunities may be explored through the university's banking affiliation partner. The current program consists of several different financial wellness workshops ranging from basic budgeting, managing student loans, establishing credit, to life after college, etc. These workshops are offered several times a week and are open to all students at the Kent Campus. The university is exploring a plan to implement by fall 2017 a Financial Wellness Education program as one of the requirements for the Kent Campus First Year Experience courses taken by all first-year students.

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?

Policy Reform regarding university real estate

Significant legislative changes have been made with respect to the university's use and control of its real estate by granting statutory authority to the university under 3345.07, 3345.11, 3345.12, 3345.54 and 3345.55, the process for selling, leasing or granting easements to land titled to the State of Ohio (which constitutes a major part of the real property at Kent State University) is both cumbersome and lengthy.

Under current law, monetizing real estate assets is problematic, since the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) must first approve the terms of the sale, incorporate it into proposed legislation and have the General Assembly enact it into law. This process can take 12-18 months, a period of time most interested buyers are not willing to wait. The DAS director controls the granting of other property rights such as leaseholds and easements. Given the volume of transactions that agency must handle, this too is a lengthy process over which the university has no control.

In the case of real property acquisition, the current law requires approval of the Chancellor and the Controlling Board. The purchase price cannot exceed the appraised value, which in some cases is unrealistic. Kent State has been unable to acquire some strategically important properties for lack of a supporting appraisal.

The universities are unlike other state agencies in that each has a governing board of trustees. It should be the role of the trustees to determine how funds are expended, and what real estate is acquired or sold. The differences between state universities and other agencies is recognized in part in Chapter 3345; however, we recommend that the university, by and through its governing board, be given full autonomy in real estate transactions, regardless of how the property is titled.

Policy reform regarding insurance

Kent State University participates in the Inter-University Council Insurance Consortium (IUC-IC) to obtain insurance coverage in the most cost efficient manner. This has resulted in cost savings each year of approximately \$400,000. The IUC-IC has been based on a pooling agreement between members without a formal structure. The legislation pending before the General Assembly (HB 416) will formalize the organization as a political subdivision and ensure that it continues into the future. Kent State recommends that the legislature approve the pending legislation.

Policy reform regarding Board of Trustees meetings

To facilitate efficient and effective conduct of university governance, it is recommended that state law be changed to permit, on a limited basis, trustee attendance at board meetings via electronic communications. This change would enable a board member to be considered present and to participate in a meeting remotely, which is currently prohibited.

It is recognized that boards of trustees are deliberative bodies and trustees need to attend meetings to perform the role to which they were appointed and to add to the diversity of thought and expertise in the board's deliberations. However, there are unusual and extenuating circumstances from time to time when a member may not be physically able to be present at a board meeting. Advances in technology have made it possible for individuals to join meetings effectively from remote locations using teleconferencing or videoconferencing.

It is suggested that permitting remote participation be at the sole discretion of the board and that a physical quorum must always be present as required by statute for a valid meeting to occur. Reasonable limits may include allowing a member to attend a meeting by video or audio conference if the trustee is prevented from physically attending due to circumstances such as a personal illness or disability, an urgent employment purpose, or family emergency; limiting the number of times in which remote participation is permitted; or requiring a majority vote of the board to allow remote participation on a case-by-case basis.

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 | \$3.4 million | N/A | N/A |
| 3B: Collaborative contracts | \$2.5 million | N/A | N/A |
| 4A: Asset Review | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4B: Operations Review | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 4C: Affinity partnerships and sponsorships | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5A: Cost diagnostic | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5B: Productivity measure | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5C: Organizational Structure | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5D: Health-care costs | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5E: Data Centers | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 5F: Space utilization | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Energy projects | \$2.9 million | N/A | N/A |

| Academic Practices and Policies | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----|-----|
| 6A: Negotiate cost on textbook affordability | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6B: Standardize materials | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6C: Develop digital capabilities | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7A: Education Campaign | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7B: Graduation Incentive | \$4.7 million | Yes | N/A |
| 7C: Standardize credits for degrees | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7D: Data-driven advising | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7E: Summer programs | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7F: Pathway agreements | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 7G: Competency-based education | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 8: Duplicative courses and programs | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Low-enrollment programs: | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 10: Financial advising: | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Total Expected Annual Cost Savings: | \$ 13.5 million | N/A | N/A |

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 |
|---|----------------------|--|
| <p>Reductions to the total cost of attendance (tuition, fees, room and board, books and materials, or related costs — such as technology)</p> | <p>\$4.7 million</p> | <p>Effective with the Fall 2015 semester, KSU eliminated the tuition overload fee for more than 16 credit hours; that is, we expanded the undergraduate full-time tuition plateau from 16 credit hours to 18 credit hours. By expanding the undergraduate full-time tuition plateau to 18 credit hours, students can complete two more credit hours a semester for the same tuition, saving them up to \$912 each semester or up to \$7,296 over four academic years. Not only does this change in the tuition overload plateau allow students to save money each semester, but it also may result in students completing their academic programs earlier because they are enrolling in more credit hours per semester. Therefore, students who take advantage of this option to complete 18 credit hours at the full-time tuition rate could complete their degree programs a semester earlier and save on other costs associated with attendance (e.g., housing, parking). During the FY16, undergraduate students who enrolled in 17 and 18 credit hours saved in excess of \$4.7 million due to the change in the full-time tuition plateau. We estimate on-going annual savings to students to be \$4 million per year.</p> |
| <p>Student financial aid</p> | | |
| <p>Student success services, particularly with regard to completion and time to degree</p> | | |
| <p>Investments in tools related to affordability and efficiency</p> | | |
| <p>Improvements to high-demand/high-value student programs</p> | | |
| <p><i>Add other categories as needed</i></p> | | |